In recent years there has been an increase in conflicts over the ethics of land use between nation-states and indigenous peoples. Federal governments are dictating policies based on an ethos created by nation-states comprised of many different cultures and ethnicities. In the face of these government policies and regulations indigenous and native peoples are battling for their cultural rights and identities based on practices that are often much older than most modern nation-states. In Glacier Bay, Alaska, the Tlingit people have struggled with the National Park Service over land and resource use in their ancestral homeland. Glacier Bay is a dynamic glacial landscape that has been occupied and used by the clans that comprise the Huna Kaawu or Huna tribe and/or geographic subdivision of the Tlingit speaking Natives of Southeast Alaska. Elders would say they have resided in the bay since “time immemorial”. Beginning in the late 1800s, and continuing until recently, there was a great ethical divide between Alaska Natives attitudes about harvesting resources and the preservationists philosophy of early Euro-Americans and National Park Service staff. In recent years the Huna and the National Park Service have been negotiating how to co-manage land and resources in Glacier Bay National Park. This paper will explore how applied anthropological research has helped bridge this abyss between two world views which, on their surfaces, appear to be inherently incompatible. The ethical dilemmas of doing such research and the fruits of involving Huna students from the community of Hoonah will also be discussed.

Huna elders tell how they have been forced out of the Bay and their ancestral homelands on three occasions. The first time was during the “time of the flood”. The second time was when they had to leave Glacier Bay due to the glacial advances during the Little Ice Age. The third time was when the federal government or National Park Service began to
restrict many of the Huna people's activities in the Park. Over the course of the 20th century, the policy of the Park Service could be characterized as a preservationist ideology which attempted to prevent humans from harvesting resources from the park; conversely Huna people believe that Glacier Bay is their ancestral homeland and is also referred to as S'íx' Tlein, meaning the “Big Dish”, which provides their subsistence foods (Thornton 1999 & 1995). After decades of embittered conflicts, the Huna and the Park Service may be moving towards a more fruitful co-management of Glacier Bay.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CONNECTION TO PLACE

Since the end of the Pleistocene and beginning of the Holocene, 10,000 years ago, the glaciers in Glacier Bay have made two major retreats and one advance. Approximately 4,000 years ago with the onset of the Little Ice Age the network of glaciers advanced and formed one large system that pushed out to Icy Straits arriving at its maximum point by the early 1700s. The clans of the Huna Kaawu have oral histories, regalia, and songs that depict an event in which a glacier comes and wipes out their village. Since 1794 and Vancouver's voyage (Vancouver 1984; Menzies 1993) to Southeast Alaska, the Grand Pacific Glacier has retreated approximately 65 miles.

The Huna elders, like Tlingit elders from all over Southeast Alaska state that they have been in the region since “time immemorial”. The oral histories about Glacier Bay or S’e Shuyee by the Huna clans usually begins with the “Story of the Flood”. According to ethnographic interviews, the Huna clans occupied Glacier Bay before the time of the flood. With the onset of the flood the people prepared their canoes and headed for some of the mountains surrounding some of the major rivers of Southeast Alaska. According to Huna elders, this was the first time the Huna people were forced out of S’e Shuyee (Hanlon 2003).

A common theme for all Tlingit clans is that after the flood they descended from higher ground and specific mountains “to live in a territory they were already familiar with but [a landscape] that had changed dramatically” (Monteith 1998:65). After the flood, the Huna clans returned to the areas in and around Glacier Bay. Upon their return to the bay, the clans, over time, developed settlements, fish camps, and other resource areas. Geographic features of these areas, such as the specific mountains that relate to each one of the clan’s flood and migration narratives, were often incorporated into clan crests and became known as their
teritories or *at.oow* (meaning clan property). Many of the villages they returned to after the flood are also symbolically incorporated into their crests.

Each clan, and house groups within the clans, managed and regulated the harvest of fish and game. Any visitors from other clans, unless related to or accompanied by a clan member, were not usually welcome to take resources from that area. Each clan had stream guards who regulated the catch and harvest of salmon. The shaman and *hitsatee*, clan or house leader, worked with the stream guards to coordinate the timing of harvests. Therefore, the clan and house groups maintained a strong emotional/spiritual connection, as well as, a practical political/legal association to their land and resources. Thus, the Tlingit were able to harvest resources from the environment in a sustainable manner. The sustainable harvest and equitable distribution of resources occurred for hundreds, possibly thousands of years, and has been substantiated through archaeological research (Monteith 1998; Langdon 1986).

**Tlingit Identity and Connections to Villages and At.oow**

The second time the Huna clans talk about being forced out of their ancestral homelands was due to a glacial advance. The Huna people have oral narratives that describe such an event. The Sit' Kaa Kaa Kana.aa narrative has been recorded by several different visitors and ethnographers (Muir 1979; Scidmore 1885; Emmons 1991; Swanton 1909; Olson 1933; James 1973; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1987). This narrative tells how the Huna people were forced out of Glacier Bay by an advancing glacier. Geologists describe this glacial advance as a surging glacier. According to Tlingit oral narratives, the advance of the glacier was believed to be brought on by taboos being broken and the taunting of the glacier by a girl. “Eventually the glacier comes down and is threatening the village and at that time the people pack up and leave. The grandmother of the girl who broke the taboo says she will stay with the village” (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1989). As the clans left the village they sang songs about the event. The sacrifice of the clan member in this narrative creates a powerful emotional connection for the Huna people to Glacier Bay.

Today the clans still sing those same songs that the ancestors sang as they left the village and have regalia that depict images of a woman’s face in the glacier. The Chookaneidi clan has a beaded robe (*at.oow*) that depicts the glacier and the woman left behind. That robe or *at.oow* is
brought out at important *ku.eexs* (potlatches) and ceremonies today. The songs, regalia, and history are *at.oow* or property of the clan and serve as documentation and mnemonic symbols of this event. The songs, the regalia, and historical narratives also serve in Tlingit culture as legal deeds to these lands. Altogether these things represent the connection between place, narrative, and history.

The Tlingit oral histories talk about a village located in the lower part of the bay. The glacier obliterated the landscape in its path and therefore the exact location of the village is not known. Some of the old Tlingit place names give us other clues about what the appearance of the landscape was prior to the last glacial advance. The village was most likely located in the vicinity of *Gatbeeni*, meaning Sockeye River or the Bartlett River and Cove today.

After this historical event the glaciers would have advanced rapidly and reached their maximum extent in Icy Straits by the early 1700s. The foot of the glacier extending out into Icy Straits would have then begun to rapidly retreat. The retreat of the Glacier was noted by explorers and travelers like Vancouver, Woods, Muir, Beardslee, and many others. The retreat of the Pacific Glacier, in the last 300 years, has traveled over 65 miles to the head of the bay. As the glaciers receded back up into the bay the Huna clans moved back in to harvest many different types of resources (i.e. seal, mountain goat, deer, salmon, gull eggs, berries, etc.).

One of the early Euro-Americans to visit Glacier Bay was John Muir. He contracted some Huna men to take him up the bay. In 1879 Muir canoed up the bay for the first time and made many observations of the geology of the area and recorded the positions of several of the tidewater glaciers. His descriptions give us important information about the historic retreat of these glaciers.

Muir would make three excursions to Glacier Bay in 1879, 1880, and 1890. Muir’s accounts from these three expeditions give us some of the first systematic written scientific accounts of the glacial history. In October 1879, Muir was led by his Tlingit guide to what was referred to as the “big ice mountain bay.” Muir writes about his skepticism about an icy bay in a country where “so heavily and uniformly all the shores were forested” (Muir 1979:141). Muir’s first morning at the west entrance of Glacier Bay was not very revealing due to “gloomy rain clouds [that] covered the mountains” (Ibid).

Muir’s visit to the bay also marks the first confrontation over the ethics of hunting in the bay. One day while the Muir party was a few days up the bay the Huna men saw some seal and decided to shoot one.
According to Muir’s description, he was very displeased with them trying to shoot a seal and he tried to dissuade them from taking a seal. Muir writes:

> about daylight next morning we crossed the [fjord] and landed on the south side of the rock that divides the wall of the great glacier. The whiskered faces of seals dotted the open spaces between the bergs, and I could not prevent John and Charley and Kadachan from shooting at them. Fortunately, few, if any, were hurt (Muir 1979:150).

Muir’s “preservationist” philosophy was far different from the Huna men’s goal of getting some seal to eat while out on this trip (Callicott 1990:16). Muir packed large amounts of food with him, whereas, the Huna men tried to pack lighter and live off the land. The Huna men’s attitude could be characterized as one of economy of effort. Muir saw Glacier Bay as a place that was unique and should be preserved as a pristine frontier. The Tlingit viewed Glacier Bay as their ancestral homeland that they had a long historic connection to and that their deed to the land had been paid for in the blood of clans persons.

The Huna people traditionally used the bay as a preferred hunting area for seal. Both historically and today every part of the seal is used. The meat is rich in many different nutrients, the furs were used for clothing and footwear, and the fat was rendered into an oil for preserving foods or as condiment on other foods. None of the animal is wasted. Muir’s visit for the Huna would be the beginning of many misunderstandings over the use of seals and other animals for food.

**Federal Management of Glacier Bay: The Growing Ethical Abyss**

The next several decades would mark the gradual elimination of the Huna people from the bay. Alaska Natives were not considered citizens and struggled with filing legal claims to land in Alaska until 1924. The islands in the bay were used in the first part of the 20th century by Euro-Americans for the establishment of fox farms. The fox farms were one way in which non-natives could file a claim for the land. In 1925, Glacier Bay was designated a National Monument by President Calvin Coolidge. In 1939, the boundaries of the monument were extended to include the lower part of the bay around Bartlett Cove. The establishment of the bay as a National Monument marked the beginning of what many Huna peo-
ple have described as the beginning of the “new ice age” or era of new restrictions on “traditional” hunting, fishing, and gathering activities.

In 1946 a landmark study was written by Walter R. Goldschmidt and Theodore H. Haas that documented the resources use and territories of the Tlingit. The report was entitled the “Possessory Rights of the Natives of Southeast Alaska” and it was submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Bartlett Cove and the area surrounding was depicted by the Huna people in 1946 as “one of the most important areas in Glacier Bay” (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:54). According to the report the Huna people obtained the following “natural products”:

- king salmon, sockeyes, cohos, and dog salmon, seals, deer, mountain goats, mountain whistlers or ground hogs, porcupine, black bear, wild berries, soapberries, high bush cranberries, raspberries, wild rhubarb, parsnip, potatoes, land otter, marten, wolverine, and wolf, ribbon seaweed, crabs, king crabs, cockles, shrimp, gumboots, seagull eggs, and timber for canoes and houses (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:55).

Not only did the Goldschmidt and Haas report document the usage and territories but it was one of the first ethnographies to suggest the antiquity of the Huna clans use of the bay. The report specifically states the place names indicating an antiquity of the use of Glacier Bay for food and resources that predates the Little Ice Age. When one Huna consultant was interviewed for the Goldschmidt and Haas report in 1946 he stated that “Natives went from time immemorial to the very edge of the glaciers and hunted and gathered eggs, and they still do this within the limitations imposed by Park Service rules” (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:55).

Just a year after the Goldschmidt and Haas report emphasized the importance of Glacier Bay to the Huna people, a biologist, from the National Park Service, Lowell Sumner, recommended the prohibition of seal hunting in certain areas of the park and the gathering of sea bird eggs (Sumner 1947). This report marked the widening abyss between Park Service management and aboriginal hunting, fishing, and gathering rights in Glacier Bay. Sumner’s conclusions demonstrated a total lack of understanding of a dynamic culture group responding to a rapidly changing landscape. Sumner’s attitude about Glacier Bay was similar to Muir’s preservationists attitudes. Sumner saw no place for the Huna people in the pristine environment of Glacier Bay. Both Muir and Sumner also felt that the only way for them to become civilized was for them to give up their
subsistence lifestyle. In Sumner’s report he recommended the prohibition of all seal hunting in the upper regions of the Bay as well as any sea bird egg gathering. As part of his justification he writes:

Were the ancestors of the Hoonah natives present in Glacier Bay during those prehistoric times? The answer to this speculative question would be interesting anthropologically, but bears little or no practical relation to the economic needs, or way of life, of the natives of Hoonah today. In any event all the evidence indicates that Tarr Inlet, and the upper ends of Muir and Reid inlets, which we now desire to protect from hunting, never were accessible even to the remote ancestors of the Hoonah Indians . . . . The natives today have forsaken their ancestral way of life, and depend neither upon seals nor berries for their living (Sumner 1947:7).

Both of Sumner’s conclusions about the range of and significance of subsistence activities were grossly under-estimated.

Sumner goes on to state that there is circumstantial evidence indicating that North Marble Island had been “raided” by “egg-hunting natives”. He goes on to recommend:

It is recognized that the Hoonah natives used to raid the bird colonies of Glacier Bay during primitive times. However, Hoonah has become an incorporated town (Fig. 8) with daily radio communication, air mail and passenger service, and all the home conveniences of the machine age that the mail order houses can furnish. Use of sea bird eggs by such a large community can only result in eventual severe depletion. It parallels the similar early-day use of California murre eggs, . . . The Director’s authorization of January 7, 1947, listing the special privileges of the Hoonah natives, does not include the gathering of sea bird eggs. It is believed that in view of present and future use of Glacier Bay National Monument, this omission is completely justified (Sumner 1947:10).

Sumner clearly misunderstood and misrepresented both the economic and social importance of subsistence. Recent studies document the Huna peoples’ gull egg gathering techniques as being biologically astute and ecologically sound. Their gathering techniques from the gull nests assured that their use of the resource would perpetuate healthy gull populations (Hunn 2003). His management suggestions were based on a
preservationist paradigm which tried to eliminate everything except passive human interaction, or visitation in the eco-system.

For decades more regulations were introduced. In the early 1990s one young man was arrested for taking a seal in Glacier National Park. The seal the man harvested was specifically for food to be given to guests at a Huna *ku.eex* or potlatch. Nevertheless, National Park Service law enforcement officers arrested the man. The Huna man contended he was just practicing a cultural right.

In the 1990s many events occurred that set the stage for a new dialogue between the National Park Service and the Huna clans. In 1992 the Huna people staged a “peaceful demonstration” at *L’eainbaa Shakee Aan* or Bartlett Cove in Glacier Bay. Several commercial fishing seine boats from the community of Hoonah transported residents to Bartlett Cove. En route many of the passengers sang clan songs. Each boat had traditional Tlingit drums and song leaders. The purpose of the event was to stage a “coming home ceremony”. Once the people arrived in Bartlett Cove they landed at the Park Service dock and disembarked from the seine boats. As they walked off the boats many continued to sing traditional Tlingit songs.

Once on the beach the people approached a dugout canoe and canoe shelter. The recognized clan leaders of all the Huna Kaawu made speeches emphasizing their ancestral rights to the area and telling their histories. As usual at a formal event of this nature there was much concern about balance. Many of the elders and leaders stated that their deed to the land they were standing on was paid by the blood of the ancestors and were represented in the regalia. Wooshkeetaan elder, Sam Hanlon led everyone in a big cheer stating “Haa Aani Aya!” [This is our land]; and all the people responded by yelling this three times.

After the speeches and the songs, a canoe began to make its way to the beach and the people gathered on the shore near a boat ramp. At this point, the Huna people re-enacted the “Story of Raven and the Food Canoe.” The boat was summoned into the shore. This was supposed to be symbolic for the Huna people of coming home to Glacier Bay. Glacier Bay is thought of and referred to as the “breadbasket”.

In 1995, the Hoonah Indian Association, the federally recognized tribal council for the community of Hoonah developed a memorandum of understanding with the National Park Service. This memorandum was established to increase communication and understanding between the two entities and lays the groundwork for collaboration on projects in the Park and specifically for Bartlett Cove. One of the first collaborative
projects was in 1997 to develop a conceptual design plan for Bartlett Cove which included the concept for a Huna Tribal House within Bartlett Cove. Another project that was initiated that year was a study of traditional gull-egg harvesting within the Park.

**BEYOND THE PRESERVATIONIST VS. SUBSISTENCE DICHOTOMY**

In 1998 during the months of May, June, and October, 45 ethnographic interviews were conducted about the traditional harvest of gull-eggs (Hunn 2003:85). This study concluded that the techniques used by the Huna people to harvest gull-eggs utilized an approach that was based on a solid understanding of nesting habits and egg production. Biologists, through an independent study, confirmed the information that the ethnographers had collected about nesting habits, egg production, and sustainable egg harvesting. The Huna study verified that the people had developed a traditional ecological knowledge and had developed a sustainable method of harvesting gull-eggs. This study proved that Lowell Sumner’s conclusions of 1947 were unfounded.

By the late 1990s scientific research and political action had developed a middle ground for a dialogue about management of the Park. In 2002, the Park Service cultural resource manager, Wayne Howell, and myself, anthropology professor at the University of Alaska Southeast, began a three year project to research and inventory traditional cultural properties in the lower part of Glacier Bay. The traditional cultural property nominations will provide the ground work for co-management of the properties between the Park and the Hoonah Indian Association. This is an important step in the face of increasing numbers of visitors to the Park. The next phase in the historic planning process for the Park is to research, develop, and write an Ethnographic Overview and Assessment for the Park.

The University of Alaska Southeast is located in the region and has enrollment of undergraduate anthropology and history students from the community of Hoonah. The University is uniquely situated and prepared to conduct this study. Hoonah students attending the University of Alaska Southeast assisted in all aspects of the project. The research provided evidence of significant historical events that have occurred for the Huna Kaawu in Glacier Bay. The methods used to gather this information utilized ethnographic interviews and consultation with contemporary key consultants and elders from the community of Hoonah. The research included ethnographic participant-observation in various cere-
monies called *ku.eexs* (potlatches) and other public and community events of the Huna clans. Ethnohistorical analysis of historical interviews, ethnographies, and primary sources were integrated with geo-archaeological techniques to develop a diachronic perspective of Glacier Bay.

**GEOLOGICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND THE ANCIENT FORMATION OF S’E SHUYEE**

Geological and archeological research was conducted to understand and to develop a more accurate chronology of the advance of the glaciers in the lower part of the bay, and to try and understand the Tlingit interaction with this dynamic landscape. When the glacier advanced to the lower part of the Bay it silted in large areas and trees were eventually submerged and or sheered off at the base leaving behind interglacial forest stumps and organics trapped in layers of glacial sediments. These organic materials can give us approximate dates of this glacial advance. During the summers of 2003, 2004, and 2005, an interdisciplinary team of archeologists and geologists collected soil samples and wood samples from interglacial forest stumps. Then the team analyzed and radiocarbon dated these organic samples to develop a better chronology for the advance of the Glacier in the lower region of the bay during the Little Ice Age. In terms of geological research, the lower part of the bay has had less contemporary work done and will be helpful interpreting the ethnographic information.

The southeastern portion of the bay has also been the focus of this geo-archeological work because it is the most likely location of the Huna village known as *L’eiwsha Shakes Aan*, the village that according to oral narratives was overtaken by an advancing glacier (Thornton 1999; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1987). Traditional knowledge of place names reinforces the Bartlett Cove area as the approximate location of the village. *L’eiwsha Shakes Aan*, meaning “place or town on top of the glacial sand dunes or hills,” and *S’e Shuyee*, meaning “place in front of the glacial silt” (Thornton 1999; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1987), depict an ancient terrestrial landscape before the advance of the glacier rather than the saltwater fjord eco-system of today.

It is safe to assume the advancing glacier constantly altered the ecology and may have influenced temperatures and micro-climatic changes in its pathway. As the glacier advanced in the lower part of the bay during the Little Ice Age it was a terrestrial glacier rather than a tidal glacier.
Therefore, the glacier was changing the terrain in front of it as it advanced. There were probably numerous rivers, sandbars and lakes all of which were fed by this glacial mass. Simply put, the ancient landscape prior to the glacial advance would have resembled a complex terrestrial riverine and estuary ecosystem. Thus, the ancient landscape of Glacier Bay would have been a remarkable contrast to the saltwater bays and islands of today. This geological action would have more than likely eliminated any archeological record of the Huna Kaawu in the bay. The picture of our understanding of the ancient landscape is being developed through geological investigations and collaboration with ethnographic work on Huna “traditional knowledge” of their place names.

The geo-archaeological investigations and the Tlingit oral histories and place names will give us some idea about what that ancient landscape may have resembled. What we can find from these various research projects will add to our understanding of how the glacial history relates to the human history and the occupation and the resource use of the bay. This research has been shared with elementary through high school students in Hoonah and used as a way to integrate their history with social studies, natural science, and geology curriculums. The integration of the curriculum not only brings local relevance to this curriculum but instills pride in their heritage and history and develops a link and dialogue between youth and elders.

ETHICAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

This project and research on Glacier Bay presented some new ethical challenges and opportunities regarding my research and its impact. Over the course of twenty-five years of doing anthropological research in Alaska I have tried to always think about my research and what its impact will be on the Alaska Native populations I have been working with and studying. Collaborating with the National Park Service and accepting funding for this research concerned me because of the past adversarial relationship between the Park Service and Hoonah. Therefore, I entered this project with great trepidation. My decision to enter into this research was based on the new and positive direction both parties were pursuing.

The positive aspects of the project I perceived were: One, some of my students at the University of Alaska Southeast were Alaska Natives from Hoonah, Yakutat, and Juneau. This would provide an opportunity for these students to learn ethnographic interviewing methods and techniques, learn their own tribal histories from their elders, and help their
community and people document their history, use, and claims of Glacier Bay for their tribe with the Federal government. Two, the knowledge and data developed from the research would provide educational material for use in the schools about Tlingit culture and history. Three, document that Tlingit oral narratives contain significant historical information and that Tlingit place names represent significant knowledge about the region. Four, document and develop traditional cultural property nominations for the Huna Kaawù in Glacier Bay. Five, provide the groundwork for co-management of Glacier Bay between the National Park Service and the Hoonah Indian Association.

My concerns with the project were first the expropriation of traditional ecological knowledge from elders and Alaska Native key consultants. Secondly, the use of data acquired through this research by the National Park Service to develop public policy or management of the bay that would adversely impact the Huna people. Finally, I was also concerned as we proceeded with the geo-archeological work that it might belittle the historical significance or credibility of the Tlingit oral histories and narratives.

**TLINGIT KNOWLEDGE AND ITS APPLICATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

The Huna oral narratives, place names, and songs may offer a great deal of information not only about the human responses to natural events in Glacier Bay but give scientists very specific information about the characteristics of this particular glacial event. After the rapid retreat of the glacier, the bay has quickly become a very productive ecosystem that sustains a wide variety of plant and animal species. This dynamic glacial history has had a significant impact on the natural and human histories of the bay. The human and ecological responses to these glacial movements has attracted the particular attention of geologists, biologists, and anthropologists. Scientific debates about global warming and its impacts on humans and animals have no doubt heightened the contemporary interest and relevance of research in Glacier Bay. In few places in the world can scientists examine as rapid a change in the environment and ecology due to glacial events, and the ethnohistorical research will play a key role in our holistic understanding of this region. Recent scientific research has legitimated the Tlingit knowledge or indigenous “science” (Nelson 1993) and has also provided a middle ground between the Huna people and the National Park Service by providing a dialogue between “subsistence” users and preservationists.
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