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Abstract

This thesis examines spiritual landscapes, illustrating their richness in understanding cross-cultural relations and revealing deeper cultural attitudes toward the environment. It also shows that spiritual landscapes hold visible and invisible remnants of the past, providing insights for intercultural relations today. The research is timely, building on the momentum of international and national efforts to better understand and preserve indigenous cultures and settler heritages. The collisions of diverse cultures during first contact (1400s to 1700s) left society with enduring intercultural challenges. Perspectives on colonial impacts range from culture annihilation and land dispossession to legitimate expressions of imperial power and politics. Regarding land issues, conflicts persist in ownership and management (e.g., legislation and treaties), preservation and designation (e.g., how and whose values apply), and use and access (e.g., equitable provision and regulation of rival commercial, community and conservancy interests). This thesis elevates earlier judgments to reveal insights into land issues focusing on multicultural contributions. The comprehensive approach used to study Sitka Alaska’s spiritual landscape considers spiritual indicators including burial grounds, worship buildings, homelands, and place names, alongside lasting cultural attitudes toward such places (geomentalities). Indigenous Tlingit, Russian and American contributions to patterns of settlement and development of sacred places are revealed in the cultural layering (palimpsest) evident in the contemporary landscape. Using an inclusive comparable platform broadens Western discourses of spirituality, planning and land management. It recognises multicultural aspects evident in contemporary settings, including power relations and settler practices of appropriation and conquest that continue in planning instruments and perpetuated spatial preferences. Such observations, together with spiritual indicators and attitudes provide a comprehensive exploration of Sitka’s spiritual landscape to celebrate several cultural heritages on equal terms. With globalisation and ongoing land conflicts this work urges planners, policy makers and educators to consider the value of adding geographic and spiritual dimensions to enhance cross-cultural understanding. Practical applications for a range of local and international settings and individual decision-making are presented for consideration.
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Preface

Cultural diversity, richness and misunderstanding exist on many levels. I was born in Canada, a country with a rich multicultural mosaic, different to our adjacent American melting pot. My heritage added to the cultural mix as my Ukrainian mother, an Orthodox believer, told the story of her marriage in 1966 to my father, a Croatian Roman Catholic. The mixing of religions influenced several close friends and family to boycott the wedding. As they were both Christians, I had difficulty understanding the conflict. I enjoyed taking part in both religions, perhaps since it meant celebrating Christmas and Easter twice. As a child, I was mesmerised at Easter Sunday mass at the Orthodox Church with my babushka (grandmother) carrying Easter baskets filled with pysanky (painted eggs), homemade sausage, paska (sweet bread), all wrapped in hand embroidered black and red cross-stitched linen. The svyschenyk (priest) would walk through rows of baskets with incense wafting through the open air. On warmer spring days, baskets were blessed outside following an all-morning mass that babushka used to go to faithfully, well into her eighties. On my father’s side, my Croatian relatives in Canada and back home would tenaciously correct me when I referred to my Yugoslavian heritage (I was born during Tito’s rule). I did not appreciate the distinction of my Croatian nationality until spending time in Zagreb in 1997 after the latest war.

As a geography major, I have always been drawn to land use and location theory, why people locate things where they do. Raised in a Western world and educated in a Western school system, my Master’s thesis targeted Eurocentric location and economic theories to explain land use and value in transport settings. I had little exposure to East Asian location philosophies, so it did not occur to me to approach land issues in any way other than a Western framework. The presence of inherent cultural location bias became evident when I started working. For nearly 20 years, I have experienced cultural misunderstanding when working in planning, policy and consulting roles across Canada, New Zealand and Australia. In particular, indigenous cultural beliefs were repeatedly disregarded and superseded by Western translations and philosophies. Particularly around land issues, there appeared to be a repeating theme of cross-cultural difference and tension. Colleagues in the same organisation, government agencies with different
mandates, and interest groups, each participated in the conflicts over land issues. Given my geographic curiosity, I needed to take a closer look at culture and land to understand how and why these conflicts kept arising.

The question of how to bridge some of these cultural gaps and different ways of seeing led me to consider a culture’s inherent belief systems and structures. While cultural geography theory goes some distance in contributing to understanding human/land relationships, I needed to delve deeper. Worldview provided a way to consider differences between cultures particularly as it pertains to a range of topics: our outlook on life, the world, beliefs on how to live, and other systematised views of worldly phenomena including love, life, death, priorities and values. In the mid-1990s, I came across writings of Hong-Key Yoon (1986, 1991) who introduced me to geomentality and the subconscious connections of a culture to the land. His research acted as a catalyst for this thesis topic providing a nexus for my various passions: cultural geography, location theory, religion and politics. But where to study?

A strong pull to the north precipitated a journey to Alaska via Canada’s Yukon, in the early 1990s. I fell in love with the tundra, mountains, and craggy coastline. While I was fascinated by the colonial period and exploration, I wanted to select a study site that could yield practical applications for today. Enter Sitka, Alaska. From the first moment I saw the tourist brochure proudly displaying Saint Michael’s Russian Orthodox Cathedral with gold onion domes, the Russian double headed eagle on the walking tour map, the indigenous Tlingit dancers and the billowing American flag, I knew I had found my ideal study site. Sitka was originally settled by the Tlingit people thousands of years ago, subsequently “discovered” by Russian promyshlenki (fur traders) in the late 1700s, and then “purchased” by the United States in 1867. Sitka holds both material and invisible lessons that challenge a uni-cultural interpretation of a diverse society. Interpreting Sitka’s spiritual landscape identifies how sacred places aid our understanding not only of material cultural beliefs, but also of subconscious geomentality that resides in a culture’s worldview. Examining cultural cosmology (or philosophy for understanding origin and the nature and structure of the universe) yields building blocks that assist to provide different lenses to examine history, colonisation and spirituality.
Bakhtin (1986:7) emphasises the importance of applying an outsider’s perspective when understanding foreign cultures as “our real exterior can be seen and understood only by other people,” rather than seeing one side from within:

A meaning only reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning: they engage in a kind of dialogue which surmounts the closedness and one-sidedness of these particular meanings, these cultures. We raise new questions for a foreign culture, ones that it did not raise for itself; we seek answers to our own questions in it; and the foreign culture responds to us by revealing to us its new aspects and new semantic depths.

It is through non-American, non-Russian, non-Tlingit eyes that I undertake this exploration of Sitka, Alaska. If this work results in one action, let it be to seek pause when engaging in land discussions: to raise new questions in how we regard deeper cultural meaning associated with spiritual places, and to consider how we might celebrate the diversity of our global society.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANB</td>
<td>Alaska Native Brotherhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCSA</td>
<td>Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPD</td>
<td>City of Sitka Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPR</td>
<td>National Historic Places Register (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Russian American Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>Sitka Tribe of Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHC</td>
<td>World Heritage Convention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 GENESIS

One important belief is that Io Matua\(^1\) has given a unique heritage to each and every culture across the world. No culture is more or less important than another – to suggest that there is, is to criticise the Creator. Rangimarie Turuki Pere, Māori\(^2\) writer (in Schaef 1995:383).

In other words, cultures are diverse and equally important. A reasonable premise, yet randomly practiced, as land issues around the globe attest. Intercultural conflicts continue through residual post-colonial dualities and land ownership disputes. They appear in government policies developed in cultural isolation and in ongoing debates of appropriate access, custodianship and land management approaches. Designations, land use and planning frameworks continue preferential treatments for some cultures. Community engagement methods for land issues are variable at best, and individual decision-making favours ethnocentricity. Contributing to these complexities, land conflicts are inevitably resolved within Western planning settings (i.e., by-laws, land use regulations, title registry offices, national heritage definitions, treaty settlement agencies). Enhanced cultural understanding is urgently needed.

Exploration from the late 1400s to the late 1700s led to conflict between European and indigenous cultures.\(^3\) Dualities established during colonisation created distinctions of *us* and *them*, White and *non-White*, which were embodied in land policies and concepts of national identity. Christian mission efforts across the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia actively sought legislation to promote dominant colonial beliefs and outlaw traditional indigenous religions. In 1871, British Columbia for example, joined Canadian confederation inheriting:

> the coercion, segregation and active assimilation of the *British North America Act of 1867*...[and] in decades that followed, powers to repress Indian culture, prevent competitive trading, control the use of Indian monies and erode the Indian reserve land base...[later] legislation in 1911 permitted the removal of reserves near urban areas without band consent (Consedine and Consedine 2001:52-53).

---

1 Io Matua refers to the supreme God (Ryan 1989:16, 31) that has always existed, without beginning or end, as both “Being-itself and absolute Nothingness,” from which all originates.
2 The Māori culture comprises people of Polynesian-Melanesian descent. They have lived in New Zealand prior to the arrival of European settlers and are considered the country’s indigenous people.
3 The United Nations defines indigenous people as: “populations...of existing descendants of the peoples who inhabited the present territory of a country...at the time when persons of a different culture...arrived there from other parts of the world, overcame them and, by conquest, settlement or other means, reduced them to a non-dominant or colonial situation,” (Burger 1987: 5-7).
Continuing land claims and treaty issues in New Zealand, Canada, Fiji and Australia suggest duality continues. Preferred cultural dominance also remains in contemporary land systems. As at 11 February 2009 in New Zealand, 1430 claims of Treaty breaches were registered with the *Waitangi Tribunal* including land, fishing rights and self-determination issues. The Tribunal aims to report on all claims by 2016.

Commercial motives underpinning colonisation continue to influence control and ownership of natural resources. Western worldviews commodifying the environment remain at odds with conservation motives, particularly around oil, gas, and water in Alaska (Haycox 2002b). Debates continue between federal and indigenous Alaskans on land use and management, access to energy, water management, and food production methods. Global post-colonial environments continue to occupy governments, indigenous and settler cultures in lengthy and costly debates. A deeper understanding of the nature and extent of difference across groups contributes to reaching common ground around use and management of limited, valued and valuable natural resources.

Different culture-land relationships can create apprehension in developing policy and providing social services. In New Zealand for example, bureaucrats and politicians are challenged by multiple-ownership indigenous lands and a call for bicultural policy considerations within the Treaty of Waitangi (*Te Tiriti o Waitangi*). Self-governance in education has facilitated cultural preservation of Māori beliefs and language in indigenous learning environments (*Kura Kaupapa Māori*). Few kura however are built on Māori owned land and ad hoc location decisions reveal a need for longer term investment rationale. In social housing, the multicultural client base poses organisational challenges in service delivery. A decision to provide a bicultural response in social housing is debated in New Zealand’s Parliament in 2004:

---

4 “The Waitangi Tribunal was established as a permanent commission of inquiry under the Treaty of Waitangi Act in 1975.” It is not a court of law, rather a permanent commission of inquiry. It examines and makes findings on “any claim by a Māori or group of Māori that they have been prejudiced by laws and regulations or by acts, omissions, policies, or practices of the Crown since 1840 that are inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi,” http://www.knowledge-basket.co.nz/waitangi/faq.html, accessed 12.02.2009.

5 For example, the Tribunal upheld the 1983 Motunui and 1984 Kaituna claims regarding contamination of traditional fishing grounds by industrial waste and proposed diverted treated sewage, respectively (Consedine and Consedine 2001:108).

When asked if “Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) had a ‘two-world view’ of the Treaty of Waitangi,” then Housing Minister Steve Maharey responded, “there is no ‘two-world view’ of the Treaty of Waitangi.” He contradicted his position emphasizing, “different people have different ways of looking at the world, often based on their distinct culture, traditions, and beliefs.” He then faced a question whether there would be an end to a two-world view, “if the issue becomes too hot for the Minister,” (Hansard 8 October 2004).

The Minister downplayed other ‘two-world’ provocations including allocation policies that consider Māori affiliations, and joint Crown-Māori housing supply opportunities. The fragility of extending an individual’s decision-making beyond their own ethnocentric thinking is one operating challenge in multicultural settings. The lack of clarity regarding how to interpret the nature of the Treaty partner relationship is another. Other government departments in New Zealand, Canada and Australia face similar contradictions in setting indigenous social policies and deciphering Crown-indigenous relationships and obligations. Do full and final settlements for example, preclude an ongoing joint governance of land? If a settlement process is perceived as inequitable, how does this remedy ongoing indigenous-settler conflict? A deeper understanding of antagonism between cultures in land issues is necessary to mitigate history repeating. Geographic scholarship contributes by raising awareness “of the nature and significance of different cultural attachments to place,” (Murphy 2006:10).

In addition to these post-colonial and policy contexts, there is a corresponding worldwide resurgence to promote cultural heritage and identity for indigenous peoples. For example, international policy seeks to protect indigenous cultures and preserve heritage sites through the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). Questions regarding heritage designations, cultural landscapes, what to value and by whom, sit alongside economic benefits for tourism and conservation. The complexity of protecting cultural and natural heritage is discussed by Gillespie (2007) wherein the World Heritage Convention:

> has come to recognize local/traditional/indigenous cultural values associated with natural areas as part of a continuum with universal values (p 92).

Gillespie (2007:92-96) notes the need to tightly articulate and operationalise ‘cultural values’ and ‘intangible values’ to sharpen the category’s potential breadth, particularly applying cultural

---

7 Both of these deliberate Corporation initiatives sought to improve housing provision for Māori New Zealanders by incorporating a Māori worldview in service delivery. Hansard refers to the Māori Capability Plan HNZC Board Paper dated 28 May 2003 by Jordan Alexander and Tony Spelman. Jordan Alexander was General Manager of Strategic Services at Housing New Zealand Corporation between July 2000 and September 2003 with policy and other functional responsibilities.
heritage criteria to nominations. The exploration of spiritual landscape in this study strongly links enhanced understanding of cultural and intangible values to such designation challenges.

These conflicts over land issues illustrate scarce regard for cultural diversity, as the cost of antagonism impedes national development and social cohesion. It is naïve to assume enhanced understanding of cultural diversity will eradicate intercultural conflict around land issues. Now is not the time to acquiesce:

> There are few things about the world into which our children will graduate that is more certain than the notion that it will be more culturally diverse than it is today. Students who experience and learn to value diverse perspectives from an early age are more likely to become well-adjusted members of the global society they will inherit (Nair 2003:4).

How might our global society develop a framework that explores heritage, raises awareness of diverse influences and attitudes toward land, and brings Pere’s statement to life so we might celebrate multicultural heritages on equal terms? Cultural geographers are well equipped to respond to this urgent call to action.

### 1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The spiritual landscape offers a comprehensive comparative platform for cultural inquiry. The setting is rich in its reflection of both the invisible inner workings of a culture’s mindset toward the land (e.g., beliefs regarding nature, what is sacred, how meaning of life/death is translated), and the visible expressions upon it (e.g., churches, temples, cemeteries, monuments or natural features like sacred mountains or rivers). It is curious then, that spiritual landscape and spiritual aspects of landscapes remain inadequately researched within cultural geography and other disciplines. A distinguished researcher of Russian American history, Professor Richard Pierce, acknowledged this gap regarding Sitka, Alaska:

> I cannot recall coming across any work on the role of religion and landscape. I think work in this area...would greatly add to the current study completed (pers comms, Kingston, 24 June 2004).

This exploration showcases Sitka Alaska to answer the research question:

> In what ways do spiritual landscapes embody insights to culture-land relationships and enhance contemporary discourse on intercultural land conflicts?
A ‘comprehensive’ methodology is developed for this study that is grounded within the discipline of cultural geography to provide a robust theoretical and practical context to explore spiritual landscape. Cultural geography has grown from a focus on physical landscape to include objects and human expressions that reflect the inner workings of culture. In the past, cultural geographers focused study on the visible form of landscape. They explored interactions between culture and the environment in a physical sense, interpreting how a culture is inscribed upon nature to create a cultural landscape (Sauer 1963[1925]). By the 1980s, study expanded to include the invisible cultural landscape, or inner workings of culture and symbolic dimensions that represent it, including maps, paintings, and iconography (Cosgrove 2008, Cosgrove and Duncan 1988, Duncan and Duncan 1988). Study of cultural attitudes towards land, place and space also expanded (Tuan 1974, 1976a, 1976b; Yoon 1980a, 1984, 1991). Explanations of landscape included socio-political and economic structures as influencers shaping cultural landscape. Given its experience, intellectual rigour and frameworks, cultural geography is an appropriate discipline to explore spiritual landscapes. Unfortunately, while past research has incorporated visible and invisible aspects, cultural geographers infrequently combine these into a comprehensive approach to study landscape and seldom focus on spiritual landscapes (Buttimer 2006, Tong and Kong 2000, Park 1994).

The comprehensive approach provides an original contribution to intellectual debate by expanding methods within the domain of cultural geography and in other disciplines that interpret landscapes. The approach explores the spiritual landscape of Sitka, Alaska incorporating interpretations of cultural attitudes toward the land and cultural influences upon the physical landscape. It blends traditional studies with the socio-political, economic and post-modern rationales to explain spatial patterns, historical development of place, and insights to intercultural power relationships. Alone, such approaches fall short of examining worldview and cultural attitudes toward land. The comprehensive approach examines Sitka’s visible patterns of settlement, sacred places and cultural layering evidenced in the spiritual landscape, while also investigating the invisible cultural worldviews.

The comprehensive investigation also provides a foundation for exploring cross-cultural relationships from first contact to present day. It provides future applications for contemporary academic areas (including interdisciplinary connections with anthropology, psychology and history) and informs contemporary policy and planning practice. Postcolonial impacts for indigenous and
settler cultures continue to be well-researched areas in geography with recent studies reflecting indigenous experiences in their own voice (Clayton, in Duncan, Johnson and Schein 2004:449). Such works are important to record and better understand indigenous cultures and the dualities created during colonisation. Findings however, record or highlight areas of difference, without providing a framework to recognise diverse ways cultures perceive the environment. The comprehensive approach allows culture-land relationships in Sitka’s material and invisible spiritual landscape to be explored to reveal Tlingit, Russian and American cultural influences and attitudes using a systematic framework. This deeper understanding facilitates comparisons of cultural approaches to environmental issues and provides a context for historic/contemporary land use and management.

This study reveals diversity through insights from culture-land relationships. For example, there is a need for more comprehensive and deeper understanding of culture to permeate current intercultural misunderstanding evidenced in post-colonial studies (e.g., focusing on power relations). Some mentality implications are explored through study objects like artwork or mythology, and others focus on how to ‘de-colonise the mind.’ A practical and powerful method can achieve deeper insight through the conceptual framework of ge mentality (i.e., mentality and beliefs that shape cultural behaviour toward the environment). This powerful, disciplined framework enables comparative explorations into cultural ideas and beliefs regarding the land as illustrated in the following contested land use scenarios.

Each culture group responds to the environment according to its worldview (i.e., outlook on life, death, how to live, values). In a physical sense, attitudes towards the land influence the location or siting of the human built environment. In a psychological sense, humans give meaning to the land in how they define their relationship with it. These combined responses connect the visible and invisible spiritual landscape. An East Asian culture may apply geomantic or feng shui principles to determine an auspicious location for a cemetery (i.e., following natural energy patterns that flow through the earth so as not to cause disharmony). Likewise, a Western transport authority may view the environment as a physical barrier to overcome when considering road expansion options, thus

---

8 Feng shui refers to the “ancient Chinese art of selecting an auspicious site,” (Yoon 2006:3). He advocates for use of the term geomancy, to relate to the system and process “of selecting a favourable house or gravesite and proper constructions of them,” as it can apply to several East Asian countries (e.g., Korea, Singapore, Japan and Vietnam) as well as China, though he recognises the increased popularity of the term fengshui (p3).
choosing a *least cost* valley option over a hilly terrain. These examples show how land use decisions can reflect cultural attitudes to the environment. Different beliefs are not inherently problematic, but applied at the same location, can lead to conflict as at first contact and in contemporary land issues noted previously. Geomentality contributes to a deeper understanding of intercultural positions in modern land issues.

In summary, this research provides an important original contribution to cultural geography. The comprehensive explanatory framework widens the spatial, socio-political, and economic interpretation to include inner workings of cultures. It illustrates the utility of ‘interpreting’ these complementary dimensions while showcasing spiritual landscape and sacred places as valuable subjects within cultural geography that hold much future potential and practical application. The study reenergizes *geomentality* as a powerful comparative conceptual framework to systematically explore inner workings of culture. These intellectual foundations for enhanced understanding of cultural relationships give scope to progress academic debate and to engage in policy setting. The cultural geographer’s “field,” according to Duncan, Johnson and Schein (2004:3) is not simply a setting for research, but:

> a network of political, management and research worlds mutually incorporating diverse types of knowledge (p 3).

A greater impact is possible according to Murphy (2006:1): “geography is largely missing from wider debates on political and social matters.” Findings in this study have applications for contemporary land issues by recognising diversity rather than perpetuating conflict by masking variations in beliefs. Finally, this research offers insights into current Sitkan perceptions of the landscape and adds to the local historic record and regional knowledge. The study approach breathes new insights into even well-researched places like Sitka, Alaska. The study objects are outlined next, followed by an introduction to the study location and an overview of forthcoming chapters.

**1.3 STUDY SCOPE**

Despite the neglect of spiritual landscape in cultural geographic study, it provides abundant objects reflecting *invisible* cultural aspects (e.g., notions of sacred and spiritual beliefs) and *visible* material expressions (e.g., geospatial behaviours in the built environment) as illustrated in Figure 1.
The spiritual landscape offers a subject area that inherently links cultural beliefs and behaviours found in all cultures to enable systematic cross-cultural comparisons. Natural and built environments with tangibles such as churches or cemeteries, and intangibles like place names and mental concepts, provide a range of information that illustrates culture-land relationships, ideas and interests. For example, myths and place names reveal cultural attitudes to the environment (geomentality), including what is deemed sacred, and how and why places and people are named. The spatial placement of sacred sites, how they are built, and by whom, further reveals cultural interests in land: visibly through land use, value and management, and conceptually through a sense of place, economic commodification of land and heritage preservation. How these dimensions are captured by those living in the landscape (through interviews), provides a contemporary context for understanding present behaviours and how these relate to past cross-cultural and land relationships. Written and oral representations reveal important culture-land observations contextualised in time, place and under the authority they were created. Information sources are summarised in Table 1. Detailed discussion of data collection, use and interpretation is set out in Chapter 2.
Table 1: Information Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Set</th>
<th>Study Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Thought Concepts</td>
<td>Origin and other myths and religious texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceremonies (dances, songs, poems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speeches, proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral maps (as with stories as used in land claims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Data</td>
<td>Oral interviews with elders, residents, tourists etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception interviews with respondents (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up interviews (2004-2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Maps, place names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveller diaries, journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books, historic accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Artwork, pictures, paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items of adornment/jewellery, clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Icons/iconography (symbols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built</td>
<td>Architecture (churches, buildings, monuments, cemeteries, grave markers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building materials (colours, sizes/shapes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Water, trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental factors (weather etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of the contemporary Sitkan spiritual landscape is based on field research at 11 July 2000. Changes after 2000 to 2008 are noted (e.g., number of places of worship). Analysis of places applies to the 37 sacred places identified at July 2000 that represent the complete spiritual landscape accessible by road within the City and Borough of Sitka. Some contemporary sacred places (e.g., Tlingit homelands) had origins prior to Russian settlement, though the written literature sources span 1794 to 2008 to cover Sitka’s colonial history. Further detail of the study location follows.

1.4 THE STUDY LOCATION

Sitka is located at 57°10’N latitude, 135°15’W longitude, in the Alexander Archipelago in Southeast Alaska. Figure 2 illustrates its location in relation to the State of Alaska (left) and within North America adjacent to Canada (right). There are no roads connecting Sitka to Alaska’s interior. Passengers and goods are transported by air and water via Alaska Airlines, the Alaska Marine Highway (ferry) System, and three barge lines. Sitka enjoys a moderate coastal climate with a natural landscape including flora and fauna (including grizzly bears, bald eagles and five salmon.
species), mountains, sea and forests providing practical sustenance and natural beauty to residents and visitors.⁹

Figure 2: Study Site Location


Sitka Borough encompasses 2,874 square miles to make it the largest city by area in the United States. It is Alaska’s fifth largest city by population.¹⁰ At July 2007, Sitka had 8,640 residents comprising 1.3% of Alaska’s estimated population of 670,053.¹¹ Sitka’s population has declined from 8,835 (2.2% since field work in 2000) due to slowing birth rates and the pulp mill closure. In 2006, the ethnic mix in Sitka included: 66.7% White persons, 19.6% American Indian and Alaska Natives, 5.2% Asian people, 1.2% Native Hawai’ian and Other Pacific Peoples, 0.4% Black persons, with Other ethnicities comprising ~7%, based on US Census Bureau data (21.01.2009).

Sitka’s economy is more diversified than the State of Alaska which is dominated by natural resources.¹² Based on 2005 Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce data, Sitka’s largest

---

⁹ Approximately 250,000 cruise ship passengers visit each summer (http://www.sitka.net/, accessed 22.01.2009).
¹⁰ The population figure is based on data from the office of the State Demographer in the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development (ADOLWD), the state’s official estimator of population (McDowell Group 2008:1).
¹¹ According to U.S. Census data, the Alaskan population increased from 627,533 at the 2000 Census to 670,053 at July 2006. This ~1% gain compares with ~6% growth in the same period for the United States (State of Alaska Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development 2007:5).
¹² In 2007, 84% of Alaska’s $2.336b tax revenue came from the oil and gas sector. The state has no personal income tax or state-wide sales taxes. Other corporate taxes, licensing and permitting fees, estate, electric cooperative, telephone cooperative, vehicle rental taxes, tire fees, gaming fees, and regulatory cost charges, are among other revenue sources (Office of Economic Development 2007:10).
employer is the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium (SEARHC)\textsuperscript{13} which, together with the Pioneer Home, Community Hospital and other private health providers, comprises 17\% of Sitka’s workforce. Government\textsuperscript{14} is the next largest employer category at 15\%. Self-employed fishers, local hatcheries and seafood\textsuperscript{15} processing contribute 12\% of all jobs, and tourism related employment adds over 10\%. Education employs fewer than 10\%,\textsuperscript{16} and retail/wholesale trade adds another 9\% to Sitka employment (McDowell Group 2006:2). Despite the better balance, Sitka is subject to employment fluctuations typical of smaller centres and flow-on population impacts. In 2007, Sheldon Jackson College closed with a loss of 109 jobs, SEARHC cutback 40 jobs, and the US Forest Service reduced by 6 with loss of another 5 expected by 2010. The opening of \textit{Silver Bay Seafoods} provided 170 seasonal and 10 full-time positions; and an increase to the ferry service may also stimulate growth (McDowell Group 2008:5). A brief introduction to Sitka’s history follows.

1.4.1 A Brief History

The following brief history of Sitka provides a context for readers including the period of Russian trade and settlement, conflicts with the Native Tlingit, and the transfer to the United States. Chapter 3 investigates the spiritual landscape development in greater detail. Several voyages led to the ‘discovery’ of the west coast of North America beginning with the Spanish commission of Gali in 1582, prior to Vitus Bering’s 1741 journey. Near Sitka, Mount Edgecumbe provides a natural beacon used for shipping and by early explorers. Sitka’s bay has three entrances providing a “safe and convenient” roadstead with sufficient space for “twenty sailing ships,” (Bisk and Sure eds. 1990:15). Profits from sea otter and other furs led European and American traders to Sitka until excess trapping led to near extinction\textsuperscript{17} for many species.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{13} SEARHC is a tribal organisation mandated to provide health care services to Alaska Natives and others referred for specialised treatment including alcohol rehabilitation, mental healthcare and community programmes. SEARHC had 497 workers at 2005 (MacDowell 2006:7).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{14} Government includes local, state and federal (including US Coast Guard and US Forest Service).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{15} Sitka is known for the quality, quantity and variety of seafood harvested in Sitka waters and processed by four major fish processing companies. It ranks 6th as the largest port by value in the United States and 19th by volume, http://www.sitka.net/, accessed 22.01.2009.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{16} This education data includes Sheldon Jackson College, Mt Edgecumbe High School, Public Safety Academy, Sitka School District and the UAS-Sitka campus. Sheldon Jackson College closed in 2007.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{17} Black (2004) and DeArmond (1995) suggest it was not the Russians that brought the sea otter to extinction, but rather the Americans. DeArmond (1995:17) notes Americans encouraged Natives to take as many as 4000 sea otters in a}
The relationship between the Russians and indigenous Tlingit in Sitka is explored through interactions with the promyschlenniki (fur traders), and Russian Orthodox Church. The interaction lasted over a century from the late 1700s when Alaska and the Aleutian Islands were regarded part of the Russian Empire. The Russian American Company (RAC) was the dominant trading influence in the area, originally established in 1781 by a Siberian merchant Gregor Shelikof and Ivan Golikof. The RAC had Government support for its activities by royal assent (ukase), first from Empress Catherine II with a further twenty years granted by Emperor Paul in 1799. Krause (1979[1885]) highlights the ukase terms:

> By this decree the entire coast north of the 55th parallel was turned over to [the RAC] for their free use. They were empowered to establish settlements, carry on agriculture and commerce, spread the Russian faith and extend Russian territory as long as they did not come in conflict with any other power (p 30).

While Natives were exempt from yearly tributes to the Russian Crown, they were required to sell their fur skins only to the Russians, reinforcing the RAC monopoly.

Alexander Baranov was RAC manager from 1790. In 1794, he obtained consent from the Native Tlingit (called Kolosh by the Russians), to establish a Russian settlement at Gájaa Héen (Old Sitka). Relations were strained and in 1799, after the Tlingit refused to attend the fort dedication ceremony, Baranov and twenty men went to their village. His courage to face the Tlingit brought him their respect. The cultures co-existed until Baranov left the area. In 1802, the Natives attacked the fort, killed most of the settlers,18 and demolished the fort. In 1804, Baranov retaliated by destroying villages of Kake, Kuju, and Noow Tlien (Castle Hill in Sitka). The Tlingit abandoned their fort at Shis’k’l Noow (near Indian River in Sitka) during the night prior to the Russian’s destruction. Varying degrees of conflict continued during Russian occupation of Sitka and Russian North America.

---

18 Medwiednikof (the RAC official left in charge) and 130 Aleut were killed. Three thousand sea otter and other skins were plundered and a ship built for the company was burned. An English ship collected 3 Russians, 5 Aleut and 18 women and 6 children who were released by the natives and delivered to Baranof for high ransom” (Krause, A. (1979 [1885]). Die Tlingit Indianer. The Tlingit Indians. Results of a Trip to the Northwest Coast of America and the Bering Straits. Seattle, Douglas & McIntyre.)
Trade flourished during the early 1800s with the RAC becoming one of the most profitable fur companies in the world (Gibson 1978). By mid-century, depleted sea otter stocks and unrest in Russia diminished its interest in the New World. In 1867, the Russians sold Alaska to the United States for $7.2 million and many of the Russians immediately left. Sitka was initially administered by federal agencies (e.g., War Department, the Treasury and the Navy) with the early objective, “to keep the Natives under control,” (B DeArmond, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000). Sitka remained the territorial capital until Juneau was designated in 1900. Government agencies began relocating from Sitka in the early 1900s (e.g., the Navy wireless station on Japonski and the federal Department of Agriculture left in 1931 (DeArmond 1995)). A population and infrastructure boost came to Sitka during World War II. Over 30,000 military personnel and 7,000 civilians came to the area (DeArmond 1993). Significant investment from Japan into the lumber industry commenced in the late 1950s and continued to 1993. During this period, infrastructure improvements included establishment of a major regional health centre and the original Alaskan Pioneers’ Home. Sitka continued economic diversification with healthcare, education, tourism, government, and four major seafood processing companies. In 1999, a high-speed water bottling facility was established at Sawmill Cove, and in 2006, began exporting fresh water to the world using the Blue Lake supply (http://sawmillcove.com/water.html accessed 22.01.2009). It has State permits to export 26 million gallons of fresh water daily.

There were major legislation milestones for Alaska’s Native population from 1971 of relevance to Sitka’s indigenous residents. The 1971 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) established Native Alaskan Regional Corporations,19 now key players in the state economy. Federal contracts for military, security, and construction projects contributed $4.6 billion to the total revenues of $5.7 billion in 2005 (Alaska Economic Performance Report 2006). These Native Corporations invest in rural infrastructure, subsidise heating, create jobs and scholarships, provide benefits to elders, and fund non-profit groups and cultural initiatives,20 (State Office of Economic Development 2007:11). This commercial structure within the state provides an important link for future intercultural

---

19 Some corporations have subcontracted to non-Native, non-minority, and non-small business firms by taking advantage of a legal loophole in the Act (State Office of Economic Development 2007:11).
20 “An example is the Alaska Marketplace, a collaboration between all ANCSA corporations, Alaska Federation of Native and several oil producers that consists of a business plan competition that aims to catalyze rural economic development through innovation by supporting new businesses that emphasize cultural heritage as an integral component of the business. Under this theme over 150 Native and non-Native entrepreneurs submitted Business Idea Applications to the Marketplace in 2006,” (State of Alaska Economic Performance Report 2006, 2007:11).
investment opportunities and co-management of land and energy sources. The *Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act* (ANILCA) in 1980 provided another milestone as it:

established 104 million acres of new conservation units...and designated 50 million acres as wilderness, half of the nation’s total. ANILCA also mandated a rural subsistence use preference in Alaska, to guarantee that Alaska Natives would have access to fish, game and other resources they depend upon (Haycox 2002b:2).

ANILCA has created conflict over land use, both from settlers and Native Alaskans. For example, Haycox (2002b:3) notes the State has yet to comply with the subsistence provisions on fish and game management that led to federal intervention (i.e., normally a state function). Land use conflicts continue across local and federal interests.

Notions of Alaska may conjure for some readers, images of grizzly bears, endless forests and glaciers. Yet despite its natural image, Haycox (2002a:x) reminds us, 70% of Alaskans live in urban centres are connected by internet, have substantial travel options and work at regular jobs; they enjoy being a part of America’s consumer society and share its history and philosophy. Sitka then provides an ideal location to explore the diversity of cultural influences and land relationships. Its spiritual landscape is set amidst the backdrop of natural resources that influence its economy. Its intercultural relationships have developed over centuries. Sitka’s contemporary modern society and rich heritage provide much to reflect on to understand culture and land relationships within its post-colonial setting. Methodology benefits of Sitka as a study site are discussed next.

### 1.4.2 Methodological Advantages

The brief history introduced Sitka as a small, but dynamic centre. From a methodological point of view, there are several advantages of Sitka’s spiritual landscape as a study location. It offers a postcolonial spiritual landscape setting, complete with multiple cultural influences in development, naming and designations. It has location benefits and numerous reference materials. First, Sitka offers a postcolonial landscape influenced by several cultures over time. LaDuke (2005:247) notes, “Alaska is a snapshot of how colonialism and neo-colonialism are repeated.” Sitka’s postcolonial society faces issues and ideas regarding land and identity that are valuable for this study that seeks insights to past and contemporary impacts of colonisation. Exploring contemporary governance and
management, heritage designations and local planning efforts in this postcolonial context provide insights for other locations.

Second, Sitka’s location, both remote and peripheral to mainland USA, provides an interesting development context with insights for both past and present, as well as for people and place. Geographically remote from Alaska’s more densely populated areas its sheltered harbour made it ideal to command the resources and peoples of the coast in the late 1700s. The inland discoveries of gold and oil geographically transformed the area with Juneau and Anchorage gaining importance over the peripheral Sitka. Its “colonial character” remains in a new “American colony” context according to Haycox (2002a:ix). As a study location then, the cross-cultural influences in the spiritual landscape and the changing status and identity of Sitka’s inhabitants provide fertile ground to explore diverse mindsets. Various culture groups each left imprints on its spiritual landscape (e.g., the Russian Orthodox Cathedral has been a city focal point for over 200 years). Sitka’s remoteness assists in preserving cultural inscriptions visible in the landscape, one over another (palimpsest21), to aid cross-cultural analysis and interpretations.

Third, there is a plethora of information about Sitka, Tlingit, Russian and American cultures. Sitkans have a passion for their past as Bob DeArmond (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000) notes: “every Sitkan is a historian.” Attracting much interest, past Sitka studies reflect anthropological themes, preservation of traditional Tlingit culture, and recording historic events. Ship logs and diaries from Russian times, Native oral histories, and American perspectives on economics and tourism, provide numerous texts for review. Despite this information, little has been studied on Sitka’s cultural and religious influences. There are no previous studies on Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape. This setting provides an opportunity to address the theoretical and regional knowledge gap using a comprehensive approach to enhance cross-cultural understanding. Sitka’s concentrated geographic settlement facilitates observation of a ‘complete set’ of visible spiritual sites. Finally, landscape perceptions of contemporary Sitkans complement the local historic studies to supplement culture group views with local spiritual perspectives.

---

21 The American Heritage Dictionary (2003) defines ‘pal-imp-sest’ as: “a manuscript, typically of papyrus or parchment that has been written on more than once, with the earlier writing incompletely erased and often legible.” Palimpsest application for this study is discussed further in Chapter 2.
1.5 THESIS STRUCTURE

This section sets out the structure of subsequent chapters. Chapter two explains the literature context and research design for this work and concentrates on abstracting the study objects. A cross classification of spiritual and location aspects is used to develop a set of ‘study objects’ that include: places of worship, places honouring the dead, and historical/homelands sites. The explanatory frameworks used in this work include: historic development, social construction, geomentality and palimpsest. Palimpsest is used to highlight the physical form of the spiritual landscape and to consider the site and situation of landscape creation (e.g., historical and socio-political). Social construction theory is applied to show how concepts of nation and race establish and convey identity, and how policy and planning actions by government shape the landscape. Historic and geomentality frameworks are elaborated below.

Chapters 3 through 6 provide the spiritual landscape analysis and research findings. Chapter 3 provides a chronology of the development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape highlighting roles of religion (spirituality) and the state (government) to enhance cultural understanding. It provides the socio-political first lens in the comprehensive approach to explore Sitka’s spiritual landscape. The importance of religion within culture and national identity is demonstrated through the proximity and power in church-state relationships during and post colonisation and through spatial influences in development patterns. The chronology acknowledges various cultural heritage contributions. It gives status to former Tlingit settlement sites alongside colonial alterations and displacement, and discusses Sitka’s spiritual landscape development through additions to places of worship and burial grounds.

Chapter 4 focuses upon geomentality, the second lens in the comprehensive approach. This discussion of the invisible landscape traverses spatial attitudes and the role of worldview and religion in shaping cultural beliefs toward land. The invisible inquiry incorporates cosmology (i.e., those beliefs regarding the origin and structure of the universe) that are common to all cultures. Prioritising a link between spiritual beliefs and the land builds on Yoon’s earlier works (1986, 1991, 1994, 1999) that investigate cultural attitudes (frames of mind) influencing geographic behaviour patterns. His meaning of geomentality is refocused to incorporate social construction theory and sharpen study objects that reflect cosmologies. This chapter is critical to reveal deeper
understanding of culture-land relationships based on diversity in fundamental beliefs. It provides a platform to raise awareness of indigenous Tlingit, Russian and American contributions, and provides original formations of Russian and American geomentalities. Findings have implications for public consultation over present/future use, ongoing co-management, and ‘ownership’ issues (importantly around custodial aspects), and access to places with traditional sacred objects. Geomentality provides a deeper interpretation for the visible spiritual landscape in Chapters 5 and 6.

Chapter 5 explores cultural influences on place names and naming. Beginning with a look at Tlingit naming of moieties and clan houses, this chapter analyses different cultural approaches to naming and how interpretations influence place identity and cultural dominance. An analysis of topographic names based on different cultural map sources reveals patterns in naming scale, type and frequency for places ranging from mountains to lakes and street names. Naming is also significant as a representation of power. At a local level, place naming for example, contributes to preserving cultural identity. Indigenous Tlingit naming studies (Thornton 1997a, 1997b, 2008) have explored implications of naming and recorded traditional place names. These works reveal corresponding diversities in the naming process by culture and highlight different culture-land/place relationships. If land planning and designation frameworks lack the precision to acknowledge these interpretations (i.e., their intangible cultural value), naming may inaccurately reflect cultural importance or be applied to inappropriate contexts (Herman 1999). Misunderstanding can lead to inequitable distribution of funding and/or ongoing management issues where preserving cultural heritage is an objective. Several naming observations in Sitka’s spiritual landscape reveal inequitable cultural representations which pose questions for processes and outcomes (e.g., does Sitka’s ‘identity’ as reflected in street naming and historic designations accurately convey its desired cultural heritage?).

Chapter 6 sets out the spatial analysis of Sitka’s spiritual landscape focusing upon sacred places. Spatial patterns are interpreted with cross-cultural insights from previous chapters to provide a richer landscape reading. Sacred places are explored within existing zoning categories to maintain a contemporary focus for findings and to provide utility for ongoing land management policy and practice. Development zones demarcated to reflect original Tlingit homelands, Russian settlement

---

22 There is risk in using paper based written public consultation methods regarding land issues where verbal/oral engagements may better reach the target group. The New Zealand Land Transport Safety Authority conducted a public consultation for the development of photo driver licences that successfully considered cultural considerations of
features and American residential growth patterns make for interesting reflections. Changes over time to sacred place buildings and functions are considered alongside place designations and geomentalities for a rich landscape reading. Sitka resident perception interview results regarding sacred places end the chapter. Study conclusions and future applications are presented in Chapter 7 where the unique geographer’s perspective into Sitka’s spiritual landscape provides insight to complement other disciplinary approaches and contribute to “shape public and intellectual debates,” (Murphy 2006:1) on important cultural land issues.

Enjoy the journey north to Sitka, Alaska.

_______________________________________________________________

community engagement by including briefings at shopping malls, churches and Saturday ethnic markets to reach their target culture groups (Alexander and Hill 1997).
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH DESIGN

In Chapter 1, tensions over land highlighted the urgent need to enhance understanding across cultures. The obvious geographic context to explore land and culture variables is the cultural landscape, wherein Wylie (2007:1) states: “Landscape is tension.” Past research and case studies reflect the potency of reading significant sites and ordinary landscapes, revealing power relationships in society, how built environments reflect cultural preference and value, and how intangible beliefs link with material expressions (Winchester et al. 2003, Wylie 2007). Few studies combine readings despite the growing interest in intangible cultural heritage (Burgess 2009). This study advocates a combined approach to comprehensively read Sitka’s spiritual landscape thus demonstrating value through enhancing cross-cultural understanding, adding to landscape theory, and providing practical future land management considerations. The interrelated components of cultural landscape theory applied in this study are presented separately to satisfy these multiple objectives. The contributions each makes to understand the holistic landscape are better understood in their own right, and diverse aspects can be combined in different ways to facilitate cultural understanding as needed (e.g., to explain the built environment or to improve practical land management). For example, the built environment is a representation of culture; however, built environments can be studied, analysed, or managed without a culture influence reference (e.g., planning or architecture). To facilitate practical application of these study findings, the visible built environment is considered separately and together with culture to reflect connections and highlight diversity across cultures. While aspects are discussed separately, the overall approach advocated in this research is a comprehensive holistic reading of landscape for greatest overall impact. Separating paths clarify connections for practical application as needed (e.g., local government, heritage planners, national designations, and so on).

This chapter is set out in two parts. Part one focuses on the theoretical context of existing literature and part two discusses the information collection methodology. Part one begins with an introduction to cultural landscape literature and the evolution in theoretical ideas. It then focuses upon the
spiritual landscape to emphasise geography and religion as a study area within cultural geography. Landscape reading is divided into visible and invisible discussions. Socio-political explanations and palimpsest feature in the visible landscape, followed by an introduction to social construction theory. Social construction theory aids understanding of spiritual landscape by emphasising constructions of race, nation and the role of the state in sacred places, applying both to the visible and invisible landscape. Its importance in this study justifies a separate section in this literature review. Similarly, moving to the intangible, the next literature review section focuses on the spiritual landscape of the mind (invisible landscape) with consideration of the role of beliefs, worldview, and geomentality. Like social construction theory, the spiritual landscape of the mind relates to cultural landscape; however, its significance to this research warrants a separate discussion section. Part one concludes with a review of study location literature. Part two of this chapter contains the information collection methodology including a discussion of the field work, interview structures and study objects. Subsequent chapters set out research findings including the development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape, diverse cultural attitudes (geomentalities), and a spatial analysis of sacred places.

2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review model in Figure 3 underpins the comprehensive cultural geographic approach applied in this study. The model fuses theory and explanatory frameworks from various sources (Cosgrove 2008; Tuan 1976a, 1976b; Winchester et al. 2003; Wylie 2007; Yoon 1986, 1991, 1994a, 1994b, 1999; and others). The tree in Figure 3 represents the investigation of what is visible, or observable, with its hidden root structure remaining unseen and representing the invisible landscape. The unseen incorporates Cosgrove’s (2008:8) reference to human imagination with “mental images, especially of things not directly witnessed or experienced.” Explanatory frameworks illustrate different perspectives used to observe and analyse the same tree (e.g., the separation between tangible and intangible aspects focus discussions but nonetheless pertain to the same landscape). Figure 3 aids the reader in the traverse of literature by setting out the sequence of the discussion (as illustrated with the faint arrows). The comprehensive approach model conceptualisation follows.

23 The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) held their 16th General Assembly in Quebec, Canada in September 2008 with the theme of ‘Finding Spirit of Place – Between the Tangible and Intangible.’
Social construction theory applies to all study aspects in Sitka’s spiritual landscape as illustrated by the black border outline in Figure 3. Beginning with the visible landscape (top half of the model), the left and right sides distinguish macro and micro scale observations respectively. The Sitka Territory in the southeast coast of Alaska provides the ’situation’ for analysis (left) while specific sites like a Tlingit homeland or a church warrant ‘site’ specific analysis (right). Both dimensions are part of the ’visible’ spiritual landscape where socio-economic and political explanations are applied to explain the landscape, and practical siting considerations elucidate sites. For example, the situation with abundant food and resources can explain Tlingit migration and homelands distribution influenced by land carrying capacity. Similarly, Russian interest in Alaska can be explained with fur trade economics with site selection of Sitka based on the promontory needed for defense. 

*Palimpsest*, as an explanatory framework (depicted with a green line across the full visible
landscape) is used to gain depth in both the macro and micro scale analysis. The layering of cultural influences across the landscape (i.e., succession of cultures over original Tlingit territory) and layering at specific sites (e.g., demonstrated by archaeological evidence like middens or former building remains) provide tangible study objects representing power dynamics and hegemony in places and across spatial patterns. Chapter 3 sets out this visible landscape analysis.

The second, bottom arrow connects the invisible landscape. Beginning on the right side within worldview (depicted with a red line), beliefs enable a traverse across visible and invisible landscape dimensions (i.e., relating to both pragmatic and mythical space). An example is a Russian Orthodox church or Tlingit clan house that are visible in the tangible landscape, but carry invisible spiritual meaning (e.g., house of god and sacred ancestry/heritage links, respectively). The nexus of spatial and spiritual or cosmological beliefs are captured within geomentality (depicted in the blue line encompassing macro and micro places left and right, respectively). To reveal geomentality requires an understanding of ‘mythical space’ (i.e., relying on cosmological objects like origin myths to understand cultural beliefs and behaviours and influences upon environmental attitudes). Chapter 4 focuses on revealing geomentalities for dominant cultures in the Sitka landscape.

The deeper understanding of invisible culture-land relationship aspects (bottom right to bottom left) are applied to analyse the spiritual landscape and to compare intercultural responses to shaping places. Chapter 5 indicates how culture-land relationships influence cultural identity within and across cultures, and how notions of time and place (e.g., linear and cyclic or continuous time) influence how a culture shapes and conceptualises their environment. A deeper understanding of the tangible landscape is achieved through this comprehensive approach since psychological connections between culture and place is made otherwise not apparent exploring visible aspects alone. The comprehensive approach applied to a Tlingit homelands site then would first examine physical evidence of Tlingit culture occupation evidenced through archaeological middens. The site is overwritten with another culture influence, as when the Russians took over Castle Hill, a former Tlingit homeland. The depth of connection to ‘Castle Hill’ and the Tlingit sense of place can best be understood exploring intangible cultural aspects. The Tlingit geomentality better explains cultural links to place and understanding why intercultural conflicts based on historic events 200 years prior, still require acknowledgement, as with the importance of the Cry Ceremony between the Russian and Tlingit cultures held in 2004.
Landscape interpretations are indeed wide, as Wylie’s (2007) gazes refers. Nonetheless, gazes are infrequently combined into a comprehensive framework, connecting socio-economic, political, cultural attitudes, intercultural power relations, geospatial patterns. This research provides an important original contribution to intellectual debate by expanding methods of interpreting spiritual landscapes. It introduces a platform to explore cross-cultural relationships within a historic and contemporary context including explanations of the spatial landscape beyond material expressions alone. The literature review that follows elaborates on the theory mentioned in the comprehensive approach overview of the Figure 3 model. The evolution of cultural geographic theory and geography of religion are set out first.

2.1.1 Cultural Landscape

“Attention to landscape is now widely shared across a range of disciplines,” (Cosgrove 2008:1). Landscape research is found in architecture, planning, art history, archaeology, literature, history and geography. For cultural geographers, landscape study has evolved in stages as illustrated in Figure 4. Changes could be described chronologically, represented in the Hegelian terms of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis (Winchester et al. 2003). In addition to linear time, considering transitions between stages is also useful to emphasise ideological developments and forecast new directions that progress thinking. For example, Stage 4 comprehensively fuses several previous approaches by building on strengths from different areas. Stages facilitate a manageable discussion, though categorisation can oversimplify complex concepts. Acknowledging this caution, the following explains relationships and developments within and between evolutions. Stages better reflect the dynamic nature of theoretical developments while chronologies imply more distinct sequencing.
In Figure 4, stages are numbered according to an evolution of ideas and ways of interpreting cultural landscape progress over time. A full discussion of the first three stages is found in Winchester et al. (2003). At Stage 1, environmental determinism (Semple 1911) represents a basic approach where the natural environment is seen to influence all human action. For example, hot climates make Islanders lazy, while cooler changeable climates make inhabitants more intellectual and quick. In spiritual associations, climate influences notions of heaven and hell. Semple (1911:41) studied Eskimo notions of an extremely cold, arctic hell compared with Christian notions of hell as a hot and fiery inferno. Such generalist conclusions imply simple causal relationships, produce naïve results with racist implications, and cannot be substantiated scientifically. Despite these shortcomings, it would be imprudent to completely disregard any environmental role in shaping human behaviour.

A less active role for the environment is found in Stage 2, the antithesis of environmental determinism, or what Winchester et al. (2003:174) refer to as “cultural determinists.” This stage reverses influence to showcase human agency as the main actor upon landscape as summarised by Sauer (1963[1925]):

Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape the result (p 343).
Stage 2 emphasises a major influence of humans upon nature, oversimplifying interrelationships of actors as with the emphasis of the “expressive role of landscapes” upon which culture is written (Winchester et al. 2003:174). The importance of rigorous field work featured in Stage 2 has ongoing merit as empirical observations strengthen the utility of applying research findings to contemporary issues. By Stage 3, actions synthesise human and environmental influences, diverging from the Berkeley ‘cultural artefacts or remnants’ focus. This theoretical ‘cultural turn’ was beneficial to enhance understanding of mechanisms shaping landscape (e.g., to interpret socio-political landscape dimensions) and to emphasise the humanities and social sciences (Cosgrove and Jackson 1987). The ‘cultural turn’ broadened study objects (iconography) and ways to ‘see’ and ‘read’ the landscape. The prior focus on nature and natural environments shifted to study of cultural phenomena, identity issues (personal and places), and ordinary landscapes reflecting multiple identities and influences (e.g., political and religious).

Stage 4 connects invisible beliefs, visible expressions and the built environment (as illustrated by continuous arrows in Figure 4). Over the past few decades, landscape theory has reached a place where contributions from diverse perspectives and approaches are increasingly appreciated. Stage 4 constructively combines different approaches to enhance geography’s role in public debate (Murphy 2006). It blends a socio-political understanding with the built environment and underlying beliefs to present a holistic interpretation of the spiritual landscape. For example, in Geography & Vision: Seeing, Imagining and Representing the World, Cosgrove (2008) acknowledges visual and non-material contributions to geographic knowledge. With room for both, Cosgrove (2008:9) steers toward the role of the imagination to “celebrate the richness and complexity” of landscape rather than critique influences of power and justice. There is indeed room and utility for both approaches. An understanding of power and politics revealed in landscape holds lessons for modern society as will be discussed further in the section on social construction theory. This study of Sitka’s spiritual landscape reveals, through geomentality, how understanding a culture’s attitude toward the environment deepens cross-cultural understanding. By combining past cultural landscape theoretical approaches, a more comprehensive reading of Sitka’s spiritual landscape is possible.

In addition to academic value, Stage 4 research is increasingly important for business and government for two main reasons. First, the globalisation of markets is continuing to shrink the world in spatial terms. Contracted space increases mixing of racially diverse belief systems.
heightening the need to understand the cultural attitudes toward land that influence behaviour in contested environments. Complexity migrates into planning and economic decisions involving human-environment interactions. Globalisation in ideas and markets, facilitated through technology, further builds expectation to improve cross-cultural relations from neighbourhoods to the international scale (e.g., United Nations agendas). Yet, as Murphy (2006:1) acknowledges, “the work of geographers was largely ignored in mainstream discussions of globalisation.” The comprehensive approach proposed provides greater depth of underlying motives and beliefs that has utility in contemporary issues. Second, the trend for comprehensive analyses affects government and business (e.g., quadruple bottom line reporting), and research communities (e.g., increased cross-disciplinary studies (Soovali 2002)). This trend illustrates the evolution of Western economic decision models to broader social, environmental, and now cultural assessments, punctuating a need for tools to better examine cultural dimensions. Great risk exists if cultural understanding is limited to what is seen. Fortunately, cultural geographers possess a range of tools for ‘reading’ both visible and invisible landscape. Despite limited studies that have blended political, socio-economic, environmental and spiritual perspectives in the past, the Stage 4 comprehensive approach has potential for global business and government applications. This comprehensive approach “is critical to expanding geography’s position in public debate,” (Murphy 2006:10) by offering deeper cultural understanding and new insights into global issues.

2.1.1.1 Geography and Religion

This section sharpens the cultural landscape focus upon spiritual aspects, framing this study within the subject area of existing geography and religion literature:

In ancient and modern times alike, theology and geography have often been closely related studies because they meet at crucial points of human curiosity. If we seek after the nature of God, we must consider the nature of man and earth, and if we look at the earth, questions of divine purpose in its creation and of the role of mankind on it inevitably arise (Glacken 1967:35).

The spiritual landscape offers a rich setting to enhance understanding of culture-land relationships, geographic landscape theory and merits of cultural diversity. Geography and religion topics range from denominational geography to spatial organisations of religious groups and development of

---

24 A special Landscape and Urban Planning (2001) issue was devoted to transdisciplinary landscape research.

The categorisation of geography and religion literature into thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis by Kong (1990) closely matches the cultural landscape theoretical stages outlined above. This section highlights aspects relevant to this research. Traditional studies in the thesis phase focus on ecclesiastic, physicotheologic and environmental deterministic areas and the unidirectional influence of environment on humans (Park 1994). Early 16th and 17th century ecclesiastic studies involved mapping, distributions and diffusion of religions, and were often country-based. From the 17th century, physicotheologic studies sought evidence of how the wisdom of God appeared in nature and environment ideas (Glacken 1967, Buttner 1980). From the 18th century, environmental deterministic studies focused on nature providing materials for use in religious ceremonies (LaDuke 2005, Howarth 1985), or how natural phenomena influenced thinking (e.g., Semple (1911) discusses how uncertain precipitation elevates the significance of rain gods in India). Research during this stage can be descriptive, simplistic, make inconclusive propositions or miss multi-variable explanations. However, revealing culture-nature relationships is significant in this study to understand diversity, spatial diffusion and ideas of sacred to inform geom mentality and enhance modern relevance.

The anti-thesis phase spotlights social structures (Weber 1963) with the unidirectional relationships between humans and environment similar to Stage 2 in Figure 4. Religion acts through social structures to direct change, as with Protestant beliefs influencing work ethics. Isaac (1959-60) sets out the research task:

> to separate the specifically religious from the social, economic and ethnic matrix in which it is embedded…to determine its relative weight in relation to other forces (p 12).

This technical approach to understanding how human behaviour shapes the environment attempts to distil those underlying forces religious in nature (i.e., distinct from settlement, transport routes, population, et cetera). Explaining human behaviour and spatial implications are more complex than such causal factors alone and frequently lack connection to deeper beliefs or worldview. For this study, religious structures are considered as part of the socio-political explanations of landscape.
development, in particular in their link to the role of the state and how power is conveyed through the church (see Chapter 3).

During the *synthesis phase* of geography and religion study, the social geographic focus grows with human/environment relationships becoming multi-dimensional. Human influence becomes iterative with the environment with both being change agents (Buttner 1980). Park (1994) outlines the mechanics of this study area:

> Forces molding landscapes do not emanate from the religion itself, rather the relationships between religion and environment (p 96).

Examples of this type of research are the Anglican Church influence on rural life and landscape in England by Seymour and Watkins (1995), and Pyong-Gap-Min’s (2000) investigation of the important social functions of the Korean Church for immigrants in New York. These studies reveal how the church provides functions of fellowship, cultural tradition, social services and status for adult immigrants, but lack deeper insights connecting beliefs and cultural behaviours.

Studying spiritual landscapes and the geography of religion are fertile subjects neglected in cultural geography despite their rich connection between human action and deeper cosmological beliefs and behaviours. Other disciplines, like sociology, economics, religion, and history have welcomed religious study, while geographers squander energy debating its merit and appropriateness. The importance of researching spiritual landscapes must not suffer debates over content and boundary issues. Tuan (2001[1977]) for example, criticises:

> the field is in disarray for lack of a coherent definition of the phenomenon it seeks to understand...A field so lacking in focus and so arbitrary in its selection of themes cannot hope to achieve intellectual maturity (p 271).

Yet in each of the three stages discussed above, the spiritual provides a context to explore culture-land relations, and the changing role of religion in society. Some argue cultural geographers should focus only on physical form and structures, or how religion affects people and landscape (Fickeler 1962) rather than explaining *the inner workings of culture* (Wagner and Mikesell 1962:5 in Kong 1990). This research seeks to understand and celebrate the diverse *inner workings* of cultures that

---

25 Studying the physical form of cemeteries (Zelinsky 1976, 1994); or changing cemetery forms, like the garden cemetery movement in Britain in the early 19th century driven by a public health need to address overcrowded burial grounds and a landscape architecture movement led by Boston botanist-physician Jacob Bigelow, founder of Mount Auburn in Cambridge (Boorstin 1965:19); or Martin (2004) for discussion of garden cemetery movement in Australia.
shaped Sitka’s spiritual landscape. Others suggest geographers comfortably focus upon phenomenology rather than theology, and commonality between religions to aid cross-cultural comparisons (Yinger 1977:67 in Kong 1990). Restricting research scope unnecessarily limits creativity and links to contemporary issues including contested landscapes. Opportunities exist across this subject space.

Religious beliefs are complex and abstract, but important to provide “meaning of life and death,” (Hills 2002:1), and to reveal human values and cultural diversity. Geographers have a responsibility to progress religious study as it “treats human values seriously,” (Ley 1981:253) and remains one of the “foundations of culture,” (De Blij and Muller 1986:181, in Park 1994:5). Still, the field remains:

littered with topics untouched, questions unanswered (often unasked), approaches undeveloped and left unexplored (Park 1994:30).

Trends of increased secular beliefs noted by Kong (1990), Park (1994), and Tuan (2001[1977]) may cause some to question the relevance of this study and its links to religion and spiritual beliefs. This is not the case. First, in this research, secular beliefs are considered alongside other cosmological beliefs in the study method, thus are not excluded from observation. Second, Loy (1997) makes a convincing argument that the market is a:

new worldview and set of values whose religious role we overlook because we insist on seeing them as secular (p 275).

His ‘market worldview’ hypothesis relates ‘spiritual’ references to Marxist interpretations of motive and intent that are used to interpret Sitka’s spiritual landscape. Third, it is not the purpose of this research to gauge religious adherence in cultures, nor the level of secularisation in society. By focusing on cultural geomentality and how beliefs influence behaviours that shape the landscape, observations are inclusive and not limited to existing religious constructs.

The inherent emotion and controversy surrounding the area provides an irresistible challenge to the researcher. Even sceptics viewing religion as escapism must concede to its significance, as religious wars cost believers and non-believers alike. So, while the field’s validity and viability is sound,

---

26 Burke (2005) distinguishes between theology, which is focused on the questions each religion seeks to answer and whether the religion’s answers are true or false, and phenomenology, which offers a detached and un-evaluative view from the outside.

27 For over half a century, 30-50% of the world’s population followed communism replacing religion as an expression of society’s historical development (http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/11/, accessed 21.11.2008).
further effort is needed to ensure it becomes “a central object of the discipline’s best endeavours,” (Sopher 1981:519). Present in all cultures, spiritual beliefs link human beliefs and actions that influence the development of the spiritual landscape. This study explores these connections to showcase spiritual landscape as valuable to enhance understanding of culture-land relationships and the merit of cultural diversity. The next section focuses on theory to interpret visible landscape.

2.1.1.2 Reading the Visible Spiritual Landscape

This section connects cultural landscapes with geography and religion to highlight reading the tangible visible spiritual landscape (linked later to the intangible). A landscape focus in geography and religion research is extensively supported (Buttner 1980; Cosgrove 2008; Duncan 1990; Kong 1990, 1999; Levine 1986:431, Schwind cited in Sopher 1981:511). As with other landscapes, ‘reading’ depends on the researcher’s perspective including the type of questions asked or evidence regarded as important for interpretation. Several approaches are combined in this study. Park’s (1994) seminal text, Sacred Worlds, summarises four traditional study methodologies: technological, focusing on human needs (space, light, access) without symbolism, imagery and religious attachment; functionalist, focusing on psychological aspects; Marxist, stressing why and for whom landscape was created; and ecological focusing on unity and naturalness. These approaches apply in this research to: document the visible spiritual landscape; reflect functions of sacred places and their link to culture; distil power relations; and convey how nature is designated. Park (1994) does not advocate a comprehensive method, nor does he include social construction or invisible spiritual beliefs lenses that add important landscape interpretation dimensions (Cosgrove 2008; Duncan 1990; Kong 1999, 2001; Rapoport 2005; Yoon 1986, 1991).

Landscapes change over time. Sauer (1963[1925]:333) emphasised the need to understand changes to recognise the “continuous process of development or of dissolution and replacement.” More recently Harvey (1994) emphasised power relationships and spatial implications within a site and situation of landscape change. In both cases place is significant as it:

serves as a constantly re-energized repository of social and politically relevant traditions and identity which serves to mediate between everyday lives of individuals…and the national and supranational institutions which constrain and enable those lives (Agnew and Duncan 1989:7).
For this study, change over time is viewed in two ways. First, a contemporary focus extracts the flotsam of history to isolate what is relevant to present inhabitants. Second, tracing the development of a landscape from first occupation provides a site and situation context to explain linear power and place changes. Practically this means a thorough documentation of the contemporary landscape with an emphasis on sacred places where cultural layering and power changes are most evident. Places (natural and built) that reveal earlier uses and possible alterations can be ‘traced backward’ using historic maps and models to determine their historic development context, power relationships and changes in physical forms. The physical remnants of cultural influences that remain visible in the spiritual landscape are referred to as palimpsest.28

In this study palimpsest is defined as physical remnants of cultural influences that remain visible in the spiritual landscape. Zelinsky (1994:36) puts it colourfully: “multi-layered fabric...embodying the residues of successive episodes of societal evolution.” Previous palimpsest investigations vary in scale from whole landscapes in Kumansi (Schmidt 2005), Bukhara (Sobti 2005), and Kandy (Duncan 1990), to specific sites like Raivo’s (1995) look at the Orthodox Church in Finland (in Park 1994), Sidorov’s (2000) investigation of the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour, and those historically significant sites of slavery in Africa by Degraft-Hanson (2005). The historic data used in previous studies is useful, providing socio-political contexts to explain direct and indirect interest group conflicts and landscape influences. Past works however, tend not to explain inner workings of cultures, nor do they focus on contemporary settings. These gaps raise historical methodology questions and limit modern applications. Earlier period studies also lack social construction theory interpretation. Palimpsest is a significant tool to examine places in the spiritual landscape as these sites are rich in interpretative data to allow a visible investigation linked to deeper insights to cultural spiritual beliefs and power relationships. In a comprehensive study, it is important to focus on landscape features that offer rich information. Other features offering such richness in the spiritual landscape are sacred places.

Establishing a set of sacred places to read the visible spiritual landscape required categorisation. Sopher (1967:24-34) included: “sacred structures, land patterns, cemeteries...flora and fauna, and place names,” (in Winchester et al. 2003:20). An ‘inventory’ approach is popular in cemetery

---

28 The American Heritage Dictionary (2003) defines ‘pal-imp-sest’ as “a manuscript, typically of papyrus or parchment that has been written on more than once, with the earlier writing incompletely erased and often legible.”
studies (Zelinsky 1976, 1994) and religious diffusion research. Jackson and Henrie (1983) developed a three-tiered typology with: Mystico-Religious Sites at the pinnacle (e.g., shrines, temples, cathedrals, mountains, and special places like Bethlehem); Homelands, which represent the roots of each individual, family or people, but remain sacred only to believers (e.g., the Rocky Mountains to Mormons); and lastly, Historical Sacred Sites, assigned sanctity resulting from an event (e.g., birthplace). Finally, Harpur (1994) includes five categories: Footsteps of Holy Men including monuments and landscapes with sacred associations to saints and spiritual teachers; Honour of the Dead focusing on burial places; Eternal Shrines featuring places evoking a sense of distant or mythic past (e.g., Buddhist temples of Pagan in Myanmar (Burma)); Glory of God focusing on churches, mosques and temples; and Journey’s End focusing on pilgrimage. Jackson and Henrie’s presumption of a place being more sacred than another fails to ask ‘sacred to whom,’ does not acknowledge varying cultural interpretations of the same place, and assigns hierarchical ‘levels’ of sacredness that contradict this study objective of an inclusive and systematic cultural categorisation. Harpur’s groupings categorise sacred places but do not incorporate sacred notions, permanence of places over time, and significance to culture groups. His Western view neglects nature as sacred as with geomancy and indigenous cosmologies.

The classification used for this study considers these prior categorisations, existing literature and current knowledge gaps to establish the following set of study objects for the visible spiritual landscape: Places of Worship such as churches, temples, nature; Deathscapes including cemeteries; and Historic/Homelands Sites including places ‘designated’ as a result of events, monuments, places of origin, or migration routes. In most circumstances, culture groups view these physical places and objects as ‘sacred,’ enabling a latter connection between visible form and invisible beliefs. In other instances the place (i.e., worship building) is not viewed by the culture group as ‘sacred’ though it is observed and investigated for its spiritual connection to the activity undertaken there (e.g., a place to worship). Notions of sacred and profane are elaborated below where both are acknowledged as social constructs. The next section discusses social construction theory as key to understanding visible landscape and inner workings of culture.
2.1.2 SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION THEORY

Broadly, social construction theory is concerned with the use of power in shaping human ideas and knowledge (i.e., studying how a dominant social body uses its power to shape categories, concepts and material processes). With roots in philosophy and political studies, the theory is relevant and richly applied in social sciences including cultural geography. Social construction and power relationships are emphasised to enhance understanding of cultures (Winchester et al. 2003:175-176). How landscape is constructed and read, the interactions between cultures, and the role of culture to shape landscape all have social construction applications. Demerit (2002) states:

construction is a noun that describes both a process (of constructing) and the outcome of that process (the construction itself)...[wherein] our concepts and ideas are humanly created and change over time and space through social processes of discovery, debate and sometimes, domination (p768).

A difference in constructs can be mutually exclusive if the group in power deems it so. Relations between groups are impacted if each holds a different knowledge to be true. One example of cultural difference is dualisms established during colonisation (i.e., notions of “us” and “them,” or “White” and “non-White”) that are the foundation for ‘race’ definitions and future intercultural constructs and conflict. Another example is similar to the space and time context for explaining the visible development of spiritual landscape. Power structures and social relations influence changes in time and space constructs (Duncan 1990, Harvey 1994, Hills 2002, Kitagawa 1979).

More substantive changes occur with culture groups over time and space. Bhattarai (2004) summarises four resulting patterns: amalgamation (A+B+C = D) resulting in a new culture group like in Kathmandu Valley merging Hindu and Buddhist pilgrimages; assimilation (A+B+C = A), where minority groups are absorbed by the majority group; segregation (A # B = A # B), including the spatial separation of race through discrimination or laws (e.g., apartheid in South Africa or the caste system); and pluralism (A+B+C = A+B+C) where multiple ethnic and cultural units co-exist with equal rights and opportunities (e.g., Canada and Australia). Investigating culture group changes can yield insights to physical places and modern intergroup relations. In this study, three change areas provide new interpretations. The first examines racial definitions constructed by colonising and indigenous culture groups. The second explores how definitions of nation, including ‘construction of a nation,’ are important in establishing and conveying identity. The third considers how government policy and planning act to shape the spiritual landscape regarding land management, sacred places and designations as explored below.
2.1.2.1 Constructions of Race


 Europeans since Aristotle have regionalised the globe against a romanticized idealized version of “Europe” itself. Europe was rational, civilized, free, complex and later on Christian. The early antimonies of East and West, master and slave, civilized and uncivilized, Christian and heathen, provided the root for the development of deterministic thinking in western culture and science…the ethnocentrism of the past gave way to a modern doctrine of racism (Hay 1966:129 in Anderson 1988).

Deeper understanding of the psychological bias at colonisation helps explain persisting and evolving cultural dualisms and influences upon physical landscape and place mentality.

Several studies illustrate dualisms and colonial power, shaping a definition of race (Anderson 1988, Harvey 1994, Jackson and Penrose 1993, King 1976, Kong and Yeoh 2003, Marie 1999, Schmidt 2005). The White culture makes itself distinct in various ways: measuring others according to White order, focusing on others avoiding self-examination, and indirectly expressing duality to maintain neutral positioning (Shaw 2001). Comparing racial constructs of linear and cyclic time and space illustrates how dominant societies impose concepts on subservient societies. Settlement in the United States by European colonists:

 bounded the land, cut it into spaces and had property rights to those spaces in perpetuity, [while by contrast Native Americans] moved across the land…naming the land full of environmental meanings, like this is the meadow where deer gather in the spring…where beavers work (Harvey 1994:129).

There is a caution against over-simplifying time-space relations by race. For example, not all indigenous Native Americans were nomadic (e.g., farming and sedentary Navaho people). Similarly, time-space relations were impacted by colonial actions (e.g., indigenous ways were altered by European influence consciously through assimilation policies and through proactive Native survival strategies (Harris 2004)). Nonetheless, space and time social constructs also link to deeper belief dimensions. Understanding origin of difference provides powerful connections for interpreting Sitka’s spiritual landscape when contextualised in time and place.
Postcolonial theory has been applied to numerous disciplines and locations. Studies relevant to this work are those that explore cultural strategies of colonialism, influence on sacred places and impacts on settler and indigenous cultures after contact. Useful research includes: King’s (1976) study of the impact of colonialism on urbanisation and urban development in Delhi; Harris’s (1997, 2004) works on the settlement of British Columbia including colonial settlement strategies, Native strategies of resistance to displacement and ways colonial culture dispossessed through maps, laws, and land policies; and Stelter and Artibise’s (1986) work comparing Canadian colonial town development to European traditions of the medieval bastide and Italian planning theory. These studies do not focus on spiritual landscape development. Nonetheless, political motivations for settlement reveal intent underlying social constructs and cultural attitudes that shape the land and relate to contemporary settings (Harris 2004).

Capturing different power relations and perspectives toward the same landscape complement historic and socio-political interpretations. DeGraft-Hanson’s (2005) research of the slavery landscape in Kormantsin, Ghana illustrates these perspectives as:

- Whites, Americans/Europeans, who may attempt to ‘whitewash the dark history of slavery;’
- Diaspora Africans who want the site enshrined as it is ‘in the filth, degradation and humiliation they produced’ (e.g., cemeteries and places of memory);
- and local Ghanaians who generally, unaware of the horrific details of Atlantic slavery, see these sites as tourist magnets.

DeGraft-Hanson’s research provides a starting point to investigate racial constructs in Sitka where dominant culture groups include Tlingit Native Americans, Russians and Americans. Conflicts, negotiations, power relationships and perspectives of each are used to interpret the landscape, ways of seeing, and intention underlying action/behaviour. Much reference material is available to represent Sitkan perspectives for a more comprehensive understanding of cultural influences and power relations (e.g., settler journals, folklore, visual spatial landscape and building form analyses). These sources aid historic understanding but care is needed to not perpetuate settler/non-settler mentalities or reduce motives across cultures. Some, but not all historic differences influence the present. Winchester et al. (2003:175) emphasise cultures as: “reproduced, created and lived by current groups...present and historic.” A contemporary perspective and comprehensive reading mitigates misunderstanding by combining visible historic findings with deeper invisible cross-cultural beliefs and an understanding of nationhood to balance interpretations. To enhance understanding of people and place relations, the next section discusses how culture groups interrelate with ‘nation’ concepts.
2.1.2.2 Constructions of Nation

The discussion of nation and the evolution of nation constructs pertain to American, Russian and the Tlingit nations. Three characteristics of nation are considered for this study: a distinctive group of people (e.g., with shared cultural attributes such as language, religion, customs or traditions and sometimes ‘race’); a notion of political entity, incorporating Rousseau’s (1712-1778) search to address inequality, “arising from self-serving empires of religion and dynasty” through sovereignty that should reside in the will and institutions of the people; and a distinctive territory or place with a mystical bond between the people and place (Jackson and Penrose 1993:5-6). Works by Thornton (2002, 2008), Jackson and Penrose (1993) and Marie (1999) provide solid theoretical frameworks and useful comparative examples of Tlingit, Scottish and Māori nation constructions, respectively. Two nation aspects are discussed below: the establishment of a ‘nation,’ and how views of ‘nation’ change over time.

The establishment of a ‘nation’ construct has a space and time context that influences its characteristics. Jackson and Penrose (1993) contrast nation perspectives in Scotland and the United States with the latter a deliberate construct from concept to material form. Its symbols, political structure, physical boundaries, and creation of ideas underpin the nation construct. Jackson and Penrose’s (1993) discussion of this ‘imagined community,’ applies to America with constructed meanings and symbols influencing Sitka’s spiritual landscape development. Similarly, the Russian ‘nation’ and characteristics, and ‘nation-status’ of the Tlingit, are important influences upon place and inform understanding of cross-nation relations. Nation characteristics within cultural geomentality explorations uncover deeper meaning and culture group beliefs, (i.e., structure of universe, cosmology and social structures). Meaning is relevant to establish identity for Sitka’s culture groups, and to discuss how government roles shape the spiritual landscape.

Identity is a combination of notions of culture, citizenship and race. Individuals operating in today’s society would find it difficult to separate these. Jackson and Penrose (1993) highlight beliefs of common heritage, historical experience, and defined geography. Symbolic markers often represent a culture’s identity within this wider culture meaning. Marie (1999) gives examples of facial tattooing
to demarcate tribal membership or the symbolic use of the Star of David for Jewish people in Nazi Germany and discusses the theory of symbolic ethnicity as:

a nostalgic allegiance to a remote vision/version of a more ‘purified’ or alternatively ‘repugnant’ past…There is a pragmatic imperative to display and institute the symbols and emblems of a former generational ethnic connection to such an extent, that they become embellished in collective notions, such as rites of passage or architectural sites (p 83).

Symbolic markers are important to consider when examining the evolution of the Tlingit definition of ‘nation.’ Yoon’s (1986, 1994b) study of the East Coast Māori and influences of post-colonialism on iwi29 practices (e.g., death rituals, siting for churches and marae) provide useful comparisons.

*Nation* constructs can evolve and change over time. Prior to the construct of Tlingit as a ‘nation,’ was the initial ethnicity construct distinguishing indigenous from White groups. Thornton (2002) discusses the changing national identity of Tlingit People tracing how the definition of ‘nation’ evolves, illustrating the significance of power relations between cultures over time. It is a useful comparative work with other studies tracing indigenous nation evolution, including Marie (1999) and Yoon’s (1986, 1994b) works on Māori in New Zealand. Penrose (1993) discusses how patriotic Scottish beliefs led to creation of the national political party and to changes in the distribution of power. While these studies are useful to understand within group dynamics, they do not conduct cross-cultural analyses (i.e., incorporating views of ‘others’ like ethnographers, settlers, clergy). Finally, an objective of this study is modern relevance and applicability. Thornton’s (2002, 2008) works present constructs of the *Tlingit nation* by Tlingit as useful contrasts to American government policy and planning definitions.

This study seeks to gain greater depth of culture group understanding through connections to place. Jackson and Penrose (1993) discuss the connection of the physical battle site at Bannockburn in 1314 and the ‘national symbol’ it represents in Scottish history linking nationalist Scottish sentiment to a specific landscape feature. In contrast, Marie (1999) explains the cultural pathology created for Māori through the loss of attachment to the land through colonisation and urbanisation whereas reunification with the land:

resurrected Māori identity as the mental and spiritual corollary to social and political emancipation (p 103).

---

29 *Iwi* is a Māori tribe descended from a common named ancestor or ancestors, and is usually comprised of a number of hapū (sub-tribes) http://www.tkm.govt.nz/definitions/, accessed 17.11.2008.
Spiritual connections to homelands for indigenous peoples remain culturally important irrespective of physical place changes. Strong conceptual bonds appear during Treaty settlements in New Zealand where Māori assert spiritual ties to specific places persisting through ancestry, customary use and frequently without visible physical markers. Ngāti Whātua in Auckland sought a role in managing One Tree Hill in Auckland as part of their Crown settlement. Despite physical landscape changes, spiritual and emotional connections to place remain like a *palimpsest of the mind* retaining a mental connection over time. These mental associations to place influence identity and nation definitions. Tracing evolutions of concepts and physical connections to the ‘land’ can aid with ‘decolonising the mind’ and assist resolving contemporary issues.

From a method perspective, beliefs, national experiences, and attitudes to the environment, combine for greater understanding of culture-place connections. The constructs of ‘frontier’ and ‘wilderness’ for example, are essential to the American sense of heritage and nation and to Alaska’s development and evolving place concepts (Haycox 2002a, 2002b). Different sources help to interpret such nation constructs. For example, settlement/migration ‘myths’ identify specific places like the Tlingit ‘source of creation’ at the Nass River (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994). Understanding Russian imperial links and the context of Russian colonisation is enhanced (DeGraft-Hanson 2005, Pickles 2006, Sobti 2005, and others). American influences related to expansion sentiment, and national experience reveal attitudes toward the environment through founding documents including the Constitution and previous studies (Turner 1996 [1920/1893], Boorstin 1965). To understand the cultural multiplicity, interdependence of nations and new waves of nationalism, Addai-Sundiata (1998) urges immediate attention to appreciate national cultural heritages. For example, Russian Orthodoxy provides a hybridised identity constructed in multiple framings (e.g., in Russia and in the colonies) that can be compared to American Protestant activities (e.g., Native assimilation strategies). Mental and physical constructs regarding the spiritual landscape expose people and place dynamics useful in interpreting multiple cultural heritages.

Architecture can reflect diversity and *national* heritage through cultural building preferences. Boorstin (1965) and King (1976) provide useful interpretations and design context for American architecture influences, while Auty and Obolensky (1988), Black (2004) and Fedotov (1946) provide useful references for Russian architectural influences. Sacred architecture studies by Clowney and Clowney (1982) and Humphrey and Vitebsky (1997) supplement Freeland’s (1963)
investigation of postcolonial churches in Melbourne to provide meaningful comparisons for Sitka’s sacred places.

Few architectural studies focus on indigenous structures, yet such buildings embody nation and culture connections with relevance for contemporary land management practices. The orientation to Bannockburn for indigenous Scottish people years after colonisation (Jackson and Penrose 1993) and the global increase of indigenous people ‘reconnecting with the land’ (Marie 1999; Thornton 2002; Yoon 1986, 1991) attest to the contemporary significance of such matters. Refined notions of identity resulting from colonialism and urbanisation impact indigenous people mentally and physically, however:

Native people neither succumbed to colonialism’s ‘fatal impact’ nor interacted with newcomers on a basis of equivalency, but coped as they could when confronted...with...the array of powers embedded in settler colonialism (Harris 2004:180).

Harris (2004) reveals colonisation preferences in land management processes and systems remain active today. However, the means to extract cultural importance of past, present and future reference points requires clarification. The means to re-engage indigenous value and traditional beliefs remain limited. Competing notions of value occur within largely unchanged socio-political frameworks. As culture group meanings for place and land are clarified, changes may be required to how physical spaces are perceived and governed. Cultural significance of place may result in a physical visible change to landscape represented through plaques or markers, or may involve the transfer of ownership, establishment of ongoing management, or renaming of places as with Treaty cultural redress packages. These examples mark evolutions in how sacred places are managed. The state has a critical role in developing frameworks and administering systems to manage sacred places and the spiritual landscape. The discussion of that role follows.

30 A traditional meeting place for Māori families usually characterised by a named wharenui [meeting house] and named wharekai [dining house]. Some marae are more commonly known by the name of their wharenui, which is usually named after a tupuna [ancestor], (http://www.tkm.govt.nz/definitions, accessed 21.11.2008).

31 One Tree Hill Domain in Auckland is under settlement to become jointly managed and jointly re-named to include the original Māori name of Maungakiekie as part of the Agreement in Principle for the Settlement of the Historical Claims of Ngati Whatua o Orakei (dated 9 June 2006 p8).
2.1.2.3 The Role of the State in Constructions of Spiritual Places

The state has a key and powerful role to develop and manage spiritual places. Since the mid-1980s, studies into cultural politics have demonstrated how “contesting identities of communities and places at different scales,” are played out through landscape (Cosgrove in Kuper and Kuper 1996:450). Government is expected to act to mediate competing interests and represent the public good. However, past studies reveal government action can entrench historic injustice as with Anderson’s (1988) demonstration of government racial constructs of “Chinese” in Vancouver. Harris’s (2004:179) study of British Columbia investigates maps, the law and resettlement policies to disaggregate the “amorphous imperial soup,” illustrating specific practices that “dispossessed one set of people and established another.” This section disentangles local and national government involvement in land by providing an overview of the basic roles: land management (including property laws), planning and zoning, heritage place designations and place naming. Discussion of each of the basic government roles follows.

i) Land Management

Government influence to shape landscape is not always viewed with a social construction lens. Even so, prior studies demonstrate ways colonising powers use their roles as government administrators to shape the colonial landscape and to achieve their political and economic goals (Black 2004, French 1983, Harris 2004, King 1976, Schmidt 2005, Winchester et al. 2003, and others). For example, Anderson (1988) demonstrates how institutional practices at three levels in the Canadian government perpetuated discriminatory practices regarding the “Chinese” use of power and influence for over a century in Vancouver to categorise the race. Zoning relegated Chinese to specific regions and professions and heavy licensing fees disadvantaged Chinese market producers that were outperforming White grocers. The naming of city streets also reinforced area designations, and newspapers illustrated the White/non-White duality describing Chinese men as:

stupefied by opium, engrossed in gambling, surrounded by stagnant air, eating dead birds and worshipping strange idols (in World 10 February 1912, cited in Anderson 1988:6).

Legislation changes closing ‘loopholes’ that allowed Chinese immigration, and Housing Act legislation justifying expropriation of Chinese land were also mentioned by Anderson (1988) who concludes over time, that local planners now offer ‘historical protection’ of Chinatown’s heritage.
Harris (2004) also examines government influences in postcolonial British Columbia including how laws, maps and land policies dispossess. His perspective avoids government *discrimination* to focus on disaggregating colonial practices impacting geographic displacement of people. Both Harris (2004) and Anderson’s (1988) focus could add cross-cultural dimensions to broaden reading. Harris (2004:180) acknowledges “that [indigenous] story needs to be told at least as much.” Research is applied to Sitka regarding Russian American Company colonisation and United States government interventions post-transfer. Neither specifies religious aspects like Christianity, or how power relations transform functional areas of the city like displacing churches (Winchester et al. 2003:72-3). Anderson (1988) supports combining hidden and visible landscape to reveal deeper forces underlying those in power that shape places.

Moving from a local to a national focus, land management including ownership, governance and planning frequently rely on authority granted by a higher governing body as with federal governments in Canada, USA, UK and New Zealand (Alexander 1991:32). In Canada, section 91 of the *Constitution Act SC 1867* provides jurisdiction over property to individual provinces that subsequently designate various authorities to individual municipalities. Similarly in America, municipal authority functions are delegated by the state. Seemingly straightforward, the underlying premise is built on land ownership notions *constructed* in White Eurocentric mindsets using hierarchical power as assigned in Western laws to local governments. By contrast, traditional indigenous constructs of land ownership and management systems differ in significant ways: *how land is governed* based on individual or collective ownership and subsistence requirements; *how power is divided* with international, national, provincial and local levels versus clan structures held collectively (i.e., multiple ownership); *how land is occupied* day to day, including use and management in a collective versus individual framework (e.g., subsistence versus economic or extractive); *how land is recorded* over time (written versus oral); and *how the land is regarded* (e.g., sacredness associated to land).

Conflict with modern dualities create disharmony and impact society as exemplified in advice from *UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People*, on the treatment of Māori in New Zealand. Rodolfo Stavenhagen, recommends repealing the *Foreshore and Seabed Act*, questions the entire Treaty settlement process, raises concerns about the political environment, race relations, the media’s negative portrayal of Māori, and:
The Māori Party hailed the report as “an accurate reflection of the plight of Māori in New Zealand,” while then White (Pākehā) Deputy Prime Minister said, “the report would be discussed and then nothing much will happen,” (Dominion Post 06 April 2006, p 1). The adequacy of the constitutional arrangements regarding the Treaty (Tiriti o Waitangi) with human rights laws is questioned by Bargh (2006:13) highlighting that governments have various roles to ensure legislation adequately represents all society. Within the system, political parties also have a role to resolve conflicts. A prerequisite for effective and representative land management is a planning system that reflects diversity in society.

ii) Planning and Location Theory

Conceptual differences also appear in local planning systems within economic land use frameworks. Individual and societal utility for land do not always coincide (Hayter 2003, Mather 1986) as private and public good motives often conflict (e.g., commercial users may wish to maximise profit while residents seek greater aesthetic benefit). Each user derives a special value for their land, or economic rent, as a by-product of what they want to do with the land (Gallion 1980, in Mather 1986). In some traditional indigenous systems, value is assessed according to best communal use (public good) as with subsistence activities. This approach contrasts Western models where protection of private and individual value is secured in law (Alexander 1991, Mather 1986, Pinch 1985). Local government then must protect both use and value to mediate between competing individual and private interests.

Cultural influences impact location theory and provide another lens to explore how attitudes influence action. Value orientation and site considerations based on cultural worldviews (as discussed in later in section 2.1.3) convert into location theories. Western economic location theory based on economic rent, location theory and legislation or regulations (Christaller 1966; Von Thünen 1966 [1826]) contrast with East Asian approaches including geomancy principles to preserve earth energy flows (Tanaka 1981, 1984; Tuan 2001[1977]; Yoon 1975, 1976, 1980, 1999, 32).

2006). For example, Loy (1997) argues capitalism is a secular worldview that “commodifies whole landscapes, constructs and reconstructs them in...profit motivated ways,” (Demerit 2002:19-20). Classic works by Weber, Engels and Adam Smith reiterate the contention of land as a place of commodities with labour and resource inputs to be exploited. These theories, with grounding in Western cultural worldview, provide an interesting foundation to view and assess the development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape. Colonisation then should demonstrate spatial patterns discernable as influenced by Western frameworks.

Several studies provide useful comparisons illustrating Western colonial planning consequences. Lewandowski (1984) looks at colonial influences in renaming places and erection statues in Madras to replace folk and religious heroes. French (1983) also discusses street names influenced from the trade quarters and foreign planning (including Howard’s Garden City) that impact linear and radial street patterns. Schmidt (2005) discusses the physical changes in Kumansi with a strong military presence and fort on a ridge above the centre of town with colonial administrative headquarters huddled around the fort:

*No longer the spiritual, political and religious centre of Ashanti, Kumansi would henceforth be transformed, its purpose and function to be determined by outside forces serving the extractive export oriented needs of the colonizers (p 357).*

In addition to exploring colonial impacts, postcolonial action is also worthy of investigation. The Indonesian government for example, after independence had transformed the former Dutch centre at King’s Square (*Koningsplein*) to demonstrate the power transfer (Winchester et al. 2003:73). Similarly, post-colonisation, Haycox (2002a, 2002b) argues modern day Alaska remains subject to exploitation of natural resources and control from Washington. In these examples, the market orientation has logistic and spatial implications. Western cultural frameworks of colonisation point to location theories like Christaller’s Central Place Theory (1966) and Von Thünen’s theories of economic rent (1966 [1826]) as worthy explanatory aids to interpret the spiritual landscape.

Stavenhagen’s PhD was thesis, titled, “What Kind of Yarn? From Color Line to Multicoloured Hammock: Reflections on Racism in Public Policy.” He has produced similar reports for other countries.

33 Physical change included the draining of wetlands to facilitate the extraction of natural resources and to create a market area replaced with an orderly square, neither which accounted for the local activities and functions prior to colonisation which were less formal. The colonial presence sought to re-establish Kumansi as a strategically important city.
Christaller’s *Central Place Theory* (1966) uses economic interpretations to explain the size, spacing and functional activities found in central places. Activities in central places respond to the needs of the hinterland market (e.g., providing religious goods and services such as churches/places of worship, icons/monuments, bibles/books, cemeteries, etc). Certain activities are located in towns of differing sizes due to available market size and trade area (e.g., more specialised functions are available at higher order (larger) centres). Von Thünen’s (1966 [1826]) model of agricultural land use is based on assumptions that hypothesise city development as a pattern of rings (e.g., the closest ring to the city is for dairy and intensive farming given these are perishable goods for market).

Location decisions balance the cost of *transportation, land* (which increases in price closer to a city) and *profit*. Both Von Thünen and Christaller provide useful theories for interpreting Western economic location influences upon Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape.

*Geomancy* is an East Asian contrast to Western location theories. It is a “quasi-religious and pseudo-scientific system” with close ties to the natural environment (Yoon 1975):

> Feng-shui teaches that man should not bring about disorder in the geomantic harmony of nature...[and] in the acquisition of one’s prosperity, the selection of an auspicious place for a house or burial site must be made by means of geomantic principles (p 22).

Can East Asian location theories explore and explain spatial patterns in Sitka’s spiritual landscape? Yoon (2006:155) cautions geomancy is more complex than Western concepts of environmental determinism with conditions of use and rules for siting. Geomancy is used today to locate skyscrapers, banks, and hotels (Yoon 1992:32) with consulting firms found in Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and South Korea. Even with limited expectations of East Asian influences in Sitka, the traditional knowledge link to geomancy customs (e.g., with folklore) helps explain location decisions (Yoon 2006:310). Traditional Tlingit knowledge similarly reveals siting considerations explained differently to Western principles. Such links are useful regarding auspicious sites like burial places with strong nature connections. Few researchers contrast diversity across planning approaches. Neglecting to acknowledge West and East approaches is illustrated in Schmidt’s (2005) work in Kumansi. Ill-informed Western colonial planning established ‘European’ parks, green

---

34 Geomancy however, allows for corrections of geomantic disharmony of nature by modifying either the natural and/or cultural landscapes.

35 Yoon (1982: 78-79) discusses geomancy in China, “as a most powerful and highly institutionalised system of environmental planning as well as a means of interpreting the divergence of culture in different places,” giving examples of the geomantic influences on the Chinese landscape in Peking, Nanking and the graves of royal families and commoners alike.
spaces and street structures that confused existing marketplace functions. Public spaces were underutilised since locals desired traditional market functionality. Government policies and practices can fall short without conscientious consideration of different viewpoints and value systems.

Little research has gone into land use, location and planning factors in geography and religion (Park 1994, Kong 1990). Places of historic significance are now commonly protected by city planning policies and state or national designations, but how do spiritual sites such as churches and cemeteries fit within broader Western planning systems? There is no common land use classification for spiritual places and protections suffer severe pressure to meet societal need. For some, downtown church properties are not the highest best use (i.e., if sold, such places command significant monetary value). In addition, cemeteries originally placed on the town fringe are increasingly under pressure from urban growth.\(^{36}\) Given such land pressures and conflicts, there is value in adapting planning systems to improve decision-making for spiritual sites to account for cultural dimensions. Understanding why locations are important to cultural groups can ameliorate intercultural conflict.

Location factors for siting a spiritual place include topography, aspect and access. Some past studies focus upon threshold populations required to support a spiritual place (Homan & Rowley 1979 in Park 1994), and religious considerations (as for Jewish synagogues (see Shilhav 1983:324)). Unfortunately, geographers have not often studied location factors influencing the siting of spiritual sites. A major focus for past studies has been on tangible aspects of spiritual sites, namely the limited cemetery studies (Kong 1990, 1999; Sopher 1967, 1981; Zelinsky 1976, 1994), churches and landscapes of death (Park 1994). In America, cultural connections to graveyards were explored by Jordan (1990) and Nakagawa (1990), with some location factor and land use studies completed (Darden 1972; Hardwick et al. 1971; Pattison 1955, in Park 1994). Zelinsky’s (1976, 1994) methodology probes cemetery information (e.g., tombstone and cemetery naming) and spatial patterns of cemetery siting, size and design.\(^{37}\) Such studies focus on visible aspects of changing names, adherence to planning principles, grave or tombstone marker changes, and segregation (by

\(^{36}\) Examining deathscapes improves our understanding of space as a contested resource in society. Kong (1999) contrasts the colonial state of mind regarding burials focused on sanitary issues and the opportunity costs of lost developmental space, with a desire for individuals to incorporate fengshui (geomantic) principles into burials.

\(^{37}\) Anderson (1993, in Park 1994) examines Czech gravestone markers in seven Texas cemeteries revealing how isolation in an agricultural setting helped them hold on to much of their culture. Nakagawa (1990, in Park 1994) looked at the cemetery landscape evolution in Japan to reveal people’s values toward the cemetery in a quantitative based study.
wealth and culture). A more powerful reading of landscape can be achieved by linking tangible landscape to function and belief (e.g., as Kong and Yeoh (2003) illustrate in Singaporean burial grounds).

The visible and invisible cultural aspects of deathscapes are found in Yoon’s (1986, 1994, 2006) examinations of Māori in New Zealand. Yoon (1986:95) discusses changes across both the tangible and intangible as “two sides of a coin.” Yoon (1986) offers Māori changes are part of their cultural survival, selectively adapting beliefs. Harris (2004), Thornton (2002) and Marie (1999) reach similar conclusions regarding indigenous people in BC, Alaska and New Zealand respectively. These observations contrast older ethnographic concerns of cultures being destroyed by contact (Krause 1979[1885]; Emmons and de Laguna 1991). These landscape studies link material and functional aspects though fail to explore social construction at physical settings or to feature a powerful link to cosmology.

In examining the whole spiritual landscape, this study expands previous deathscape studies by comprehensively exploring wider location considerations and related spatial impacts discussed in Park (1994) including: gardens (e.g., Japan uses objects considered Kami (inherently miraculous and sacred)); settlement patterns (e.g., Indian and Indonesian village temples are at the centre of town); and landscape names (e.g., towns, topographic features, use of saint names, church/cemetery names). These smaller scale material expressions are often the focus of geographic studies on their own rather than combined together to provide a multi-dimensional spiritual landscape interpretation. These aspects also reflect cultural cosmologies and ‘what is sacred’ as important to understanding cultural geomentality. Examining the spiritual landscape in toto reveals its richness as a study subject.

**iii) Designating Places**

Designations are social constructions expressing importance and value of specific places. In the spiritual landscape, the process to establish national and/or historic places reveals much about those in power (government designators) and cultural attitudes toward sites (Alanen and Melnick 2000).

---

Humphrey and Vitebsky (1997:147) discuss how funerary architecture “aims to meet the needs of the dead, but also meets the emotional needs of the living.”
International designations can recognise the importance of a place to a particular cultural group and/or nation, offer protection over time, preserve or restore specific sites or locations, and provide potential economic benefit associated with tourism externalities that flow from a site’s designation (D’Ormesson 1973, Gillespie 2007, Okasha 1972). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) protects cultural heritage on scientific, practical and legal grounds. International conventions allow for cultural and natural landscapes to be considered together.³⁹ For World Heritage Landscapes, three main categories of cultural landscapes have been identified:

- **Clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man** (e.g., easily identifiable garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons often associated with religious or monumental buildings and ensembles; 
- **Organically evolved landscape** (e.g., resulting from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative, with form developed by association and response to its natural environment like fossil landscapes or active contemporary society depicting traditional ways of life; and
- **Associative cultural landscape** justified by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent (UNESCO, http://whc.unesco.org/exhibits/cultland/categories.htm, accessed 25.07.2004).

Comparing rationale for designations in Sitka of indigenous cultural artefacts and heritage can be insightful to understand hierarchical importance assigned to places.

In America, cultural landscapes are relatively new aspects of historic preservation. Alanen and Melnick’s (2000) seminal work traces building and landscape preservation, how public interpretations emphasise what is valued (buildings and natural places), and how agencies like the National Park Service support heritage preservation. The work refers to Sitka National Historic Park and NPS commissioned cultural heritage studies by Smith-Middleton et al. (1999a, 1999b).

Designations alone cannot bridge cultural conflicts; however, they do embody higher level management protections representing heritage significance in space categories. What is preserved represents a point in time as interpreted by society and preserved as a part of history. Applying the designation lens to modern places in Sitka’s spiritual landscape connects culture and land relationships through public value interpretations and spatial history. Designations offer ways of celebrating diversity in national and international contexts presently lacking a culturally inclusive lens.

iv) Place Names and Naming

Place names express the invisible (geomentality and social constructs) through the visible (physical places). Much has been written on the power of names to give a sense of meaning to place and to convey ideological intent (Duncan 1990, 1985; Goldschmidt and Haas 1998; Herman 1999; Kong and Yeoh 2003; Thornton 1997a, 1997b, 2008; Yoon 1980a, 1986, 1991). In anthropological works on indigenous cultures, naming is shown to reflect social structures and environmental connections (Basso 1984, 1996 in Thornton 1997a; de Laguna 1960; Goldschmidt and Haas 1998; Krause 1979[1885]; Thornton 1997a, 1997b, 2008; Yoon 1980, 1986, 1991). Thornton (1997a:209) summarises the naming nexus connecting “three fundamental domains of cultural analysis: language, thought, and the environment.” As a visible representation of cultural importance, place names are important study objects in the spiritual landscape.

In addition to place names, the naming process provides another level of analysis to understand social constructs and intercultural power relationships. Porteus (1990) refers to rewriting of indigenous place names for example as “topocide,” and “the annihilation of place.” Herman (1999) refers to the “conquest” of Hawai’ian names following America’s annexation and imposed Western capitalist order, knowledge and language. A classic work on naming in the United States by George R. Stewart was reprinted in 2008. Names on the Land: A Historical Account of Place-Naming in the United States was written in 1944, with Stewart’s 1958 edition including a new chapter on place names and the naming process in Alaska. Exploring names and naming in Sitka provides an appreciation of how place names impact the people of the place, external impressions and the importance of changes to both over time.

2.1.3 THE SPIRITUAL LANDSCAPE OF THE MIND

Having explored the theoretical context for analysing cultural landscape, this next section shifts to highlight invisible beliefs and attitudes toward land, or the intangibles that underpin behaviours. The theoretical context for “unseen” concepts includes how worldview and its subsets of cosmology and geomentality offer insights regarding a culture’s spatial beliefs and attitudes (e.g., including what is sacred and how human relationships to nature and the environment are defined). Conscious and

Worldview explains cultural behaviours and environmental perceptions. It embodies our outlook on life, the world, beliefs on how to live, and other systematised views of worldly phenomena including love, life, death, priorities and values. The term is a translation of the German ‘weltanschauung,’ containing two dimensions:

- the overall perspective from which one sees and interprets the world; and
- a collection of beliefs about life and the universe held by an individual or a group (The American Heritage Dictionary 2007).

For this study worldview is defined as: a structured view of the universe incorporating a culture’s attitudes and belief system. Two dimensions are relevant: cosmology and geomentality, with the area of greatest interest where these intersect. Figure 5 represents the overall connectedness of concepts discussed in this section with physical and mental beliefs and behaviours bestriding the imaginary centre line dividing visible and invisible spiritual landscape for discussion purposes. Social construction theory applies to all constructs: worldview, geomentality, cosmology and the notions of sacred and profane (black border line). Within worldview (red oval), the subsets of geomentality (green oval) and cosmology (blue oval) represent ‘spatial’ attitudes toward the environment, and ‘spiritual’ ideas about origin and the structure of the universe, respectively. Cosmology is important in understanding the spiritual landscape and cultural views toward it. Using cosmology enables interdisciplinary applications of this comprehensive approach to reading landscape.

The visible landscape at the top half of the model in Figure 5 includes both the natural and built environment. There are profane and/or sacred dimensions within the visible landscape (e.g., a Russian Orthodox Church is a visible object that is considered sacred to believers and can be situated in a profane neighbourhood). While beliefs fall into the invisible part of the model, their manifestation, through behaviours can be explored in the visible landscape. It is important to acknowledge some cultures do not distinguish between the visible and invisible landscape (e.g., a Tlingit shaman could cross over between mythical and pragmatic space, or from this to other worldly spaces using a mask and/or traditional dancing). In the model then, a dotted line around sacred represents the crossing of visible and invisible space. Deeper understanding of culture-land relationships within worldview (beliefs) assist in comparing cultural attitudes and explaining spatial patterns in the natural and built environment.
The sense of ‘place and space,’ according to Tuan (2001[1977]) is based on worldview including cultural upbringing. Such views are useful to capture how “members of a particular culture see the world,” including values and meaning regarding lifestyle, behaviours and activities (Rapoport 2005:95). This study systematically examines cultural worldviews to gain insights to intercultural beliefs and actions. The discussion that follows overviews past studies, introduces cosmoology and geomentality, and then redefines geomentality for application in this research.

Worldview has been featured in four areas of past geographic study: how cosmology is applied, historic and sociological studies, reflections in the built environment, and how value is reflected through worldview as a part of culture. Cosmology is the branch of metaphysics40 defined as:

the philosophical study of the nature of the universe and the scientific study of the origin and structure of the universe (The American Heritage Dictionary 2007).

---

40 Metaphysics is the study of what is outside objective experience and concerned with the fundamental reality of being or existence (The American Heritage Dictionary 2007).
Cosmological beliefs are prevalent in all cultures, whether subconscious or conscious to individuals. In *Notes Toward the Definition of Culture*, for example, T S Eliot (1948) argues the identity of religion and culture remains on an *unconscious* level:

> upon which we have superimposed a conscious structure wherein religion and culture are contrasted and can be opposed...[however] are aspects of one unity, and two different and contrasted things (p 68).

So despite a religious culture being defined as one with ‘a clearly structured worldview’ (Tuan 2001[1977]:272), the interplay between influencers and shapers of beliefs *within* worldview may not always be conscious. It is important then to explore both the seen and conscious, and unseen and unconscious, to gain a full appreciation of the nature of culture-land relationships.

The history of geography and religion had roots with Russian geographers studying the ‘cosmos’ (from the Greek meaning ‘universe’) and world diagrams and maps that reflected a worldview shaped by religion (Cosgrove 2008, Kong 1990). Historically it has been recognised that cosmological beliefs hold:

> some of the most deeply rooted triggers of human behaviour and attitudes which have significant implications for geographic patterns of human activity (Park 1994:1).

In *New Found Lands: Maps in the History of Exploration*, Whitfield (1998) assembles several maps illustrating worldview, like the Indian cosmic model with the world pictured as a lotus with mountains at its sacred centre (p 7) and the placement of the Madonna of navigators at the top (p 53). Cosgrove (1999) similarly traces past map meanings including cosmographic ‘other earthly’ expressions. These past efforts once integrated spatial and spiritual concepts and remain useful to explore past relationships. It is perplexing that modern efforts do not more purposefully connect space, time and place. Cosgrove (2008:8) advocates this direction in his recent work referring to *geographical vision* as able to “transcend both space and time...foreseeing as well as seeing.” In this study, interpretations of traditional Tlingit, historic Russian and American maps prove useful for social construction analysis of race, nation and place names.

Cosmology influences beliefs that ‘shape’ the land through a culture’s manifestation of these mental constructs. The importance of studying beliefs and ideas (true and false) was put forward as ‘geosophy’ by J K Wright (1947), though the time of his writing coincided with “his American geographical colleagues...committing...to a positivistic ideal of objective science,” (Cosgrove 2008:8).
Beliefs create a reference point for the culture’s direct experience, or how spiritual and spatial beliefs, are expressed on earth, in spiritual landscapes. To illustrate these inner workings, Figure 6: Beliefs Model illustrates the relevant concepts in relation to sacred space as the core construct based on worldview.

**Figure 6: Beliefs Model - The Central Concept of Sacred Space**

The model is based on five assumptions. *First*, beliefs are at the heart of the notion of sacred space. *Second*, beliefs have several influences including parental beliefs, schooling, life experiences, social trends and norms, politics, religion and emotions. ‘Worldview’ is one of the social constructs that captures these influences. *Third*, beliefs shape our values, attitudes and behaviours. In a place and space sense, beliefs shape spatial values, influence our attitudes toward nature and the environment, and shape spatial behaviours as a result. *Fourth*, we are not always conscious or aware of our beliefs and their influence. *Fifth*, beliefs can evolve and change over time. Walking through these assumptions using the illustration model in Figure 6, the illustration depicts the linked spiritual ideas and concepts (left) which consciously and unconsciously act to influence of our beliefs (the heart of sacred space) with these beliefs shaping our spatial behaviours (consciously and unconsciously) to

---

*41 The Encarta Dictionary (2006) defines belief as, “the acceptance of the truth of something: acceptance by the mind that something is true or real, often underpinned by an emotional or spiritual sense of certainty (e.g., belief in an afterlife, faith in God or in a religion’s gods).”*
yield physical and tangible expressions. The model is dynamic with iterations adapting beliefs over time as depicted in the feedback loop at the top of the model (see dotted line).

Two spiritual beliefs form the cosmological focus for this research: **origin**, including explanations for creation of the world and associated veneration of the creator; and **the ‘structure’ of the universe**, including the role of humans, gods, nature, and how these interrelate, particularly between what happens on earth and in the afterlife. Past studies emphasising spiritual and spatial beliefs illustrate the potency of this type of inquiry to broaden culture-land understanding. Past studies focused on **spiritual beliefs** (cosmology) as expressed through culture include: Yoon (1986, 1994) who uses worldview for explaining cultural mentality and compares cosmologies based on creation myths of Judeo-Christian Tradition, Yin-Yang Theory and indigenous Māori in New Zealand; Jolles’ (1989) study of St Lawrence Island in Alaska as an example of how protestant conversion led to a new cosmology and language for the Sivuqughhmiit; Harris (1997) discusses the Fraser Canyon in British Columbia providing miner/settler and indigenous N1ha7kápmx cosmological settlement rationale; and Williams (2006) who explores Māori attitudes to water underpinned by a worldview that recognises the water’s own life-force, related to the **atua** of the creation story, and how these beliefs influence water classifications. In these examples, Yoon and Harris consider the spatial implications of cross-cultural cosmology comparisons. Few studies connect tangible and intangible aspects. To provide insights in this regard requires a deep analysis of both aspects in order that connections are clearly understood.

Beginning with the spatial, spiritual belief is observable in the built environment. Rapoport (1978, 1990, 2005) examines traditions and relationships between culture and built environments which he believes are often misunderstood. The built form is:

> actually a subset of culture which made the nature of the translation process of one into the other rather difficult to grasp (Rapoport 1978:10).

He proposes that human activities and behaviour could be useful to understand links between culture and form yet he does not provide a method to do so. Schmidt (2005:354) cites a number of studies that examine uses of space by different culture groups in various settings (Craig 1972, Hutchinson 1987, Rose 1987, Loukikaitou-Sideries 1995). Further, Walsh (2004:2) links worldview to built housing environments discussing how Native Peoples’ link to the land “will never be understood or
heard by ruling authorities,” remaining the “great religious divide.” His study is useful in its use of objects to understand the notion of ‘home,’ focusing interpretation upon prayers, songs and rituals that go beyond questions of market values. In this way Walsh’s work supports this study approach to delve deeply to cultural beliefs to better understand geographic behaviour. Walsh’s work could be improved by considering practical ways to bridge cross-cultural difference rather than merely acknowledging the difficulties of divergent worldviews. Coolun and Ozaki (2004) also look at housing, seeking value in the meaning of a dwelling relating to culture and lifestyle. They link the layers of meaning attributed to the built environment outlined by Rapoport (1978, 1990, 2005) to develop a continuum of understanding fixed features related to worldview at a high level (e.g., cosmology and philosophical beliefs), values at a medium level (to convey identity, status, wealth, power) and functions at a lower level (e.g., access, eating, movement etc.). Their conceptual framework does not translate to landscape, a domain relished by the cultural geographer. Their deconstruction of the built environment to dwelling features is less relevant in cultural geography where the focus is upon culture groups (Coolun and Ozaki 2004:6). Geomentality provides a deeper lens to read the built environment at a culture group level (see 2.1.3.3 Geomentality section to follow).

2.1.3.1 Concepts of Sacred and Profane

Early writers on the subject (Eliade 1959, Otto 1950) constructed ‘sacred’. Eliade contrasted ‘sacred space’ with ‘profane space’ (literally that which lies outside the temple), as relating differently across cultures. Tuan (2001[1977]) distinguishes mythical space and place from pragmatic space where:

mythical space is a component of worldview...symbolic but...also a reference point for culture and an order for man and nature to fit into (p 99).

While the distinction between profane and sacred provides one way of categorising, it cannot be generically applied across culture groups who have different constructs of ‘what is sacred.’ For animists, such as Shintoists, a tree or rock in nature is imbued with spirits, while the incarnation of God in Jesus provides a material example for Christians. Sacred is not verifiable with, “objective

---

42 Atua refers to god and the supernatural (Ryan 1989:8).
indicators that can be read like dials,” (Harpur 1994:7) nor is it subjectively assignable, what Isaac (1965:28) cautions as intruding into theological domains. Acknowledging these aspects, this study does not limit ‘sacred’ to a discrete set. Figure 5 depicts ‘sacred’ with a dotted line, indicating a semi-permeable membrane allowing for cultures and races that view all space as sacred. Despite these limits to define sacred, it is important nonetheless to explore what is valued by a culture as expressed through their beliefs, particularly their cosmological beliefs that are core to notions of ‘sacred.’ Some contexts are presented to illustrate how sacred is manifested in nature, physical spaces (through consecration), objects and other characteristics.

Nature-culture relationships vary regarding the role of nature. In geomancy, all of nature is imbued with spirituality and appropriate placement of life’s activities (buildings, shrines) to ensure human well-being (Castle 1998, Yoon 2006). This approach compares to Western perspectives where humans dominate nature (Glacken 1967, Turner 1996[1920]). In the ancient world, it was universally believed that nature was instilled with spirit and special places held concentrations of this spirit (Buttimer 2006, Crouch and Colin 1992 in Park 1994). Ceremonies were held for river gods in Rome (or spring, fountain, and woodland gods). Geomancy was practiced by Chinese and Buddhists. Mountains were honoured like Fuji, Olympus and Tongariro. Heavenly bodies such as Great Temple of Aztecs at Tenochtitlan or UNESCO world heritage sites like Ikishima Island in Japan were venerated. Beliefs that nature is the home of gods, or that specific places bridge the known and unknown worlds (e.g., gates), also leads to veneration of natural places. Eliade (1986) gives an example of how a smoke hole in a hut or yurt of Northern Asia is conceived as the centre of the world where:

> archaic man endeavoured to live continuously in a consecrated space, in a universe kept open by the communications between cosmic levels [such as with shaman liaising between the heavens and earth during a trance] (p 120).

The act of veneration links *mythical meaning* and *physical manifestation* to create excellent study objects. Despite this recognition and veneration for natural places, scant research explores different cultural views toward the same sacred place (Burgess 2009, Buttimer 2006, Park 1994).

---

43 Ikishima Island in Japan the Bay of Sakoshi, Japan was designated a national natural monument in 1924 because of its rare laurel forest grove. Local legends foretell insanity for anyone who cuts a tree on Ikishima and guarantee local fishermen’s catches so long as the area remains to be held as sacred (Humphrey and Vitebsky 1997).
In addition to natural sacred places, Eliade (1959) explores how ordinary (profane) space is converted into holy (sacred) space, suggesting a symbolic process that reflects spiritual characteristics associated with both the physical features and the deeper, abstract implications. Jackson and Henrie (1983) present the creation of sacred places as social constructs, though they do not use this terminology:

Sacred space is that portion of the earth’s surface which is recognised by individuals or groups as worthy of devotion, loyalty or esteem…[and] does not exist naturally, but is assigned sanctity as man defines, limits and characterises it through his culture, experience and goals (in Park 1994:94).

Park (1994:245) discusses designation of a sacred place as a response to two types of events: a direct manifestation on earth of a deity (hierophanic) or somebody receives a message from the deity and interprets it for others (theophanic). Other ‘consecration’ can occur establishing ‘sacred grounds’ for church or cemetery buildings, depending on the denomination belief system, and if required, places can readily be ‘deconsecrated’ (e.g., decline in church congregation forcing closure); however,

[...] once a sacred space or holy ground is established, it is not easy to eradicate…From such ground springs that which forever renews the earth/Though it is forever denied (Eliot 1948:7-9).

Eliot suggests that once deemed sacred, there is a permanence that resides in a culture. This permanence explains the physical recycling of religious sites as when pagan sites were supplanted with Christian churches (Sidorov 2000). The depth of cultural connection to place can re-emerge during Treaty settlements despite obvious physical changes to a place. Such non-transferability of sacred places means they need not be re-established with each new generation as they are inherited through sacred traditions passed on through intergenerational teachings, stories, songs and myths (Isaac 1965). This ‘lasting nature’ of sacred places enhances their attractiveness as study sites.

While origin myths and aspects of cosmology represent lasting beliefs, some material expressions of sacred as constructs can change over time. Several illustrations follow: Kitagawa (1979:32-33) traces the evolution of broader and changed meanings of kami (sacred) and matsuri (profane) from one emperor to another; Yoon (1986) discusses changes to the Māori spiritual belief system post-colonialism regarding burial practices; Tanaka (1981:250) identifies physical features of Buddhist compounds (including halls, priests’ residences, gates, statues, sacred water and pilgrim road signs) and pilgrim activities concluding sites “emerge, decline, and sometimes diffuse” evolving over time; and Duncan (1990) traces changing imperial influences upon the Kandy landscape using religious text interpretations. In these examples, the built environment is influenced by power and social
consciousness thus inherently holding information worth exploring. Tuan (2001[1977]:112) considers the educative purpose of buildings and their role as “primary text for handing down a tradition, for presenting a view of reality.” He points to examples illustrating cosmic and social order (including candle light, statues of saints, confessionals, pulpits, and others) that in the past were self-evident, but changed through time with passive learning and different symbolic meanings, (Tuan 2001[1977]:112). Given the unconscious influences upon behaviour and the deep rooted belief system as part of cultural cosmology, the buildings and spatial landscape hold lessons for contemporary society regarding culture-land relationships that may shed light on conflicts, and broaden perspectives on how place is perceived in modern societies.

Both visible and invisible meanings are keys to deep understanding of place, sacred and cultural beliefs. The meaning of life and death or the story of creation within a cultural cosmology can persist while ‘visible’ changes occur to places. Yoon (1986) illustrates this with indigenous burial practices incorporating dimensions of European practice while still ensuring objects like teapots were placed near graves for ongoing use in afterlife (traditional understanding); and Christianised Māori may call upon the traditional Māori god of sea, Tangaroa, to aid in the rescue of fallen diver Robert Hewitt (Dominion Post 19 March 2006 p 2). Winchester et al. (2003:175) highlight, cultures are not “born into discrete cultural containers, through which they live their lives.” Explaining changes to beliefs in response to dominant powers is important to the socio-political analysis in this study.

The final element to consider regarding cosmology is the ‘sacredness’ of specific objects and images. Images in the visual arts for example include masks, dress and iconographic symbols, and translate worldview into concrete images (Eliade 1986). Masks are based on origin myths and the wearer transcends space and time to the supernatural where, “every human installation…repeats the cosmology,” (Eliade 1986:66). Examining sacred objects, how they are conceived and who deems them sacred informs the understanding of culture group beliefs (e.g., Western minds may not consider indigenous art including masks, totem poles, or smoke holes, as holding spiritual qualities). Such considerations are relevant in ‘race’ definitions, interpreting objects and analysing human-nature relationships relating to places of worship, death, and historic/homelands sites. The variance in what is ‘valued’ by a culture is important, since these conflicting viewpoints can lie at the heart of
cross-cultural difference. The next section briefly discusses the notion of values to provide a context for how beliefs and behaviours in the spiritual landscape relate.

2.1.3.2 Values

Cultural values are often cited in heritage preservation contexts despite “different interpretations” of what to protect and an absent methodology to evaluate “spirit of place,” (Burgess 2009:13-14). A greater focus to study values, moral issues and spirituality is endorsed by various researchers (Buttimer 2006; Kong 1990, 1999; Park 1994). Addai-Sundiata (1998:np) for example, suggests worldview adds a ‘depth dimension’ to understand a people or nation’s value-orientation, “making intercultural transactions capable of performing a critical and educative function.” How values relate to this study requires some discussion, since the popularity of the construct of values needs to be set within the context of geomentality, worldview and the inner workings of culture.

Understanding the spiritual can be enhanced by linking meaning between place, landscape and experience (Cooper 1992:123 in Park 1994). Emphasising the ‘value’ aspect, there have been few studies in geography: work by Lowenthal (1978) on ‘landscape value’; Pitt, Soergell and Zube (1979) who explore the ‘value of trees’ in the city; and Sadler and Carlson (1982) that look at ‘declining aesthetic value’ and the increasing value of technology. Related recent environmental perception studies directly link cultural behaviour with worldview including: Simmons’s (1993) Interpreting Nature: Cultural Constructions of the Environment, which includes frameworks of political and religious worldviews such as Buddhism and feminism to show how humans interpret their environment around them; Berkes (1993) uses the worldview of Cree Indians to explore their ability to act as stewards of the fishing industry in the eastern sub arctic; and similarly Hunn, Johnson et al. (2003) explore traditional environmental knowledge of Huna Tlingit people providing applications for wilderness park management. Resource management dynamics in land-based activities (e.g., logging, fishing or environmental conservation) are particularly complex. Hayter (2003:709-711) discusses how clashes in value systems of trade, environment and aboriginal political interests demonstrate global-local interdependencies across trade, foreign investment, information, migration, technology and rules/regulations for numerous institutions.
Values expressed in the above studies illustrate the nature of values as social constructs representing preferences or priorities in various settings. Henderson and Thompson (2003:15) highlight how beliefs and values are ‘inseparable,’ with beliefs coming before values to create the rationale for why something is important and preferred. Henderson and Thompson (2003) simplify the position stating:

Our values are nothing more than a representation of our underlying belief systems (p 27).

Two aspects are significant regarding values and this study. The first is a need to connect to the popularity of the ‘values’ reference in current heritage discussions. The second is the need to recognise the power of values in decision-making to acknowledge that:

decisions are based more on priority values than on rational analysis...factual data overlaid by an emotional context...the values are the emotional filters through which we make the decision (Henderson and Thompson 2003:117).

This decision-making context is discussed by linking the cosmological context of how we organise and structure our universe with beliefs through Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) Values Orientation Theory.

The potency and practicality of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) work relates to this study with similar assumptions that: there are a limited number of universal common human problems, a limited number of (societal) value-based solutions and different cultural preferences adopted at different times (Hills 2002). Five basic types of human problems relate to cultural geographic areas of inquiry: On what aspect of time should we focus? (i.e., probing past, present, future with similarity to Harvey’s (1994) questions about time and space in a social construction context); What is the relationship between humanity and its natural environment? (i.e., mastery, harmonious, or submissive relationships link to cultural attitudes to nature (Glacken 1967); How should individuals relate with others? (i.e., hierarchically, as equals or according to individual merit); What is the prime motivation for behaviour? (i.e., how strongly a collective or individual motive affects action) ; and What is the nature of human nature? (i.e., good, bad (‘evil’) or a mixt’ure).

The Values Orientation Theory is relevant to cultural geography and its application has practical benefit as evidenced for over half a century. Hills (2002) gives an overview of the rich applications of the theory to human thought referring to both between-group and within-group comparisons. Hofstede (1980, 2001) used the theory, tools and measurement framework in over 100 different
countries to develop five basic value dimensions. Hills (2002:5-6) demonstrates the efficacy of the theory in cross-cultural values citing studies in the South Pacific (Hills 1977), Fiji (Hills and Goneyali 1980) and North America. Russo (1984, 1992) worked with the Lummi Native American tribe in Washington State to, “relate successfully to the predominantly white American majority population,” as their major customer base and supplier of food, clothing and manufactured goods (in Hills 2002:6). This study approach relates to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) basic principles. It expands the reach of the Values Orientation Theory into cultural geography and adds a spatial dimension, which was suggested as a sixth value dimension by Hills (2002). These spatial allocation questions overlap in the area of urban planning discussed previously. Combining the Values Orientation Theory with planning approaches as part of the comprehensive analysis of spiritual landscapes improves understanding between culture groups to practically inform decision-making around sacred places management and relates to popular terminology in heritage contexts. The following section on geomentality further links the theory and practical applications for a deeper understanding of cultural attitudes in contemporary settings.

2.1.3.3 Geomentality

This section provides an overview of literature on geomentality. In cultural geography, geomentality provides a conceptual framework for ideas and beliefs. It is distinguished from geographies of the mind like geosophy, geopiety (Wright 1996[1947]), and topophilia (Tuan 2001[1977], 1974) that describe relationships between humans and the environment, but have not been used to explain patterns in the cultural landscape and do not contribute to regional knowledge. Geomentality investigates links between environment and culture traits in non-material forms (i.e., ideas and beliefs) on the level of mentality:

It is an established and lasting frame (state) of mind regarding the environment translated into geographic behavioural patterns and cultural landscape (Yoon 1986:39).

Geomentality is not time and place bound like cultural landscape or cultural region studies. It endures, and is not temporary or easily changed as with environmental perception, thus the geomentality or ‘state of mind’ translates into behaviours and how a culture ‘shapes’ the land. Geomentality, like cosmology and assumption four in the Beliefs Model (Figure 6) is often, “taken
for granted, unquestioned and often unaware by the actor,” (Yoon 1986:39). Geographic thinking or ‘geomentality’ emphasises the spatial dimension to understanding a culture’s beliefs and deepens understanding of the culture-land relationship and landscape interpretations. Rapoport (2005:5-6) emphasises the need to understand what is important to a group from the inside first, then to apply an understanding as an observer.

A benefit of geomentality is the ‘cultural attitudes’ level of examination as distinguished from ‘perception.’ The difference between perception and attitude is:

‘perception’ is both the response of the senses to external stimuli and purposeful activity in which certain phenomena are clearly registered while others recede in the shade or are blocked out; and ‘attitude,’ is primarily a cultural stance regarding the world, with greater stability than perception, based on experience and a certain firmness of interest and value (Tuan 2001[1977]:4).

Yoon (1986) emphasises the ‘lasting’ cultural perspective toward the environment that is essential to inform cross-cultural discussions. The relationships between perception, attitude and worldview are like a Russian matroishka doll: the smallest doll at matroishka’s centre represents different individual response to stimuli. Larger dolls represent cultural values and attitudes based on long term experiences, and the largest doll represents worldview with enduring beliefs common to all. The inner ‘dolls’ may move around, evolve over time with wear, while the outer matroishka remains largely intact, and subject to less change. Put differently, Eliot (1948:68) describes a dual role of individuals where people seek to “remain members of the crowd...even when we succeed in being individuals,” yet both individual and culture are inextricably connected. In this analogy, it is conceivable that a larger worldview doll contains different matroishka dolls representing different culture groups (e.g., European worldview with British, Italian, Scottish geomentalities). Attitudes then are relevant to understanding culture-land relationships as they “refer to a culminating effect of a collection of beliefs,” (Henderson and Thompson 2003:24), with greater intercultural comparability over time.

To date, the applications of geomentality as a research tool to uncover the beliefs and ideas of a culture toward the land are limited. Yoon (1986, 1991, 1994, 1999) applied geomentality to Māori landscapes in New Zealand and to Korean geomantic folklore; de Freitas (1998) used geomentality to explore intentions of contemporary artists and interpretations when applied to landscape art in New Zealand; and Gilbert (1993) conducted an inquiry into the relationship between geomentality
of the Japanese Gardener and the Artist Andy Goldsworthy. No other geom mentality works exist, yet there is great potential for its wider application. Applied in Sitka, for example, geom mentality is expanded from previous applications, but how it is applied also renews the framework offering a robust and systematic perspective to enhance cross-cultural understanding. Tlingit, Russian and American geomentalities reveal culture-environment attitudes that can be compared and contrasted as ways of conceptualising and reading landscapes. Having concluded the cultural landscape overview of existing literature, the next section reviews previous Sitka-based research.

2.1.4 PREVIOUS SITKA BASED RESEARCH

Despite numerous studies of the Sitka territory and its people, there is little research on cross-cultural and religious landscape influences. This study concentrates on this gap. For example, the comprehensive approach builds on past anthropologic, historic and geographic research efforts to enhance cross-cultural understanding. It reveals cultural geomentalities adding a new dimension to landscape interpretation. The observation of a complete spiritual landscape and sacred sites provides new information and findings to add to local and academic geography and religion knowledge. The relevant study site research topics not previously mentioned include: southeast Alaska prehistory, physical environment, the Tlingit people and place, and historic settlement and colonisation. There has been no previous spatial, cross-cultural, contemporary spiritual landscape research in Sitka.

Prehistory research of the Sitka area (Chaney and Betts et al. 1995, Erlandson et al. 1990, Ackerman 1993, Keddie 1990) is useful to this study for two reasons. Firstly it provides physical evidence to establish the presence of the Tlingit people in the area, a long period of time prior to contact with European explorers. It also provides detail of such evidence that informs the nature of that early settlement through artefacts that persist in the landscape (e.g., evidence of middens at sacred sites in Sitka aids palimpsest analysis). There is much evidence for the physical Tlingit settlement sited on the west side of the Indian River at Sitka National Park. Chaney and Betts et al. (1995) provide a key reference that traces the Tlingit fort area after the 1804 Battle (including physical site changes in the Park) to historic designations. These pre-history studies however, do not discuss the cultural context for the artefacts, nor the cultural ‘shaping’ of the landscape related to

44 ‘Culture’ includes ethnicity and race discussion referred to above.
location/siting aspects, nor functions of artefacts, though it was not the research purpose to do so. This study builds on the evidence base to discuss early Tlingit settlement and shaping of landscape prior to European contact thus extending the body of knowledge across both physical and cultural geography in the area.

A search of physical geographic studies in the Sitka area yields thousands of articles including geology, marine environments, and fish migrations (current to 20.01.2008). Most are not relevant to this cultural landscape. Relevance is found in studies by Thornton (1992; 1997a; 1997b; 2002; 2008) and Brandt (1995) regarding the cultural context shaping landscape, though Thornton’s approach is anthropological and Brandt’s is historic. While lacking a cultural geographic methodology, these studies provide reasons for settlement, re-tell myths of origin, and describe new information about the physical environment making them useful site and situation references for reading Sitka’s landscape. Other useful studies relate to Tlingit traditional knowledge in areas of resource management and education (Thornton 1992, 2008; Hunn, Johnson et al. 2003). These works differ by focusing on physical resource management rather than a spatial pattern and cross-cultural analysis to explain conflicts in attitudes and approaches. In traditional environmental knowledge much work remains to apply important traditional cultural lessons to modern practices.

Past seminal studies on understanding the Tlingit culture include ethnographic works by: Swanton (1908) emphasising social, religious and language views; Krause (1979[1885], 1993 [1881/1882]) taking an ‘encyclopaedic’ approach to record every aspect of the culture; Olson (1967), de Laguna (1960, 1972), Drucker (1955, 1958), Emmons and de Laguna (1991), Erna Gunther (1947), Viola Garfield and Linn Forrest (1961) presenting a collection of Tlingit myths. Sitka research, predominantly by Europeans, initially emphasised anthropology and the ‘primitive’ Tlingit culture as highlighted below. Following the transfer of Russian America, the US naval officers Niblack (1890) and Emmons (1991) for example, collected thousands of artefacts and material culture objects describing various aspects of the social and spiritual culture of northern tribes of the Northwest coast (Grinev 2005). Reporting on the Harriman Expedition, George Bird Grinnell (1995)

45 Some of Thornton’s later works relate to these more social implications, such as changing roles of the Tlingit psyche and nation status (2002, 2008).
46 Note Nga Pae o te Maramatanga, is a Centre of Research Excellence established in NZ that investigates traditional environmental knowledge as it relates to the indigenous Māori with a view to modern day applications. Initial projects have proven to be very successful in bridging modern day practice with traditional resource management knowledge (Michael Walker, pers comms, Auckland, 20 February 2005).
captures findings from the twenty-five interdisciplinary specialists from natural and social sciences, fine arts and anthropology that travelled to Alaska in 1899. A comprehensive ethnographic study covering all of Emmons’ previous works on the Tlingit culture is assembled by Frederica de Laguna (Emmons and de Laguna 1991). De Laguna’s breadth of Tlingit ethnography and comprehensive research methods are well-regarded for their application of history, archaeology and ethnography to a range of study objects (e.g., archaeological data, myths, and historic documents through to field research (Grinev 2005:7)). Recognition of her broader approach is encouraging considering this study’s comprehensive method. Limitations of past-noted works include their largely documentary nature and that all noted researchers are non-Natives.

More recent and study-related works of the Tlingit culture include Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1987, 1990, 1994), Goldschmidt and Haas (1998 [1946]), Hope III (1982), Hope III and Thornton (2000), Jonaitis (1994), and Thornton (1992, 1997a, 1997b, 2002, 2008). The focus in these past works is Tlingit ethnography (i.e., limiting cross-cultural analysis, spatial focus and spiritual landscape), though the Goldschmidt and Haas' (1998 [1946]) inventory of traditional land use for the region is a key data source for this study. Works for the NPS by Smith-Middleton et al. (1999a, 1999b) are useful for documenting specific areas of cultural activities at the National Historic Park (e.g., berrying, game areas). Historic economic and religious studies are discussed further below. Oberg’s (1979 [1937]) work, The Social Economy of the Tlingit Indians, is mentioned here for his insightful look at the Tlingit people, customs and system of production connecting culture and economy in ways neglected by museum-based or university-based anthropology efforts. Oberg does not reflect cross-cultural interpretations regarding settlement drivers nor intercultural relations. His approach is important in applying social construction and location theory explanations, and his Klukwan-based work provides Native People stories used to describe some Sitkan sacred places.

Abundant research is available on Russian America primarily from a historic perspective, though access to Russian sources for interpretation into English was limited from the 1940s to 1980s fuelled by the Cold War and increased academic competition (J Davis, Interview, 10 July 2000; R Pierce, Interview, Kingston, 24 June 2004). Enhanced access to Russian materials and newly acquired Tlingit oral history is captured in Dauenhauer, Dauenhauer and Black eds. (2008) who combine extensive insights to Tlingit and Russian perspectives on the early Russian settlement period, focusing on the Battles of 1802 and 1804. Four areas of past Russian works are relevant to this
study: works that explore the Russian occupation of North America, including the role of the Russian American Company (Black 2004; Fedorova 1973; Gibson 1976, 1978; Pierce 1984, 1986, 1990a, 1990b); period travel diaries (from Russian and American perspectives); the economic analysis of the region’s history (Jones 1914, Salisbury 1962); and religious influences over the area inhabitants (Black 1997, 2004; Carlton 1999; Hinckley 1972; Kan 1989, 1999; Oleksa 1992; Stewart 1908). While relevant for context and historic background and revealing geomancy, none of these previous studies relate to the development and interpretation of Sitka’s spiritual landscape.

Discussions regarding the political and economic motivations for early exploration, such as furs, fish and lumber, are well captured in past studies (Black 2004; Chevigny 1943; Gibson 1976, 1978; Grinev 2005; Oberg 1979[1937]; Okun’ 1939; Pierce 1990a). These sources provide useful historical accounts of changes to Sitka resulting from Russian and American occupation and are applied to Sitka’s chronological landscape development discussion in Chapter 3. While informative, past studies are written primarily from socio-political, economic, ethnographic or historic perspectives and lack cross-cultural landscape analysis. Combining these works with more recent research of Alaska (Haycox 2002a, 2002b) provides this study with diverse dimensions in the site and situation analysis and the chronologic landscape development. It also helps to explain historic, religious and political motives and intent of power relations for social construction interpretations.

Exploring diaries of inhabitants of the area provide eyewitness accounts of life during early settlement. Personal diaries have been examined of ethnographers, archaeologists, a governor’s wife (1859-1862), American travellers to the area, priests and historians. Between 1800 and 1837, Russian American Company (RAC) reports and personal diaries from seafarers Chirikov, Golovin (1979 [1862]), Kotzebue, Khlebnikov, Litke, Lisianskii (1812), and Tikhmenev (1861) provide often cited Russian perspectives on settlement and early colonial life. Teichmann’s (1983 [1925]) diary of his six week visit to Sitka on business (dated 1868) is useful in providing observations about Native customs around the transfer period. Another firsthand account of activities in Sitka during early American settlement is Sophia Cracroft’s 1870 journal, Lady Franklin’s Diary (Cracroft and DeArmond 1981). Harris (1982:126) refers to this “travel book genre” of diaries during the 1800s as reflective of American views toward nature, thus being useful to inform the

---

47 This publication is not a mechanical reproduction of the 1861 version, rather is more complete with new archive materials for scientific research incorporated into the translation (Pierce in introduction).
American geomentality aspects. The above-noted diary translations are important to this study for two reasons: for their recording of information, in some cases descriptions of sacred places at specific points in time to aid the chronology and palimpsest discussions of Sitka’s spiritual landscape; and for their capture of different culture group social constructions of race and nation as articulated in subsequent chapters.

Moving to *influencers of the Presbyterian and Russian Orthodox religions* on the social and economic impacts on Sitka over the years, research is well documented. Sheldon Jackson and Bishop Innokenti (Veniaminov) are common names cited by Sitkan residents as making a great impact in the area. Much is written on the Presbyterian mission in Alaska and Sheldon Jackson’s role (Carlton 1999, Hinckley 1972, Stewart 1908) including Jackson’s own work, *Alaska and Missions on the North Pacific Coast* (1880). Carlton (1999) focuses on Jackson’s role as a collector. References including his correspondence with key government officials and ethnologists (including Governor Brady, Francis Boaz, Reverend Austin, G T Emmons, and others) reveal Jackson’s mentality and aids understanding of Presbyterian influences in deciphering American geomentality. Jackson’s Presbyterian and early American attitudes to settlement, indigenous cultures and Russian settlers provide contrast to previous diary and traveller accounts. Reference to his work in Sitka is used in the historic chronology and in the spatial analysis in Chapters 3 and 6, respectively.

The *Journals of the Priest Ioann Veniaminov in Alaska, 1823 to 1836*, was translated by Jerome Kisslinger (1993) and edited by Marvin Falk. Veniaminov’s diary provides social constructs that reflect religious and Russian inhabitants of Sitka useful for the site and situation discussion of sacred places. It also provides base material for a Russian perspective upon Tlingit geomentality. The translation of Veniaminov’s journal provides an autobiographical comparison to Black’s (1997) account of his life including many achievements and talents. Both perspectives add to the study interpretation of Russian settlement from mental concepts to physical landscape changes. Kan (1989, 1999) has extensively studied the Russian colonial encounter and the Orthodox religion and its influence upon Native Alaskans, which he describes as, “both a power struggle and a dialogue between different systems of meaning,” (1999:cover). Kan’s works use original materials, combine 20 years of field work and archival research (Grinev 2005:8), and provide significant contributions to both the understanding of the potlatch and the spiritual culture and history of the Tlingit, and the Russian American period. This exploration of the spiritual landscape excludes specific investigation
into the potlatch as a ritual depicting the Tlingit spiritual culture since Kan’s extensive exploration could not be expanded in a study with length limitations. Kan also translates works by Archimandrite Anatolii Kamenskii (1985[1906]) offering insights to the missionary activity and Tlingit spiritual culture. Another first-hand Russian perspective, Kamenskii writes during the period of early American transfer.\(^{48}\) Kan contributes to Kamenskii’s work by cross-checking diary materials with government documents, newspaper reports, publications from the Presbyterian Church and makes corrections to Kamenskii’s factual errors. From a Russian missionary perspective, the value of Kamenskii’s writings are that he: describes the impact of the US transfer and American influence on Sitka post-transfer; contrasts Russian and Protestant approaches to indigenous Tlingit; provides an alternate approach to other priests regarding mission activity; and provides new information regarding the Tlingit spiritual beliefs.

This section provided an overview of the existing literature on Sitka Alaska including its prehistory, physical environment, Tlingit occupation, and settlement by Russians and Americans. Previous works capture ‘factual’ information, such as the historic record of Russian occupation and period perspectives through translations of early settlers or seafarer diaries. The lack of cross-cultural research in the area, and absence of spatial studies and the contemporary spiritual landscape are noted. Existing research is demonstrated as useful to develop this study methodology and to provide different interpretations, constructs, and points of view toward the spiritual landscape.

### 2.2 Information Collection Methodology

The information sources, methods of collecting information, and analysis for examining both visible and invisible aspects of Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape uses the proposed comprehensive approach for a deeper and meaningful interpretation. Collection methods are based on the human geography data generating techniques outlined by Shaw (2001) including field research (participant observation), interviews and recorded information (interpretation of written, oral and model expressions) as described below.

\(^{48}\) Kamenskii’s works traverse a period from approximately 1899 with the first work published in New York by the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger*, and in Russia, as a monograph in 1906. Kamenskii provides detailed information on Tlingit shamanism, witchcraft, beliefs about spirits, mythology and other aspects about the indigenous religion. “As a Christian missionary, he was particularly concerned with Native religion, since understanding it was essential for fighting against it,” (Kan in Kamenskii 1985).
2.2.1 FIELD WORK

A complete inventory of all visible sacred places (i.e., places of worship, cemeteries, homelands and historic sites) in Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape was completed during field work in Sitka between 27 June and 11 July 2000. The short field research duration enabled a full documentation of the spiritual landscape including site visits to all sacred places since access was facilitated by the compact study area. Much of the visible and spatial analysis relates to this base of sacred place locations. Information collected included: Photographs taken at each sacred place; Video and audio recordings during travel between sites to record the landscape and observations and to note follow up questions or reflections; and Pencil sketch maps and data for each sacred place recording place location, street name and type, site slope/grade and building siting, construction materials for buildings, and other relevant characteristics (e.g., colour, sculptures, monuments, direction facing,\textsuperscript{49} proximity to other land uses, access to the site, establishment date, religious denomination, and any ‘other’ notable features).

The “God Bless America,” billboard on the Maytag Home Appliance Center visible from the main road into town suggested Sitka to be a religious community. In addition to the 24 places of worship that had identifiable sites in the landscape, there were service listings in the Sitka Sentinel daily newspaper for an additional 6 religious denominations (Baha’i, Christian Science, Eckankar, Jewish,\textsuperscript{50} Quaker and Lifeworld Ministries). Collecting church data during field research included recording building siting, materials, access, and parking lot sizes, with each photographed and videotaped. Sketch maps were compiled of neighbouring uses and site elevations. Church attendees were canvassed for collecting establishment data as site visits spanning two Sundays (2\textsuperscript{nd} and 9\textsuperscript{th} of July 2000). The \textit{Sitka Yellow Pages} (July 2000)\textsuperscript{51} were the main data source for establishing the list of Sitka’s places of worship.

\textsuperscript{49} Tuan (2001 [1977]: 99) describes how concepts of spatial perception embody spatial values.

\textsuperscript{50} Teichmann (1963[1925]: 199) notes approximately 20 Jewish observers holding their Sabbath service in Sitka during 1868.

\textsuperscript{51} According to the \textit{Sitka Yellow Pages} at 8 April 2007, (http://www.sitkayellowpages.com) there were the following changes to the church listings since my field research: There is no longer a listing for the Victory Christian Fellowship; and two new places of worship listed as at 8 April 2007: Lighthouse Church (at 601 Alice Loop), and Sitka Bible Baptist Church (at 325 Peterson Avenue). The Lighthouse Church was included as part of the on-site research and the addition and deletion of one place of worship since field work makes neutral the change in quantity of places. Changes are not
A greater understanding of the cemetery landscape occurred following field work when a review of field work, interviews and historic references provided a greater appreciation of the overall picture. There is no complete collection of cemetery data available for Sitka’s current spiritual landscape. Establishment dates for all, except the Sitka National Cemetery and the Lutheran Cemetery, are estimates based on the spatial site and situation, population distributions, denomination trends, and government influences. The *Sitka Yellow Pages* at July 2000 and a subsequent internet search at 12 April 2007 were not useful to check ‘completeness,’ since listings only include the Sitka National Cemetery. Similarly, some data on websites was available for the Lutheran Cemetery and the National Cemetery, but no complete listing for all sites was found. Recorded cemetery data during field work included site features and appearance (e.g., fencing, signage, access, parking lot size, headstone information (dates and names) and size according to number of burials). Photographs from the internet taken in 2004 (http://www.genealogia.fi/indexe.htm, accessed 17.04.2007), complement Lutheran Cemetery, Moose Cemetery, Old City Cemetery, and Sitka National Cemetery field work photographs to distinguish features discussed in the analysis.

Geographers have conducted much research in landscapes of death or “necral space” including individual graves, tombs, cemeteries or cremation grounds (Bhardwaj in Park 1994:213). It was planned to apply Zelinsky’s (1976) methodology and findings to probe specific names and cemetery siting; however, in Sitka, many of the older headstones have eroded away to an illegible state and records of cemeteries generally are predominantly held orally only and by few people. Zelinsky’s (1976) approach to reveal cultural patterns from gravesite markers in individual locations as planned for field work investigation of the Russian cemetery (i.e., Russian names, dates, places of birth, tombstone materials, facing direction etc.) was abandoned as the large overgrown cemetery was not conducive to accurate data collection for an analysis. For other sites, grave marker information is included in cemetery discussions where possible. Despite the research context, some insights into the overall spatial landscape according to establishment information deduced from interview, on-site field research and available reference materials are set out in this analysis.

sufficiently significant to alter analysis from the original field data collection that represents the complete Sitka spiritual landscape at 11 July 2000.
Using places of worship and cemetery information collected from field work, a database of sacred places information was created for future analysis of patterns and trends (e.g., examining patterns of sites located centrally to compare power relationships, central place and planning theories, palimpsest and social construction). Table 2 sets out Sitka’s spiritual landscape as at 11 July 2000, which consisted of 37 sacred places being: 4 historic/homelands sites, 24 places of worship (including churches) and 9 cemeteries. Zoning data used for spatial analysis by district also appears in Table 2, based on City of Sitka Planning Department (CSPD) zoning maps and Sitka Zoning Ordinance (1986) obtained on-site (current as at February 2000).

Following field research in Sitka, additional information and photographs for this study were gathered between 12 July and 2 August 2000 in Victoria, British Columbia at the: British Columbia Archives, Royal Museum of British Columbia and the University of Victoria. The time in Victoria allowed access to relevant academic articles and texts. Important works for the study have limited access and availability in New Zealand. For these reasons, between 15 and 30 June 2004, further information on the West Coast was collected at the University of Pennsylvania. During that period, an interview was also conducted with the most prolific publisher on Russian American history, Professor Richard Pierce, at Queen’s University in Kingston, Canada. Ongoing contact with other Sitka and Tlingit researchers continues.

The base information collected for investigation was critical for historical development and spatial analyses to: complete a quantitative investigation of the data including trends and findings from a planning perspective; consider the palimpsest evident in buildings and landmarks in Sitka (being able to trace back the origins and changes to sites over time); consider how interviewees explain siting criteria (considerations) for locating at various places; and describe motivations of culture groups and attitudes of local Sitkans toward special places, landmarks and sites.
Table 2: Sites in Sitka’s Spiritual Landscape at 11 July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle Hill (Present day Sitka)</td>
<td>historic/homelands</td>
<td>Public lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Historic Park (area near Indian River) including Mortuary poles &amp; Russian Memorials</td>
<td>historic/homelands</td>
<td>Public lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sitka Site (at Starrigavan Bay)</td>
<td>historic/homelands</td>
<td>Public lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet'ka Kwáán Naa Kahidi – Tribal Community House (Kiks.ádi District)</td>
<td>historic/homelands</td>
<td>Public lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sitka) Assembly of God</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's House Chapel</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of the Nazarene</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1LDMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Church</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First) Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace (Evangelical) Lutheran Church</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah's Witnesses Kingdom Hall</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Lighthouse Church</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1LDMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer House Chapel</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential – R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist Church (&amp; School)</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Jackson College Chapel</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sitka) Church of God Sitka Christian Centre</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka Lutheran Church – ELCA</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Gregory Catholic Church</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael's Cathedral</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter's By-The-Sea Episcopal Church</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Baptist Church CBA</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian Universalists Assoc (Fellowship Bldg)</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Methodist Church of Sitka</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Pentecostal Church</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Christian Fellowship &amp; Bible Training</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Residential – R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old City Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Orthodox Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Residential - R1 &amp; R253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka Memorial Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka National Cemetery</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 The Sitka National Historic Park has memorial sites for fallen Russians and Tlingit during the Battle of 1804 and Old Sitka also has a memorial for the fallen Russians of the Battle of 1802, however they are considered ‘homelands’ sacred places as evidence to support burials at these sites is inconclusive. “The K'alyaan (Totem) Pole stands guard over the Shis'kt Noow site to honor the Tlingit casualties. Ta Éetl, a memorial to the Russian sailors who died in the Battle, is located across the Indian River at site of the Russians' landing,” (Chaney, & Betts et al. 1995:122).

53 There are two parts of the Russian Orthodox Cemetery considered at this site with the older part (known as Trinity Cemetery) closer to town zoned as R2, with the more recent part zoned R1.
2.2.2 INTERVIEWS

Researcher observation is supplemented with two in-field interviews. Qualitative information for Sitka’s sacred places, different notions of spiritual landscape, and personal spiritual experiences was gathered through 16 face-to-face unstructured interviews with elders and 12 face-to-face semi-structured environmental perception interviews with Sitkan residents. Consent documents for University Ethics Committee\(^{54}\) approval are set out in Appendix 1. Interviewee information (e.g., name, age, sex, employment, interview date) is contained in Appendix 2. Ongoing contact with several Sitkan residents and researchers (e.g., phone, letter and/or email) allowed post field-work queries to be followed up with six Sitkan residents involved in interviews: two elders between 2000 to 2004, and four other interviewees during 2006, 2007 and early 2008.

The objective for the first set of interviews with elders was to gather cross-cultural perspectives to broaden information collection and aid understanding of specific sacred places and events, including the following topic areas: origin of settlement stories, general information regarding specific sacred places and changes, landscape development over time, and personal perspectives and attachments toward landscape and sites. An unstructured interview achieved the broadest coverage and understanding of the topics (see Appendix 3). This interview technique is often used in historical and geographic research, ethnographic studies and to collect oral histories (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (eds.) 1994; Goldschmidt and Haas 1998 [1946]) as it encourages the interviewee to speak freely and reveal personal preferences, mental maps, and priorities related to topic areas. The use of narrative and discourse analysis, which is popular in human geography, is encouraged by Shaw (2001:59) and Tuan (1999). The New Oxford Dictionary (2001) defines narrative as, “a spoken or written account of connected events in order of happening.” Narrative is important in this study to document different views on reasons for settlement and sacred site locations in Sitka. To allow the interviewee’s narrative to flow freely during these face-to-face interviews, interruptions were minimised probing only on specific areas of interest as set out in the topic guide. All views were recorded as they are valid and correct even if versions differ as each tells something about

\(^{54}\) Approved by the University of Auckland Human Subjects Ethics Committee on 21 June 2000 for a period of 3 years, from 21 June 2000. Reference 2000/180. See Appendix 2 for relevant document.
Sitka and the people who live there or influenced those that lived there. All stories and perspectives are useful for this study.

The target audience for the 16 interviews was ‘elders,’ (i.e., long time Sitka residents) who might provide an understanding of various stories of Sitka’s origin, their recollections of historic/political events, or any specific church and/or cemetery/memorial knowledge. The interviewee’s rationale for sacred place locations and how places changed or evolved over time and why was of particular interest. Few potential interviewees were identified prior to being on-site in Sitka; however, once there and speaking to residents, the list of possible interviewees grew. Suggestions emerged for whom to talk to about cemeteries (e.g., two with over 20 years experience each). The Sitka model makers depicting the landscape at 1845 and 1867, and attendance at a ‘pioneers’ picnic (i.e., Sitkan residents for more than 25 years) led to interesting insights by many picnic elders as well as the arrangement of numerous subsequent interviews. Interviewing elders gave an opportunity to gain local and historic knowledge, as well as different cultural contexts for narratives. Shaw (2001:44) notes how social sciences recognise the use of local knowledge, “to deepen and ground narratives of interpretation.” Badcock (2002) discusses the increased need to understand culture as well as economics within local and regional studies. During interviews the power of politics and government agency in shaping the landscape, as well as subtle and overt inter-cultural tensions were revealed.

Information gathered during interviews is discussed throughout all areas of the spiritual landscape examination. For the historical analysis in Chapter 3, the interview findings are used in relation to discussions of siting/origin of Sitka settlement, major influences during WW2 (tracing Sitka’s landscape development) and exploring changes to the location and function of sacred sites and other key locations. Interviews enabled discussions that explained the settlement’s origin giving way to its multi-cultural influences (i.e., through contact, exploration/discovery, missionary efforts, and underlying economic motivations). These dimensions are also woven into the spatial visible spiritual landscape analysis including current form and function of sacred places in Chapter 6.

---

55 The Journey Home, a repatriation event held in Sitka 7-10 July during my field research, followed after the discovery of a mausoleum during an airport runway expansion project. After over 60 years, bodies were being repatriated to their families all over Alaska and the west coast. The event involved a range of government representatives and many families that had not known what had become of their sick relatives once they were removed from their local communities to attend special hospitals. Illnesses were mostly tuberculosis related and often affected children. One of
The second set of interviews target resident environmental perceptions. Past studies fall short to uncover deeper, long lasting cultural attitudes, values and beliefs. Saarinen and Sell’s (1981) review of past environmental perception studies reveals an increase in cross-cultural components and increased integration between disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology and anthropology). Still, Glacken’s (1976) seminal work on ‘Western’ ideas regarding culture-land relationships remains one of the few well-recognised works to explain cultural attitudes toward nature (Muecke 1996; Humphery, Mongush and Telengid 1993; Columbus 1994). The paucity of literature suggests cultural attitudes are more difficult to expose, particularly when techniques, such as projection methods, focus on revealing individual views. For this comprehensive study, environmental perception techniques add colour to other methods to reveal ‘hidden’ or subconscious perceptions of sacred places held by the local population. Several cultural geographers suggest broadening the tendency to study extraordinary or exotic locations and Others, to include more day-to-day environments and individuals to aid landscape interpretation and enhance understanding of deeper human motives shaping landscape (Duncan and Duncan 2003, Winchester et al. 2003, Wylie 2007). Environmental perception interview data allows ordinary resident impressions to be considered alongside other data collected thus broadening landscape interpretation.

Methods for probing how individuals perceive and value nature and their environment include surveys, questionnaires and psychological tests (Tuan 2001[1977]). Individual “perceptions” are easier to reveal, though group perceptions (e.g., adults, children, architects) to the same environment have greater utility (Pennartz and Elsinga 1990; Potter 1992; Povinelli 1993; Simmons 1994). For example, exploring various perceptions to a particular landscape and then grouping similar perceptions can inform land management, such as with visitors and residents to forests, national parks, urban environments, and use of abandoned facilities (Baas, Ewert and Chavez 1993; Fiallo and Jacobsen 1995; Hunziker 1995; Ishii and Shirasaka 1988; Quinn 1992). This study investigates general initial perceptions of the landscape, and specific responses to defined sacred places.

Twelve residents were interviewed to gather environmental perception information by using a semi-structured questionnaire. The consistent question format allowed for information to be compared
and contrasted while still gaining insights of individual respondent spiritual experiences. The interview guide (Appendix 4) contains a list of questions for residents that seek to identify and understand: perceptions about key landmarks and the most ‘significant’ places; perceptions of specific sacred places (natural and built); functions of specific sacred places; tourist perceptions; personal religious experiences; underlying tensions and political climates; and awareness of designations. Testing wider understanding, sacred place functions exemplify how interviews can broaden information regarding specific sites. For example, a *community meeting place* is a significant function of attending church, especially for new migrants (Connell 2005, Furby and Dinham et al. 2005). Understanding multiple functions provides depth in the role played by sacred sites *beyond* those obvious ‘visible’ aspects.

Respondents were selected to represent a range of perspectives. Prior to field work, the following desired characteristics for respondents was compiled to include a mix of: ages (young 18-35 and over 35); sex (50/50 male and females); and long and short term residents (i.e., new settlers in Sitka less than 2 years; long term there over 5 years). Specific characteristics that were essential to include were representation from: the settler population (contact cultures such as Russian, Finnish if possible); indigenous people (Tlingit); religious/spiritual persons such as a priest; and tourists. Other characteristics preferred were: church staff, parks workers/staff, planning staff (e.g., town clerk), tribal council representative, local politician, ethnic/immigrant population, and archives staff. Perspectives of an adventurer (e.g., rock climber/walkers), educators (e.g., teaching staff), and accommodation industry (e.g., hotel staff) were sought but not critical to include. The desired sample mix and range of characteristics were represented across 12 respondents interviewed for the environmental perception data collection. The analysis of the interviews is set out in Chapter 6 and covers resident perceptions toward key landmarks, places for tourists to visit, sensory experiences (i.e., favourite touch, taste, sound et cetera), and respondent descriptions of a unique ‘special place’ to which they have a ‘personal spiritual connection.’ A limitation of using perception interviews is illustrated with a response to this last question:

Nothing in particular – I don’t have the imagination to connect with that – are you like a psychologist or something (Russian Store Shopkeeper, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

While these interview results do not contribute to the ‘cultural’ interpretation of Sitka’s spiritual landscape (discussed in the next section), they bring important contemporary and local resident dimensions to the exploration and highlight areas for future enquiry.
2.2.3 COLLECTING RECORDED INFORMATION

Recorded information including historical and contemporary texts, traveller diaries/journals, and visual materials were collected during field research from 27 June to 11 July 2000 to assist in documenting Sitka’s past and present spiritual landscape. Degraft-Hanson (2005) and Sidorov (2000) note the historic significance revealed by applying site and aerial photographs, period sketches from travellers, and historic/contemporary texts to reading the landscape. Information was assembled from a variety of sources including: local and Westcoast libraries, historic landscape models, personal collections from residents and researchers, and the internet.

Library materials related to my research objectives were requested in advance from the four libraries in Sitka: Sheldon Jackson Memorial Library (Stratton), National Historic Park, Kettleson Memorial Library, and Isabelle Miller Museum. Short publications for places of worship only held locally included: Balcom’s (nd.) work on the Catholic Church; Reverend Kashevarof’s (1947) work of St Michael’s Cathedral; and Maakestad’s (1967) piece on the Lutheran Church. No cemeteries publications were available although four relevant newspaper articles (circa 1980s/1990s) about cemeteries are referred to in the analysis. Tourist brochures, including materials from the local National Historic Society, were of some use, but provided conflicting information.

Two landscape models depicting Sitka as at 1845 by Bill Kleinert, and Sitka as at 1867 by Dr Jim Davis were on display at the National Park Visitor Center and Isabelle Miller Museum, respectively. Both models were photographed and video-recorded for future analysis as each provides another perspective in revealing the historic development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape. Both model builders were interviewed for this study. The importance of these models is conveyed with some of their features. The scale model of Sitka at 1845, for example, displays four Orthodox Churches and buildings of dominant paint colours being red and yellow to remind inhabitants of their homeland of Russia while non-Russian American Company (RAC) buildings were left in the natural timber colour and appear weathered by the climate as does the Tlingit village. As no comprehensive inventory of churches existed until the transfer document in 1867, Klienert’s model prompted a search for information regarding four period churches.
The model of *Sitka at 1845* took Kleinert a year and a half to build. He has been model building since age 10 and spent 25 years working for the City of Sitka as a groundskeeper before retiring in 2005 to Idaho. He enjoys research to make his models historically accurate. His Sitka model is based on a Russian map from 1845 supplemented with photography by Winter and Pond, and watercolours by a Finnish sea captain for design elements of Russian and Tlingit homes:

> They [the Russians] were trained observers, often used as spies, so they had to be accurate...I get two or three pictures or descriptions that match (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

During the interview Bill advised the model looks different at eye level where the ground elevation provides a different perspective for younger audiences (e.g., at dock level, and at Castle Hill with the Governor’s mansion). Harvey Brandt (NPS Historian) used Kleinert’s model with his history students at the junior high school. The model is displayed at the National Historical Park, but built in pieces to be portable.

Despite being secondary information sources, the model makers spent years researching primary historic texts. Dr Davis took seven years to complete the model of Sitka at 1867 including research and two years on actual construction. An 1840 Russian map of Sitka formed a key part of his research at the Russian Archives:

> The 1840 [Russian] map was more accurate than any other map of the transfer. There were three maps at the time of the transfer. The Russians did one and the Americans did another two. This one was more accurate – a smaller map – the 1840 Russian map. None of them coincided. They weren’t alike in a lot of details...The transfer map was also made by a Russian in 1867. I wanted to get a copy of this – all I would get was “nyet” [when he visited Moscow Archives]. But anyway – I tried and tried and Matsoutoff [Davis’ Russian friend and relative of former Governor Matsoutoff] tried to get copies for me and he couldn’t get it...about a month after I got home I got a copy in the mail. He snuck it out and copied it (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

The accuracy of Dr Davis’ research is demonstrated by with the National Archives in Washington commissioning Dr Davis to develop an accurate transfer map later used to renegotiate the Treaty.  

In Sitka, a collection of news clippings from the 1970’s to 2000 was made available by Hixie Arnoldt, a Sitkan resident for over 30 years. Published works titled, *A Sitka Chronology 1867-1987* (1993), and *From Sitka’s Past* (1995) both by Robert N DeArmond, were also obtained. DeArmond chronicles major events during the 121 year period based on information contained in: *The Alaskan*,

---

56 “The government – believe or not – they had to go and re-negotiate the Treaty. It took two years I guess – they finally got the Treaty renegotiated – Russia was hard to get along with – it was during the cold war and all that… it was only a
a weekly newspaper in publication between 1886-1907; various official records (such as from the Office of the State Recorder (to 1867)); letters and diaries, published histories; correspondence files of Dr Sheldon Jackson; business records and unpublished manuscripts (DeArmond 1995:1). Together, these references provide good ‘snapshots’ in time linking specific building locations, names and key landmarks useful in comparing the landscape changes. Both elders were interviewed for this study. Other rare and historic books were available at the town’s book store *Old Sitka Books* including a growing body of Tlingit recorded oral history edited by Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1987, 1990, 1994). References obtained in Sitka were invaluable for compiling the historic development of the spiritual landscape and adding information about individual sacred places.

Finally, technological advances since the time of field research have led to a greater supply of documentation available on the internet. A number of sources relevant to this research include US Government websites, archival photos, and Tlingit mapping references. For example, The Library of Congress, University of Alaska Fairbanks, The Open Society Institute of Russia, and the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences jointly contribute to the sharing of materials that specifically relate to Russian and American colonisation, in the project *Meeting of Frontiers* (http://www.loc.gov/rr/european/mofc). Other sites are useful for providing detail for specific sacred places including the National Park (http://www.nps.gov/sitk/) and Lutheran Church (http://www.sitkalutheranchurch.org/), oral histories at *Project Jukebox* at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (http://jukebox.uaf.edu/), among others. In addition to these noted sites, other useful references are listed in the *Other Useful Sources* section of the Bibliography.

### 2.2.4 SACRED PLACES ANALYSIS

Naming, function and denomination sacred places data is used to compare establishment dates, spatial site and situation, general population distributions by denomination trends, and changes in

---

57 Key works for this study such as, Khlebnikov’s (1817-1832) *Journal of Colonial Russian America*, the *Journals of the Russian Orthodox Priest Ioann Veniaminov in Alaska* (1823-1836), and an excellent cartographic reference of the town
the levels of government involvement. Government roles from land management through heritage place designations and place naming informed the data collection framework for this study as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Considering Government Roles in Sacred Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Place Name (and origin)</th>
<th>e.g., St Michael’s Cathedral, Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) Hall, National Cemetery, National Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private, Public (local, state, federal), Multiple ownership (mixed/private corporation e.g., Sealaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Management</td>
<td>Board, Community Group, Private, Government, Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designations</td>
<td>e.g., UNESCO, State Park, National Historic site, local/national cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together with location theory, and use and ownership information, the above topics show how government roles and priorities evolve in relation to specific places in the spiritual landscape. As part of the investigation of planning practices, practical siting considerations such as topography, aspect and access, and threshold populations are explored (Kong and Yeoh 2003; Homan and Rowley 1979 in Park 1994). Religious denomination considerations and impacts on location are discussed as characteristics shaping the form and function of sacred places (e.g., as for Jewish synagogues (Shilhav 1983:324)). Explaining the worship landscape according to function for example, leads to seeking meaning behind churches (e.g., for Roman Catholics it is the house of God, while for some Protestant faiths the ‘meeting place’ function can warrant less ornate gestures). Although siting, elevation, and facing (e.g., North, South etc) data was collected for cemeteries and places of worship sites, building and site placement and directions revealed no discernable patterns. Similarly no pattern was found in the ‘direction facing’ data of building fronts. The historical development analysing Sitka’s sacred places is set out in Chapter 3 (e.g., incorporating physical topography and climate siting factors), and Chapter 6 includes the discussion of spatial patterns including function and form (e.g., size, style and location).

---

58 Places of worship data included: 11 sites on flat sections, 6 on top of a gentle slope and 7 buildings on hilltops.
59 Data included: 11 faced S/SE or SW; 9 faced N/NE or NW; and 4 faced E.

of Sitka in 1836 by Edward Leontief Blashke, surgeon of the ship NIKOLAI, printed in Builders of Alaska, The Russian Governors 1818-1867, by Richard A Pierce (1986) were obtained in Sitka.
The summary of cathedral site alterations and historical context used by Sidorov (2000) is adapted to document palimpsest in Sitka. Although scale and national importance are not directly comparable, Sidorov’s (2000) exploration of the national monumentalisation process in Moscow emphasises politics of scale at national and local levels and illustrates rich understanding gleaned from one site. Sidorov’s (2000) data collection table is amended to add current location, role of government and place name changes (see Table 4) to broaden the conceptual application of palimpsest, cultural attitudes and social construction interpretations. Places are analysed considering origin and location as articulated in oral expressions, interviews, and historic information (including government/power relationships during place development).

Table 4: Tracing Palimpsest in Sitka’s Spiritual Landscape (sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiritual Landscape:</th>
<th>Table 1: Landmarks and Natural Features (e.g., Mt Edgecumbe)</th>
<th>Table 2: Built Environment (e.g., Tlingit Community House)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Site Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Use Recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alteration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second &amp; Subsequent Alterations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming Sequencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To guide historic and spatial analysis, Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape is divided into ‘zones’ as applied in Maps 3, 6, 7 and 8 (see the legend for the shaded numerical identification reference). The zones divide the area as follows: Zone 1: The original (1800s) settlement area; Zone 2: Within the commercial business district (CBD); Zone 3: Outer town zone; Zone 4: Suburbs; and Zone 5: Japonski Island. The rationale for categories follows. Zone 1 is based on the boundary used in Map of the Town of Sitka in 1836 by Edward Leontief Blashke, surgeon of the ship NIKOLAI (in Pierce 1986:19). It represents the original settlement area during the 1800s, including home to the Russian post and Tlingit village. It is an approximate boundary since Blashke’s shore contour lines differ from present day Sitka following urban development. Zone 2 contains the current CBD as well as the majority of the oldest residences in the area. The CBD development zone category differs from Sitka’s local Zoning Map as the former incorporates original 1800s settlement areas not an artificial boundary constructed on an existing landscape. The difference is not material to analysis. Zone 3 is the ‘outer town zone,’ represented higher density residential homes, mostly
single family dwellings oriented to services in the city centre. Zone 4 is called ‘the suburbs’; multi-family dwellings are featured to the west arterial and oriented to ribbon commercial development leading from town, while to the east, the arterial road leads to the original sawmill area and features lower density housing. Both areas are sufficiently distant to town that a car is desirable for access. Finally, Zone 5 includes Japonski Island categorised separately due to its geographic location. The Island is currently connected to town by a causeway; however, it was formerly separated by water until the infrastructure boom pre-WW2.

These development zones are useful references of the time and space context for the historic and spatial analysis (Harris 2004, Harvey 1994). For example, the zones overlaid upon the contemporary landscape allow modern sacred place siting comparisons relative to original settlement areas. Historic and socio-political explanations are applied to landscape change including siting the seat of power, major churches, and palimpsest of buildings. Zones are also useful for the location theory interpretation of landscape relating to Christaller’s Central Place Theory (1966), Lösch’s (1954 [1941]) distance decay effects and spatial externalities associated with consumption rates and ranges of a good or service, and Von Thünen’s theories of economic rent (1966 [1826]).

2.2.5 REVEALING GEOMENTALITIES

Recorded primary sources and religious documents are best for exposing an unbiased worldview (Berndt 1983, Burke 2005, Duncan and Duncan 1988, Duncan 1990, Park 1994). To apply geom mentality as an explanatory framework relies on information sources outlining: structures of the universe (i.e., worldview/cosmology views about creation, good/evil, sacredness, life/death, cyclical vs. linear time, identity issues, mythic/profound space); attitudes and beliefs toward the land, nature and the environment; ways of identifying themselves and the places around them; and behaviours and functions designated to sacred places. Information collection draws significantly on Yoon’s (1986) methodology to reveal geom mentality in Māori Mind, Māori Land. Information collection included assembling creation myths and folklore, proverbs and songs, naming (places and people), and behaviours and ceremonies held at sacred places as they reveal cultural morals for living, and beliefs regarding sacredness and attitudes to nature. Messages that relate to the land effectively connect cultural geom mentality and beliefs for comparisons across culture groups.
To examine ‘invisible spiritual beliefs,’ this research emphasises the reliability of cosmological study objects. Creation and other cosmological myths best reflect cultural beliefs and attitudes toward the environment as they are longer lasting and are accepted as truths. Concepts can represent centuries of beliefs as with origin myths. The Bible story of Creation for example is accepted by Christians as true. In the same way, Yoon (1991) illustrates how traditional Māori societies accepted myths and legends as true linking these beliefs to behaviours and attitudes toward the environment (i.e., Māori geomentality). de Laguna (1960:22) confirms the ‘credibility of tradition,’ or truth associated with such information citing the perpetuation in present day of various traditions and how the church reinforced such beliefs (e.g., equating Raven with the Christian Creator, and with similarities of the Raven and Biblical flood stories).

Cosmological sources better reflect invisible attitudes and values in the ‘spiritual landscape’ compared with information collected during environmental perception interviews. Often interviews with elders reiterated cosmological constructs. Some interviewees however, provided diluted versions with blurred or diverted origin discussions. De Laguna (1960:21-22)\(^6\) notes how impossible it is for Tlingit informants to specify an event as occurring before or after Russian occupation since the Tlingit people conceptualise mythical and historic time different to the “ranking of events...[along] a single time scale.” Environmental perception responses in this research were similarly subjective and changeable across respondents, thus used to reflect informal views by contemporary Sitkan residents leaving more robust indicators of cultural attitudes represented through higher and better value creation myths.

The study objects differ from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) who use interview techniques to ascertain cultural value orientation. Since geomentality seeks a deeper and lasting cultural value reference, the study approach effectively incorporates the breadth of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), Hills (2002), and others, while taking the analysis to a deeper, subconscious level with ‘hidden’ belief constructs. Tlingit, Russian and American cultures are featured as the dominant influences shaping Sitka’s spiritual landscape and geomentality analysis is divided by these culture

---

\(^6\) De Laguna (1960:21) cites Boas (1916:565) who implies a conceptual “intermediate period” to distinguish myth and historic time in Northwest Coast tribes though myths like the origin of clans and crests are recognised as only a few hundred years old.
groups and set out in Chapter 4. This study’s comprehensive approach applies geomentumality to the place naming analysis (Chapter 5) and to the spatial analysis (Chapter 6).  

2.2.6 PLACE NAMES DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This study focuses on naming in Sitka territory from an identity perspective including how cultures name people and topographic places. Findings are set out in Chapter 5. Previous work on Alaskan place names by Orth (1967) and Schorr (1991), combine with Stewart’s (2008[1956]) work on American place names and DeArmond’s (1993, 1995) local historic chronologies to provide a starting point for Sitka territory name origin information. Few studies explore cultural influences upon Sitka’s landscape. Extensive work has been completed applying an anthropological recording of Tlingit place names by Thornton (1997a, 1997b, 2008), Hope III and Thornton eds. (2000), and Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994). No previous research exists on Sitkan street names, nor is there a cross-cultural examination of Sitka territory topographic naming. A key input to the naming discussion is Thornton’s (2008) work exploring Tlingit place names to illustrate contributions to anthropology, sociology, culture and nature assessments. A perspective on Russian naming applied in Alaska and broader American naming processes are found in Stewart’s (2008[1958]) historic account of place naming in the United States. His insights to American naming processes rely on a vast range of source materials that enable deeper understanding than found in dictionaries of name origin only. Yoon’s (1986, 1994b) works on place names on New Zealand maps, Chinese geomantic maps (1992), and Whitfield’s (1998) account of exploration maps also provide useful comparison. Yoon’s (1986, 1994b) prior naming analyses look at cross-cultural influences in topographic naming, focusing on hegemony and the relationship between settlement and cultural influence, among other aspects. No other studies focus upon street naming, though Herman (1999) refers to an analysis of indigenous Hawai’ian street names. Other studies refer to place names as rich sources to interpret landscape dimensions by: applying social construction theory (Herman 1999, Kong and Yeoh 2003), examining historic and political influences including colonisation and palimpsest

---

61 Environmental perception interviews in Chapter 6 add a contemporary context to supplement this deeper understanding of cultural attitudes and align with value orientation techniques.

62 Stewart (2008[1958]:440-441) relies on references that include (in order of significance): scholarly studies of place-names, original narratives from expeditions, histories, street patterns based on city plans, maps and gazetteers, postal and
analysis (Azaryahu 1996, 1997; Degraft-Hanson 2005; Schmidt 2005; Sobti 2005), and applying a geom mentality analysis across cultures (Boelhower 1988; Yoon 1986, 1994b).

Place names data collection includes spellings and origins from maps on three different naming themes: Tlingit Tribes and Clan Houses, Topographic Features, and Sitka’s street names. The focus on current landscape is based on the defined study boundary of settled areas within the district of Sitka Borough, useful for the streetscape investigation. The Sitka Territory boundary based on the traditional aboriginal use (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998 [1946]) is applied to Tlingit Tribe, Clan House, and topographic place name analyses allowing a wider cross-cultural examination.

Limited cross-cultural place name research leaves few appropriate methodologies to apply to this study. Yoon’s (1986, 1994b) use of culture tags on a map indicating name origin assists to illustrate spatial patterns and cultural influence. This approach is adopted for Sitka topographic and street names (Appendices 6 and 7, respectively). Naming explanations consider: who developed the map and for what purpose, formal designations like historic or national monuments, spatial patterns, and the maps themselves (i.e., presence of symbols for cardinal directions, scale, energy flows, and cultural influences). Few studies consider map patterns from different cultural sources. This study includes map names from Tlingit, Russian and American sources varying from Yoon’s (1986, 1994b) use of census and topographic maps in his Māori place name analysis. Limiting collection to mainstream sources would have excluded traditional Tlingit Territory names. Each cultural data source is discussed.

Tlingit Tribe and Clan House names are explored using the Traditional Tlingit Country – Tlingit Tribes, Clans and Clan Houses map (Traditional Tlingit Country Map). The map, reproduced as Map 1 with kind permission of Tlingit Readers, was developed as a project of the Sealaska Heritage Foundation, the Sitka Tribe of Alaska, and the Alaska Federation of Natives. In the late 1970s, Tlingit elder Charlie Joseph Senior, began working with the newly formed Alaska Native Brotherhood programme where he named and identified old Tlingit villages, camp sites, shorelines, railway guides, government documents (e.g., colonial records, congressional record, legislative journals) and conversations with naming and regional experts.

During field work, the Sitka Tribe with the Alaskan Native Brotherhood was documenting sacred sites around Sitka area. While the project is now complete, the purpose of that work was an inventory of physical locations of specific sites sacred to the Tlingit people gathered while elders were available to provide this place knowledge. The inventory was not...
islands, bays et cetera. The map was first completed and brought out at the Sitka Tribal Cultural Committee meeting on 29 October 1998, though as culture is not static, the map is periodically refined, verified and updated (Tobias 2000).64

The data table listing 147 topographic place names is set out in Appendix 6. Data is collected from four map sources. The Tlingit perspective is obtained through use of the Goldschmidt and Haas (1998[1946]) map of the Sitka Territory (Chart 9, reproduced with permission as Map 2). Originally an unpublished report, “Possessory Rights of the Natives of South East Alaska,” shows Aboriginal use and ownership recorded at 1946 based on information from 88 oral interviews with Native elders who had firsthand knowledge of traditional Tlingit and Haida land ownership and use. The report was edited and expanded by Thornton and published in 1998 as, Haa Aani/Our Land. A number of the interviews relate to specific Sitka locations with oral accounts describing physical and invisible connections for analysis.

The Goldschmidt and Haas (1998[1946]) map is a key reference for the topographic place name analysis as it is the first written Tlingit account related to land use, occupancy and place, and is the most geographically relevant in scope over previous studies. The map coverage marks the territory boundary used for the topographic place name analysis. The same geographic boundaries are applied to the Russian 1867 map and current United States Nautical charts (2005) to ensure the names collected from different sources consistently refer to the same geographic area. The Russian naming perspective is applied from the 1867 Map of Russian America or Alaska Territory compiled by Lewis and Cadin using Russian Charts and Surveys. It is held on-line at the US Library of Congress (http://international.loc.gov/cgi-bin/map_image.pl, accessed 22.11.2006). For the American perspective, United States Nautical Charts (2005) of the Sitka area, obtained from the US Government Office of Coast Survey, are analysed (http://nauticalcharts.noaa.gov/csdll/ctp/abstract.htm 25.10.2006). Finally, the City of Sitka Zoning Map (current at 2000) is used to provide smaller scale features naming and provide a local contemporary reference to ensure study

intended to link cosmology to location, rather be a means of tracking and ensuring such important sites remain known to future generations (Robert Sam, Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000).

Accordingly, the Sitka Tribe reviewed the map and naming of the seven new nautical charts in 1993 and 1998. In 1999, the Sitka Tribe partnered with the South East Native Subsistence Commission (SENSC) to collect additional place names and cultural information including work with Thornton (1997), name lists by Governor James Brady and Louis Shotridge, and ethnographic research by Swanton (1908), Emmons and de Laguna (1991), Goldschmidt and Haas (1998), de Laguna (1960; 1972), and others. Information was databased and mapped in GIS.
findings consider the local present naming environment. This map provides more complete natural features naming than other local maps used for the streetscape analysis.

The data table of 160 Sitka street names used for analysis is set out in Appendix 7. It comprises: the complete list of 147 names in Caputo’s (1998) Sitka City Walking Tour and Road System Map (current as at February 2009 (see http://welcometoalaska.com/maps/sitatatownmap.gif, accessed 22.11.2006); 13 additional streets from the Sitka Chamber of Commerce Map (1991); and the City of Sitka Zoning Map (1986 with revisions to 1999). No one source provides a comprehensive set of street name origins as provided in this study. DeArmond’s (1993, 1995) Sitka chronologies based on post-transfer newspaper articles contain some relevant street naming information, though it is limited to those streets recorded in newspaper articles. His chronology is also useful in providing an overview of individuals from Sitka’s early governance years that aid in deducing street name origins. Street name origin information is supplemented with Sitka Historical Society (1977) research and interview data. The analysis of street names explores major Tlingit, Russian and American cultural influences, and includes reference to colonial planning including Winder’s (2006) historical work on British and American planning influences illustrated in town layouts. The spatial analysis also considers development zones and street origin data. Sitka as a study location has been the subject of much research yet the streetscape naming analysis is the first.

2.3 Summary

The theoretical framework for exploring cultural landscapes continues to evolve. The comprehensive approach applied to study Sitka’s spiritual landscape has required an extended traverse across the breadth of related literature. Beginning with the evolution in cultural geography and a focus upon the subject area of geography and religion, ongoing debates question legitimacy of exploring spiritual landscapes despite the unique perspective and depth they offer to cultural understanding. Ways of interpreting the spiritual landscape included an introduction to past studies of palimpsest in colonial settings and applications of social construction theory to elucidate government power and relationships in managing land (e.g., planning, legislation, designations and place naming). The review of existing literature in landscapes of the mind introduced ways of reading the intangible focusing on ‘invisible’ cultural beliefs and values. Geomentality as an
explanatory framework was introduced and refined to incorporate social construction theory and emphasise cosmology. This important framework provides a systematic proxy linking cultural sacred and spatial beliefs to behaviours, ideal for studying spiritual landscapes. The literature review introduced the categorisation of sacred places for future analysis including: homelands/historic sites, places of worship and landscapes of death. Part one concluded with a summary of previous Sitka-based research ranging in topics useful to contextualise this study, but none that provide a cross-cultural spiritual landscape investigation. Part two of this chapter discussed research information collection methods from interviews and field work to data set rationale for geomentality and a comprehensive place name analysis. The gap in a comprehensive, contemporary and cross-cultural spiritual landscape exploration was reinforced along each of the above dimensions from cultural geography and landscape research to local Sitka knowledge.

The literature review and research design chapter has reinforced the importance of this study topic and methodology. The absence of comprehensive cultural geographic research in light of the evolution in geographic thinking presents a logical ‘next step’ to advance academic research and provide relevant insights for modern social issues. By connecting policies and planning the spiritual landscape highlights culture-land diversity in both the visible and invisible landscape. Making deeper connections then can facilitate intercultural celebrations of diverse heritage across tangible and intangible places. A range of perspectives serve to better develop environmental and culturally sustainable solutions for the multi-cultural global world. Cross-cultural insights and their applications are elucidated in the remainder of this thesis. Analysis begins with a chronology of the cultural influences that shaped the spiritual landscape in Chapter 3, an exploration into cultural attitudes toward the environment in Chapter 4, how cultures influence place naming in Chapter 5, and a spatial analysis of sacred places in Chapter 6. The showcase of Sitka’s spiritual landscape concludes in Chapter 7 by affirming the value of this study area for cultural geography, providing individual cultural insights and implications for the future discourse of intercultural land conflicts. The journey starts by establishing Sitka’s spiritual landscape with the chronology of culture group relations and influences.
TRADITIONAL TLINGIT COUNTRY

TLINGIT TRIBES, CLANS AND CLAN HOUSES

"...a name once given to a clan house) survives; the mere structure." —George Emmons, 1916

Map 1
CHAPTER 3: A CHRONOLOGY OF CULTURE GROUP RELATIONS AND INFLUENCES UPON SITKA’S SPIRITUAL LANDSCAPE

Land is an ally for the preservation of religious tradition for it does not change so easily, as does society. Landscapes have an inertial quality, places enshrine traditions (Chateaubriand, in Thrower and Glacken 1969:57).

What cultural traditions, socio-political and psychological impacts are locked in Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape that reveal insights to its imperial65 past? Meinig (1982) suggests an answer lies in basic questions regarding changing geographies, namely:

How have areas been changed as a result of the encroachment of one people upon the territory of another...[or] by what means have areas been changed as a result of imperialism? (p 75).


Geographers have unfortunately downplayed the role of the environment following Semple’s (1911) simplistic causal relationships (environmental determinism) to explain religious beliefs and behaviours. However, in peripheral locations like Alaska, the environment’s role remains important, influencing physical and economic development as this chapter demonstrates. Regarding socio-

---

65 "Colonisation is a variant of imperialism, the latter understood as unequal territorial relationships among states based on subordination and domination, and typically associated with a distinct form of contemporary capitalism, such as the
economic explanations, the role of religion is an underutilised social construct that, Buttimer (2006:197) argues, gives a “sharper understanding of social history in various corners of the world.” Political links to religion are numerous: shaman influenced decision-making from hunting to village siting, religious texts influenced Kandy (Sri Lankan) development (Duncan 1990) and Catholics influenced the monarchy to construct the Basilica of Sacre Coeur (Harvey 1979). Despite the limited forays to the religious arena by cultural geographers, power relationships and close links between the state and the church (religious beliefs) are discovered in the spiritual landscape. This study’s comprehensive approach to explaining landscape is aided by colonial explanations using frameworks of Harris (1997, 2004), King (1976), Meinig (1982), Rapoport (2005), Stelter (1986) and Duncan (1990) who espouses “the cultural is always… political.” Finally, social constructions of race and nation are included as cultural diffusion and resistance strategies of ‘invaded peoples’ influence later intercultural relationships (Meinig 1982:75). The invisible landscape is explored in Chapter 4.

3.1 Tlingit Settlement (Pre-1794)

Three of Sitka’s four66 visible Historic Sites and Homelands recorded during field research (2000) were part of the spiritual landscape prior to Russian settlement. These include: Gájaa Héen or Old Sitka (See Photos 1-3); Noow Tlien (Castle Hill); and Sitka village (marked as Sheet’ka Kwáan Naa Kahida Tribal Community House area - See Photos 4-6). The fourth site, Shis’k’l Noow (Fort of Young Saplings within Sitka National Historic Park) was established after 1802 under significant influence of the determined Tlingit Shaman, Stoonookw.67 Map 3 contains a contemporary map of these sites pictorially illustrating layers of cultural influence over time at each site.

---

66 A fifth Tlingit homelands site, Shaaseiyi Aan, in Map 3 is sitting as an original Kiks.ádi homelands site now layered with residences. The importance of homelands locations to the Tlingit warrant the site’s identification, however, analysis focuses on the four presently visible sites in line with this study’s methodology.

67 “Confident that the Russians would soon return, Stoonookw urged the Clan to construct a new fortification that was capable of withstanding cannon fire, and provide an ample water supply. Despite strong opposition, the Shaman’s will prevailed…Shis’kí Noow was built at the high water line near the mouth of the Indian River to take advantage of the long gravel beach flats that extend far out into the bay; it was hoped that the shallow waters would prevent the Russian ships from attacking the installation at close range,” (from Natural History Association video, The Last Double Eagle and the Battle of Sitka, Sitka National Historical Park (2000)). See also Herb Hope (in Hope and Thornton 2000:53).
Map 3: Sitka’s Contemporary Spiritual Landscape
Historic Sites and Homelands

Sacred Places
1. Historical Site or Homeland
   1. Original Settlement Area
   2. CBD
   3. Outer Town
   4. Sitka Suburbs
   5. Japonski Island

Sources:
In Map 3, Tlingit occupation is represented by a black eagle, light background, Russian settlement by a white eagle, light background, and American presence is depicted with a white eagle on black background. Labels are based on evidence at each site as recorded in Appendix 8. For example, archaeological evidence at Castle Hill include midden deposits indicating Natives living there around 1,000 years ago and Russian artefacts including building materials for at least four Russian period buildings dating to 1820s and 1830s, (www.dnr.state.ak.us/parks/oha/castle/introd.htm#anchor130618, accessed 03.03.2007). The durability of homelands sacred places in Sitka generates imperfect erasures (palimpsest) in the physical landscape. When the site and situation context is examined closely, these places facilitate a deeper understanding of the cultural influences that shaped them.

Only one homelands area has persisted as a Tlingit residential settlement. Sheet’ka Kwáan Naa Kahida Tribal Community House (Naa Kahida) is used in this study as a proxy for the homelands area located in the long standing traditional settlement area of the Tlingit Kiksádi clan (see Map 3). The Naa Kahida building located in downtown Sitka is not a church or ‘place of worship’ per se, nor does it have a formal historic designation, but as a meeting house meets the sacred place criteria for this study. Naa Kahida represents the wider area originally extending to include Castle Hill (Noow Tlien). Both places are mapped separately distinguishing their positions in the contemporary landscape. A cultural division between the sites persisted since early 1800 as Indian Village and Russian Town. A concentration of Tlingit residents remain in this homelands area today.

Investigating sacred homeland sites in Sitka’s contemporary landscape reveals four characteristics. First, all sites originated as Tlingit summer or winter settlements or fort sites. Second, each was a place of conflict between Russian and Tlingit cultures (e.g., Battles of 1802, 1804), followed by a ‘negotiated’ co-location/joint use. Third, the Castle Hill site remains the ‘seat of government,’ as a location which has held constant for over 200 years. Fourth, the current Tlingit village (e.g., Naa Kahida site) has persisted in that location for at least two centuries. Closer examination of landscape development will explain these aspects. This section is structured to first provide a brief introduction to establish Tlingit occupation in the study area with siting characteristics that include locations abundant in food and resources that offered defensive advantage and good water access. Next, the socio-economic and political characteristics of the Tlingit culture are discussed in the homelands context highlighting factors influencing relations with Russian and American settlers. Finally, as a
contrast to the Western development perspective, this section concludes with Tlingit location/siting rationale including traditional settlement and migration myths.

### 3.1.1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA PREHISTORY AND EARLY TLINGIT OCCUPATION

Writings by early colonisers emphasise European ‘discovery’ of lands despite clear evidence of long periods of prior human settlement. Artefacts like shell middens, support early human occupation of Southeast Alaska extending back over 10,000 years (Ackerman et al. 1985a:110-146; Davis 1990a, 1990b; and Moss 1993; in Chaney, Betts et al. 1995). Initial work at Angoon in 1949 and 1950 at late-prehistoric sites by de Laguna (1960) dates Tlingit presence in Southeast Alaska a few hundred years prior to European contact, with Chaney, Betts et al. (1995) suggesting the settlement pattern is at least 1,600 years old. Evidence of the Native occupation of Sitka Sound by Erlandson et al. (1990:6) date a shell midden associated with a Tlingit fort site to between 1200AD and 1400AD at least (600-800 years old). Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1994) also provide evidence supporting early occupation. Citing four Tlingit occupation estimates from 500 to 10,000 years ago, Hope suggests the strongest evidence supports hypotheses at 1,500 and 3,500 years ago (in Hope III and Thornton 2000:25).

Estimates regarding the size of the Tlingit population pre-contact vary from Lisianskii’s (1812:151) estimate of 10,000 in 1805, to Andrews’s (1947:315) estimate of 3,895 in 1920 and a synopsis from 1805 to 1930 provided by Grinev (2005:28). Table 5 summarises Tlingit settlement numbers at the study location ranging between 721 and 1,344 at early Russian contact (late 1800s/early 1900s) based on well-supported research and early Western written accounts (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998).

---

68 The period prior to European contact, approximately 1,000 years ago, is referred to as the Developmental Northwest Coast Stage by Davis (1990a, 1990b) with artefacts including large shell middens, house features and burials, barbed harpoons, labrets, and ground stone tools.
69 Women and children may be excluded.
70 Information is not specific regarding the inclusion of males/females, nor if estimates are only for Tlingit (e.g., some estimates include Kaigani Haida).
Table 5: Sitka Tlingit Villages as noted by Researchers (circa late 1800s/early 1900s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Publication</th>
<th>Year of field work</th>
<th>Community cited name and population</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swanton (1909:397)</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>Sitka (1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niblack (1890)</td>
<td>1885-87</td>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>Sitka (721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krause (1885)</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Schitka-kon (1200)</td>
<td>Sitka (1344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrov (1884:31ff)</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wehrman (See Petrov 1884)</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas (See Petrov 1884)</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>The authors note that Sitka is likely included with the Takoo Samdan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veniaminov (See Petrov 1884)</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Sitkha (750)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Extract from Goldschmidt and Haas (1998:9) *Table of Tribal Entities reported* in field investigations since 1835.

Pre-contact Tlingit areas were seasonally inhabited following nature’s production cycle with permanent winter villages and several temporary hunting and gathering areas. Winter homes were in secluded and protected places and summer homes71 were along the shores where they caught their fish (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:17). “The quantity and movements of the various species of salmon” influenced the village size (Oberg 1979[1937]:56) and social geography (see Thornton 2008 for a localised perspective on ecological distinctions).72 Migration between sites depended on food availability and season with distribution that appeared to follow the carrying capacity of the natural environment (i.e., sufficiently proximate to allow collective Clan House social and economic engagement, sufficiently distant to sustain a family without infringing upon another). New fishing streams or hunting grounds were acquired73 through conquest, settlement on virgin territory, or agreement with other clans (Oberg 1979[1937]). Having established evidence of Tlingit presence in the wider Alaskan territory pre-Russian contact, the next section looks more closely at the study location and environmental considerations of these Tlingit homelands sites.

---

71 Childhood recollections of Charlie Joseph Senior include going to “Latoulia Bay,” the family summer camping grounds used since time immemorial (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:322).
72 See Thornton’s (2008:40-41) discussion of how key ecological distinctions among Tlingit culture groups affect Tlingit social geography including: macro-environmental changes, variation to resources over time and locations, an increased reliance upon marine resources, improved preservation techniques, production surpluses for trade, and impacts of population growth (e.g., resource competition).
73 De Laguna (1972) stresses only the chief could assign use of his clan’s territory.
3.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The abundance of resources, defensive advantage and access to water offered by the physical environment in Sitka influenced settlement site selection. The link of resource abundance to the settlement location is well established (Thornton 2008). It influenced Tlingit occupation of Sitka as Gil Truit, Tlingit elder describes:

The Tlingit people came to the area about 9,000 years ago. The most probable reason for coming there was the abundance of food. The area is very rich in resources. Along the Indian River and around Totem Park, in fact all along the southeast coast is abundant…Old Sitka and the small settlement located in the now Totem Park area were important locations and fought over because of the abundant food supply and stream [respectively]. They used to smoke salmon there. The resources were the most abundant in the Sitka region (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

Observation of Old Sitka highlights the region’s abundance with the natural estuary, sheltered port area (i.e., the State ferry terminal is a kilometre away), shallow shoreline for fishing, numerous berry bushes, forest boundaries and Mt Edgecumbe on the horizon.

In addition to resources, the natural topography of the area provided defensive advantage including a promontory for the lookout at Noow Tlein (now Castle Hill), and shallow waters preventing larger boats coming to shore at Shis’k’l Noow (now Sitka National Historic Park). Gibson (1978:43) refers to the territory’s “commanding site and scenic locale,” and Gil Truit (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000) believed Castle Hill was selected “to provide a better view of goings on in the harbour.” Siting with access to waterfront for food and ease of transport was also key:

The people were very tied to the water and boats…access to the water and resources that it held was key…it was pre-docks time, so shorelines were essential areas (G Truit, pers comms, 05 July 2000).

The area’s topography with limited inhabitable land also influenced settlement location along the coast:

The low swampy ground, covering only a few square miles which lies between the town and the chain of hills, is overgrown with heather and low bushes which at the foot of the hills merge into the dense primeval forest (Teichmann 1983[1925]:173).

In summary, the environmental considerations strongly explain Tlingit settlement in Sitka, with sites aligned to topography, food source and seasonal cycles of production. However, the environmental factors are explained differently by non-Tlingit cultures. Some examples follow.

74 The best herring fishing was off Baranof Island (Grinev 2005:29).
In the early 1900s, American writer Jones (1914) emphasises Tlingit laziness to explain the settlement siting:

Villages are constructed to conform to the contour of the shore. There is no such thing as the laying out of a town site. They have no knowledge of surveying. The villages can hardly be said to have any streets, as every native is desirous of having his home directly on the waterfront...by building next to the beach, no clearing the ground is necessary. The Tlingit avoids all exertion possible (p 53).

This sentiment is echoed by Oberg (1979[1937]) who notes Tlingit as:

slower than White men, not owing to physical weakness, rather to standards set by their society…so they go…sauntering about, with apparently no purpose in mind (p 88).

In contrast, Salisbury (1962) presents a resourceful Tlingit siting rationale:

with no means of transporting logs, Indians used the water to tow the logs into place, naturally making them locate their homes close to the tide line (p 8).

Finally, observing the disposal of rubbish, different perspectives are highlighted according to racial interpretation. In one instance:

sanitary arrangements as carefully secluded back behind bushes while other refuse were thrown on the beach, where dogs, gulls and crows extract the last bit of nourishment from it (Oberg 1979[1937]:11).

This view can be compared with Salisbury (1962:10) complaining of dead dogs on the beach as a Tlingit trait of “no sense of civic responsibility to clean things up.”

These views illustrate different racial sentiments toward Tlingit standards of work and performance that contrast earlier environmental homelands location factors. Such perceptions create a duality between White and Tlingit as commonly established in colonial contexts (Meinig 1982). The normative White way is depicted as “proper, true and beautiful,” and those who conform are sanctioned while those who do not are punished (Kuper and Kuper 1996:161). These examples made decades after American transfer, represent lasting racial impressions without regard for Tlingit understanding of initial environmental siting factors. Tlingit homelands sites can also be considered by their role in the Tlingit socio-political framework as is considered next.

---

75 Alaska has 33,904 miles of coastline, more than the rest of the United States combined (www.nps.gov, accessed 20.09.2008).
3.1.3 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

Abundant resources facilitated the Tlingit culture to develop economically through trade, politically regarding its social structure and culturally in its crafts, carvings, and ceremonialsism:

The Tlingit prepared fish and fish oil annually in large quantities both for winter and for feasts and exchanges. The prosperous Indian fishing enterprise insured harvest surpluses and socioeconomic stability, allowing for development of exchange, craftsmanship, accumulation of wealth, development of rank, and the beginning of exploitation of the work of others (Averkieva 1974:137, in Grinev 2005:30).

Evidence of long-distance marine travel and trade networks are suggested in Moss’s (1993:6) reference to the presence of non-indigenous obsidian in the Tlingit territory. The Krause brothers (1993[1881-1882]:122) also note the evolving establishment rationale for locating villages along the coast (i.e., previously for natural resource access and latterly emphasising commercial aspects). Commerce and the exchange of goods is unnecessarily distinguished by Grinev (2005:32) as “barter within the tribe” being an exchange of gifts and “true [European] trade” as between Tlingit and neighbouring tribes. His comments perpetuate the White is right duality by allocating greater importance on inter-nation trade and diminish the gifting process to barter missing inherent complexity in relationships and obligations within Tlingit social structures.

In Western economic frameworks Oberg (1979[1937]) describes the exchange of goods on a continuum from pure barter to potlatch, which he describes as something economic and social. A thorough investigation of the potlatch and its role within Tlingit society is provided by Kan (1989), with many past ethnographic studies covering the topic well (de Laguna 1960, 1972; Emmons and de Laguna 1991; Krause 1979[1885], 1993[1881/1882]; Swanton 1908; and recently Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994). The potlatch is frequently cited in reference to represent the gifting process with aspects of economic need balanced with social obligation:

The gift, as a mechanism for the exchange of commodities and the mechanism for the payment of services, performs at once an individual and social action (Oberg 1979[1937]:97).

---

76 He notes however that before the arrival of the White man, pure barter did not exist among the Tlingit as exchanges took the form of gifts. The gifting concept is termed ‘barter’ by Grinev (2005:32) who notes its use prior to European arrival. The difference in views is best explained by the writers’ personal bias in interpreting the value of the gifting exchange as a legitimate ‘true’ form of economic exchange.

77 There was also some ceremony attached to trade in that, “…certain rituals, such as fasting for luck, getting a shaman to foretell the future, and holding a feast and dance several days before departure…Sometimes paint[ing] their faces…,” though Oberg was not certain if this was “connected to the trade itself or was done to ensure protection against enemies along the way,” (Oberg 1973:110).
Oberg demonstrates a deeper understanding of the ceremony\textsuperscript{78} and importantly links it to a Western framework to allow other White Europeans to understand the economic exchange concepts to yield a different and meaningful interpretation. The relationship component of the gifting process is a sharp contrast to the individual accumulation of wealth found in European societies. The Tlingit prestige economy associates greater wealth with the ability to distribute rather than acquire. The importance of collective in terms of distribution and maintenance of hunting, fishing and gathering areas was carefully maintained through ceremonies like the potlatch (Grinev 2005, Kan 1989). The potlatch/gifting system emphasises the strong connection between common and ceremonial aspects of the Tlingit social structure as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: Relative Time Spent by Tlingit on Important Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season / Month</th>
<th>Ceremonialism*</th>
<th>Economic Purposes**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ceremonialism category includes house building.
** Economic Purposes category includes collecting, storing, manufacturing.

Source: Based on 1933 data in Oberg (1979[1937]:77-86)

Table 6 emphasises not only the important proportion of ceremonial activities, but also the seasonal nature of the Tlingit annual cycle of production (e.g., November is a month full of ceremony, celebrating the autumn harvest and hold social preparations for the winter ahead, a tradition now incorporated into Thanksgiving celebrations in North America). The Tlingit chronology compares with:

\textsuperscript{78} Mutual obligations and reciprocal relations arise out of the taking and giving of food gifts and feasts are emphasised.
agriculturalists of the middle latitudes, for who the production of vitally important products peaked from May to October, while handicraft activity was most productive from November to March (Grinev 2005:34).

Ecology influenced the Tlingit division of time. De Laguna (1972) discusses how moons coincided as months and seasons followed changes in nature, like salmon spawning in August and herring in March. So the Tlingit culture integrated ceremony and economics within their social structure. Mary Sarvella, long time Sitkan and Sheldon Jackson Museum staffer, attributes the well-developed Tlingit culture to the abundance of relaxation time:

They didn’t have to work as hard as other tribes because of their key location (flat, access, favourable climate)...This gave the Tlingit time to develop their culture, their social structure and their trade (M Sarvella, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

It is worthwhile to further explore the connection of various elements discussed thus far (e.g., economic exchange, environmental links and ceremonialism) as these capture a key cultural aspect of the Tlingit civilisation that pertains to land occupation and ownership, a context described by Goldschmidt and Haas (1998):

[The Tlingit]...utilised all the major resources in the area except gold, which was of no value to them...had a well defined system of property ownership...title to land was obtained by inheritance or as a legal settlement for damages; it was never bought or sold. It was recorded in the minds of all interested parties by elaborate ceremonials and the distribution of gifts among the guests (potlatches.) These acts were necessary in order that land ownership could be publicly recognized...Rights were sometimes also recorded in the form of carvings on the famous totem poles (p 4).

Thus property ownership and resource management structures of Tlingit communities were well established prior to Russian contact.

Each clan had its own hunting, fishing and trapping grounds, its bird egg island, its herring spawning ground and its salmon stream and those claims were held inviolate or war followed (Salisbury 1962:9).

Notions of ‘public good’ were also identified (e.g., the beach was generally common property) with individual needs and clan requirements identified separately (e.g., clans claimed waterfront immediately in front of house sites (Oberg 1979[1937]:62)). Goods and services needed to meet primary needs (e.g., food and shelter) were thus met communally with luxury items (e.g., grouse or ptarmigan, big horned sheep or black cod) being rare articles left for private consumption (i.e., not typically shared according to Oberg (1979[1937]:90)).

Collective and individual ownership is further distinguished with the house group owning the house, slaves, large canoes, important tools and food boxes, important weapons, ceremonial gear, and the
food products of collective work…[and] *individul* property consist[ing] of tools, weapons, small canoes, clothing, decorations and ceremonial objects (Oberg 1979[1937]). Drawing on Western economic rationale, Goldschmidt and Haas (1998) explain the Clan House relationship:

The clan or house group is an economic group in Tlingit society which, like a corporation in western society, controls the use of certain lands and other valued properties. The head of the clan or house group is the person directly responsible for administering the property, but according to custom, his rights are subject to certain restrictions. The most important of these are that (1) he cannot sell the right…(2) he must allow the use to appropriate members of his group (p 16).

As custodians of group property, the heads of clans would allocate “where, how and how many animals each hunter could procure,” (Grinev 2005:43). The collective is stressed in the notion of ‘community’ house and its priority over individual needs, in contrast to Salisbury’s (1962:10) contention of Tlingit having “no sense of civic responsibility.”

This *collective* concept clashes with the European *individual* focus in the land ownership matters with the latter expressed in Harris (2004:177):

So great moreover is the regard of the law for private property, that it will not authorize the least violation of it: no, not even for the good of the whole community...The public good is in nothing more essentially interested, than in the protection of every individual’s private rights (Blackstone 1809[1765]:138).

The difference expressed in *collective* and *individual* interest and ownership between cultures is more about exercising notions of *public good* (i.e., making land decisions on behalf of a wider interest) than about presence or absence of a system of land tenure or ownership. This is one of the fundamental and ‘popular misconceptions’ as Henshaw (1910) articulates:

Indians are not nomadic…having no fixed place of abode, but wandering hither and yon as fancy or the necessities of existence demanded…Every tribe…laid claim to and dwelt within the limits of a certain tract or region, the boundaries of which were well understood, and were handed down by tradition, and not ordinarily relinquished save to a superior force…[The] Indian ownership of land…belonged to the tribe as a whole for their own use…hence it was impossible for a chief, family, clan, or any section of the tribe, legally to sell it to sell or to give away to aliens, white or red, any part of the tribal domain… (cited in Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:7).

This clash between collective and individual ownership and management of land persists in today’s economic environment.

During field work, an NPS interpretive sign at Castle Hill noted that “some elders maintain that Noow Tlein [Castle Hill] was the only part of Alaska truly owned by Russia when they sold Alaska to the United States,” (Field Research 4.7.2000). Applying the collective ownership of territorial
lands concept would have required a decision within *that* well-defined system to surrender the use/occupation/ownership of the wider Sitka territory. No transaction record of this nature exists. European colonisation did not recognise other systems of ownership (e.g., land title recorded through oral traditions in Roseman’s (1998) research into song lines in Temier). Such tenure is well-documented, yet in a manner that conflicts with European systems (e.g., written title, ‘true trade’). Considering only one cultural system of land management fails to recognise or consider the existence of another cultural system and meaning of land management. This failure perpetuates misunderstanding and intercultural conflict around land issues. To meaningfully understand another’s culture requires a willingness to understand their social structures and how they may differ or influence that culture’s way of interpreting and interacting within the same place. The next section presents a different cultural influence upon Sitka’s spiritual landscape: Russian occupation from 1794 to 1867.

### 3.2 Russian Occupation (1794-1867)

The influence of Russian culture on Sitka’s spiritual landscape development is considered according to the space and time of establishment (Harvey 1994), classical location theories (Christaller 1966, Von Thünen 1966 [1826]), and prior studies of Russian cities. French’s (1983) work on the development of Moscow, and Rozman’s (1976) exploration of urban networks in Russia compared to European cities around 1750-1800, provide useful references. Harris’s (1997) colonisation model defining periods of cooperation, conflict, and compromise, and common characteristics of colonisation (King 1976, Meinig 1982) provide socio-political and historic lenses for exploring Russian actions. Numerous authors have extensively written about the Russian American Company (RAC) history in Alaska thus detailed elaboration here is redundant (Andrews 1922; Chevigny 1943; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1990; de Laguna 1972; Fedorova 1973; Gibson 1976, 1978; Kan 1989, 1999; Khlebnikov 1976; Pierce 1986, 1990a; Wayne 1986). Regarding colonisation impacts, Fisher (1987) provides two views based on his work on the Northwest coast. The first is a negative brutal view of the decimation of culture and populations. The second more positively views European colonisation as contributing to “the flourishing of art and ceremonialism,” (Grinev 2005:11). Interpretations of impacts of Russian settlement in Alaska are similarly balanced between Black (2004) who emphasises positive impacts and Grinev (2005) who emphasises negative
impacts. This section not only compares Sitka’s experience alongside typical colonial interpretations (e.g., simple Russian-Tlingit dualities), but also highlights how the experience is distinct. This approach appreciates *amalgamation* aspects (Bhattarai 2004) where both cultures are altered through contact. The resulting hybridisation discusses adaptations for both cultural groups such as acknowledging active Tlingit survival strategies without being absorbed by the dominant Russian colonial culture.

To introduce readers to the Russian influences upon the spiritual landscape development, Figure 7 has been developed using Blashke’s 1836 sketch map79 as a base (Pierce 1986:19), and adding post-transfer information and references from Sitka models at 1845 and 1867 to give a complete picture. Having been introduced to the four Tlingit homelands sacred places, Blashke’s 1836 map introduces a separate Russian and Tlingit cemetery and St Michael’s church. Five significant sacred place changes occurred since Blashke’s 1836 map during the Russian epoch: the *Lutheran Church* (established 1840), *Russian Bishop’s House* (established 1842), *Russian Orthodox St Michael’s Cathedral* (established 1843), *Tlingit Church of the Holy Resurrection*80 (Resurrection Church) at the Tlingit Village/Russian palisade border, and a new *Russian cemetery* inside the palisade near Resurrection Church (Cracroft 1981:72). Sheldon Jackson Industrial Training School and Presbyterian Mission (discussed in the next section) are identified in Figure 7 for future reference. To supplements the visual map, Teichmann (1983[1925]) describes Russian settlement features at 1868 with a comprehensive overview warranting inclusion of his full text, only slightly abridged:

79 Blashke’s sketch map is not to scale as his placement of the Russian cemetery is distant from the built settlement area. In the contemporary spiritual landscape the historic Russian cemetery with headstones circa 1848 (Photo 14), are closer to this original settlement area. Further, the NPS *Sitka Official Map and Guide* (1997) contains a photo of a painting by A W Franzmann (undated) that shows the “replica blockhouse” on a hill “keeping solitary vigil over the Russian cemetery,” adjacent to the old Russian Trinity Cemetery (Photos 15 and 16), although the surrounding natural topography has changed. The painting is estimated to be early 1900s by NPS staff (pers comms, 12 February 2008).

80 Also known as the *Koloshian Church, Trinity Church,* and *the Holy Life-Creating Trinity (Tlingit) Church* (Black 2004:276). Kashevaroff (1947) estimates the establishment of the church in approximately 1850: “a separate church was built for the natives, on a line along the stockade, dividing the Indian Town from Sitka proper. This church was dedicated in honour of the Holy Trinity…cemetery formerly surrounded the church. Black (2004:240) notes building occurred between 1846 and 1848, “for the Orthodox Tlingit of Sitka.”
English mile, and the whole terrain that slopes down to the bay is enclosed at its rear by a range of wooded hills that rise steeply to a height of some 500-600 feet, whilst further back still the mountain heights, covered with eternal snow, give the whole district an Alpine character (Teichmann 1983[1925]:172-3).

Figure 7: Map of Sitka in 1867

Teichmann’s (1983[1925]:193-196) description confirms features of the “Indian village,” of 80-100 dwellings along the bank, each accommodating 150-200 “Indians,” with canoes in front of each house and behind the houses on rising slope a burial place with “numerous little wooden huts...to guard the ashes of the dead,” (p194). Oberg (1979[1937]) adds Tlingit graveyards are:

...some distance behind the Houses...one for each clan...[and] formerly a funeral pyre in which the dead were cremated also formed part of the settlement area. Houses were located along the shore with entrances facing the ocean81 (pp 10-11).

Russian settlement produced several observable landscape changes from the Tlingit period: first, claiming former Tlingit homelands sites in present day Old Sitka and Castle Hill areas; second

81 A Tlingit elder, David Kanosh (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000) suggested entrances were placed this way “to keep the cold winds from the mountains from coming in.”
recreating a Eurocentric colonial pattern of development; and third, introducing racial containers reflecting the duality between Russian and Tlingit people through living areas. Explanations for these changes are discussed with reference to economics and trade, environmental considerations, colonisation and the role of the church.

3.2.1 ECONOMICS AND TRADE

Politics and economics led Russia to occupy Alaska. Politically, the drive to expand the Empire began with Tsar Peter the Great (Peter Alexeyevich Romanov 1672-1725) and the ‘discovery’ of the area by Bering and Chirikov. Growth continued under the reign of Catherine II from 1762, bringing many new territories, multiple ethnicities and Western ideas to develop Russia’s military, political, and cultural position. Catherine II’s son Paul reigned from 1796-1801 and chartered the Russian-American Company (RAC) that managed Russia’s interest in Alaska. The RAC came seeking new supplies of furs to build profits. Fur trade from Siberia during the mid-1600s already accounted for approximately 10% of Russia’s total revenue (Gibson 1976, 1978). Russia’s entry to the North American trade however, was within a multi-national context with numerous interests represented.

In 1794 when Baranov settled in Sitka, “first contact between the Tlingit and Europeans was essentially over,” (Grinev 2005:105) revolutionary France and an ousted Spain left England and the USA as Russia’s main competition. British trade weakened with federal commerce requirements to double-licence the East India and South Seas Companies and restrictions on Chinese imports (Gibson 1976:155). This in turn assisted American trader competitive advantage as “superior horse traders,” (Gibson 1978:56-57) that:

…no people in the world surpass in the boldness, activity, and perseverance of their mercantile speculations (von Kotzebue 1967:64).

Americans also offered a wide range of goods including firearms that strengthened trade with Tlingit trade. Russia was impacted by competition from indigenous Tlingit, American direct access to Canton and greater seaworthiness of British and American fleets (Gibson 1978).

The Americans are remarkable…They sail from Boston straight to Sitka in 140-160 days after stopping to take on supplies and fresh water in the Sandwich Islands (Khlebnikov 1994 [1861]:188).
For Russia for example, entry to China was comparably more complex with an 8,000 mile overland trip to Company offices in St Petersburg (NPS interpretative sign, Sitka, July 2000).

Dr Jim Davis tells a story of a Catholic priest’s family in Sitka during the Russian period, just before the time of transfer colourfully illustrating the trading situation:

The Catholic priest was originally from Patterson, New Jersey. He came down from the interior – he’d been evangelising the Eskimos around the Fairbanks area and the Native tribes up in that area. He had an Eskimo boy with him and he was getting old and he wanted to get out – so Sitka was the only place you could get a boat. He and the boy built a sled with a load of furs – and they had a dog team – went down the old (now known as) Alcan highway, down through the pass, past Haines to the Native village up the river (Haines wasn’t there then). He left the sled there and loaded the canoes and paddled him all the way to Sitka...He got there and was waiting for a boat – he wanted to get back to New Jersey if he could. There were American and Spanish ships calling in every now and again. He took in his furs at the trading post – the Russians at the post were surprised because they had thought they had caught all the furs coming out of the area. They had never seen such furs. The Americans had stolen all the furs (the Russians couldn’t get them)...The Americans had no political interest here – they brought guns and booze and traded with the Indians – brought their ships from Boston and traded. Came in at night with the tides, traded, and the Russians never even knew they were there…[A Russian officer] confiscated the furs [from the priest] – he hit this [Russian officer] in the belly…he banged his head on the potbelly stove – knocked the pipe out of the ceiling…and everything damaged this officers white suit - knocked him unconscious. So [the Russians] went in and arrested the priest. Put him in the dispensary. Went off and left him. No heat no nothing…the story eventually – a day or two later – got back to Baranov [the priest’s name sounded familiar]. Baranov had married an Athabascan woman in the interior and thought he remembered this old fella…it was the same guy. So he took him out [from the dispensary] to the Officers Hospital until he had recuperated…Eventually after the transfer, when Jefferson Davis came up here – who by the way was my great great uncle – this old man and Jefferson Davis became good friends and Jefferson took this old man with him back to Patterson New Jersey. Somehow these people heard that I was doing this work – don’t know how, but they heard and they sent me a copy of his memoirs, his diary. He died in Patterson about a year after he got there. But I was really glad to hear he made it home (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

American trade superiority however was coupled with their hostility toward the Tlingit. “When Indians refused to trade,” writes Gibson (1992:160-166), “some American captains fired on their canoes and villages with cannons.” Grinev (2005:115) tells how Americans “did not even shrink from direct slave trade.” However, violence is a key attribute in establishing colonies (Meinig 1982) and “has long accompanied the fur trades,” (Harris 2004:169).

Summarising the trading situation, American interests were about immediate profits, not settlement during the Russian epoch of Sitka’s development and included hostility toward indigenous Tlingit as exemplified by Kan (1999) in their:

unwillingness to honour the local chiefs and aristocrats according to Native traditions, as the Russians did (p 58).
British were involved in, but did not feature in the landscape development in Sitka. The Russians were actively involved in the fur trade, within a challenging trade context, and well supported by imperial Russia. Trade efforts by Russia included an imperial aspect of occupation of the territory which distinguishes its influence from other countries during the early 1800s (Meinig 1982).

The nature of the Russian colonisation effort is depicted differently by several researchers. Black’s (2004) Russians in Alaska 1732-1867, chronicles the mutual trading partnership between the Tlingit and RAC and defends the Russian conservation efforts.82 Arguing Russians were not cruel and oppressive toward Tlingit people, Pierce (1984:viii) refers to patriarchal treatment of Tlingit by RAC workers to evidence concern for Natives through intermarriage, education, and by 1818, a rare use of derogatory terms and “categories of…native workers (kaiurs) and hostages (amanats).” In a mixed complimentary message Russian Golovin describes Tlingit proficiency in trade:

These savages are so cunning and careful that they tell the Americans they will agree to carry out trade in sea otters only if their ships bring a known quantity of arms and the equipment associated with them, and if not they will not trade them even one otter (Grinev 2005:114).

This sentiment is echoed by Khlebnikov (1835:30-31) stating Tlingit are “powerful, daring…ably adopt European customs…with innate cleverness and intelligence,” (in Grinev 2005:107). While admiring skills and attributes, contrary positions to the amicable nature of Russian-Tlingit relations are presented in various historic accounts.83 Khlebnikov’s statement regarding adapting to European customs also reinforces the White/Native duality where Russians compare Tlingit and European ‘norms’ favouring European ways as most important.

Duality in colonial situations is well supported in social construction literature (King 1976, Anderson 1988, MacCannell 1992 in Marie 1999; Harvey 1994; Jackson & Penrose 1993; Schmidt 2005). In Sitka, the Russians were in a position of power (‘us’), and the Tlingit were (‘them’). Still, Russian-Tlingit relations differed to American-Tlingit relations.

There is no evidence of any campaign during the Russian period against Tlingit language, culture or society (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:35).

This comment is reinforced by Russia’s no-retaliation policy for:

---

82 Tikhmenev’s diary (1861-1863) translated by Pierce and Donnelly (1978: 206) notes conservation practices of the Russian American Company, such as “refusing to barter for pelts taken too young.”

83 Grinev (2005:104) cites Vancouver (1833:438) writing of an incident in Yakutat Bay where the Yakutat chief indicates “the injustice of the Russians who killed and carried away…the sea otters.” Kotzebue (1987:212) negatively characterises the Tlingit: “It cannot be described, how disgusting this people seems,” (Grinev 2005:5).
the Natives [who] were to be treated with kindness and forbearance at all times and the use of arms against the Native Americans was absolutely forbidden, even when provoked by hostile or ‘bestial’ acts (Black 2004:94).

Russia wished to claim the coast as her possession “if no other State is occupying it,” and use the right of occupancy while at the same time authorising traders to “destroy…any symbols or markers left by foreigners,” (Black 2004:94).

The European method of using a material object to mark the physical possession/ownership or claim to a place differs from the indigenous method of recording ownership/use through oral tradition. Shiels (1967:28-30) discusses the imperial orders for expansion and specific instructions directing the Admiralty to claim the lands with “consent of the inhabitants” and to mark the “posts…with the arms of Russia.” Upon settling in Arkhangel’sk:

Baranov chopped down a small tree and fastened a cross-piece midway to the top. This cross he set in the ground…and at its foot he buried the copper crest of the Romanovs,” (Chevigny 1943:136).

This action is also recorded by Andrews (1922:18) who places this location at Krestov Bay. The copper crest was one of several buried by Russia on Alaska’s coast to formally mark their claim to the land as part of Russian occupation. The use of markers to physically represent ownership and/or the transference of power in newly colonised areas is common with cultural geographers using these markers to reveal historic meaning and power relationships at a place (Winchester et al. 2003:74-75). The politics of these places will be explored further in a later discussion of palimpsest. Next the role of the environment is investigated in relation to Russian occupation.

3.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Russian settlement was driven by aspects facilitating trade, including ease of water transport, timber for building, and a food supply for inhabitants. In Sitka:

The shores were thick forests of gigantic cedars, spruce and fir, never touched by fire but protected from the scourge by the blanket of wetness that overlay everything. Here the big trees were perfect for shipbuilding, the tides apt for launching ships, the harbours ideal for defense, and the sea otter plentiful, (Chevigny 1943:136).

Nature is considered with a view to commerce and what it can provide for colonisers. “Trees were to convert into house lumber,” (Haycox 2002b:171) and shipbuilding. Sitka’s topography and watercourse enabled navigation:
Mount Edgecumbe serves as a precise landmark of sea travellers, helping navigators sail through the bay with the aid of Lazarev Island and Biorka as bearings. With three entrances to the bay, two from the East and one from the West, the roadstead is safe and convenient and it is possible to have twenty sailing ships in the bay near the fort. The roads are never covered with ice, and are well protected by the islands. During the new or full moon tide waters are 14 feet when accompanied by winds the water rises 16-17 feet. This high tide has advantages in that it allows easy access to the ships so that they can be examined and repaired without difficulty and danger (Khlebnikov (1994 [1861]):176-186).

Environmental conditions were like home to the Russian promyshlenniki (fur traders) familiar with Siberia’s tundra and boreal forests. The damp coastal climate however, was different and quickly rotted ships and buildings.

From a food supply perspective, soil and water in the area were not suitable for Russian agriculture (e.g., grains, gardens and rearing livestock):

Sitka is the best place for growing potatoes [with rocky] earth…usually fertilized with seaweed…A constructed fish pond supplies ocean fish each year, plus year round fishing for herring…The Aleut hunt mountain sheep and can catch up to 200 head for fresh cheap meat for the settlers…[Pigs and chickens] fed fish and shellfish, have a repulsive taste, [and it costs] approximately the same amount of money to maintain a head of cattle as it does to maintain a human being, [and] Sitka was dependent on grain from California (Khlebnikov (1994 [1861]):176-188).

The dependence upon foreigners for food is articulated by Grinev (2005:146-7) as requiring “rescue…from death by starvation,” citing Rezanov needing to travel to California on an American purchased ship to seek food for the Sitka post. Dr Davis agreed:

If it wasn’t for the Tlingit, the Russians would have simply starved. I know that for sure. Tlingit girls had married some of the people and moved in here and through their contacts were able to keep the compound alive (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

This position is contradicted by Black (2004) stating:

Food was abundant, though…not what American and European visitors were used to…[Golovin] refused to eat halibut or…taste the crab meat offered…by locals as a delicacy (p 279).

Golovin’s response would typify colonial situations where inhabitants seek reminders of home, including food, though all cultures obviously make concessions in new environments (King 1976, Meinig 1982). Imperial homeland connections are discussed next.
3.2.3 COOPERATION, CONFLICT AND COMPROMISE – ARKHANGEŁ’SK MIKHAILOVSKAYA

Imperial Russia determined how its interests were managed overseas with a Tsarist ukast to allow the RAC trade monopoly and establishment of colonial outposts including Arkangel’sk (Sitka). Settlement gave the RAC situational advantage and a possibility for cooperative relationships with indigenous people, a characteristic Meinig (1982) views as key to success. The following exchange of Russian*-Tlingit relations illustrates this connection:

In the year 1788…seamen of the Shelikof and Golikof Company…in their galleon The Three Apostles with forty men on board, found themselves in the friendly relations with…the Kolushan [Tlingit] people, they carried on an agreeable trade and at last brought them under the protection of the Russian Imperial throne; in commemoration of which they gave the estimable chief a Russian copper crest and a copper engraving of the likeness of his Imperial Highness… (in Krause 1979[1885]:28).

The company acts as ‘agent’ of the imperial power (Meinig 1982) bringing Kolushan people under ‘protection of the Russian Imperial throne.’ The Eurocentric view suggests an engraving of ‘his imperial highness,’ is something Tlingit would value and presumes no Tlingit social structure and a desire for ‘protection.’ The exchange is noted as ‘friendly’ without ill-nature or what Harris (1997) would call a period of cooperation, that is common with initial contact and creates a conducive atmosphere for colonial settlement.

In 1799, Chief Manager Baranov (Photo 7), moved the RAC headquarters from Kodiak to Sitka ‘reacting to depleted sea otter supplies and thwarting Hudson Bay Company expansion via Canadian rivers,’ (Isobel Miller Museum interpretive display, Field Research July 2000). Baranov’s settlement choice of Castle Hill was already home to four Tlingit longhouses. Baranov sought permission from the Sitka Tlingit to establish the post at Starrigavan Bay (seven miles north) naming it Arkhangel’sk Mikhailovskaya (Archangel Saint Michael), referred now as Old Sitka. The first buildings in Old Sitka were “a large balagan [storehouse]…ordinary bath house, [and] barracks with two watch towers,” (Khlebnikov 1973:73). Terms between the Russians and Tlingit appear cordial during this cooperation phase of colonisation. When Captain Vancouver travelled there in 1794, he:

obtained the impression [the Russians] were on good terms with the natives and that the latter were quite satisfied with their subjection to the Russians (Krause 1979[1885]:24).

84 The Russians were represented from the Shelikof and Golikof Company, predecessor of the Russian American Company.
85 Andrews (1922:18) notes Baranov, “purchased a tract of land from Skayeutlelt.”
Colonisation experiences in the Fraser Canyon in British Columbia showed similar settler and indigenous cordial relations in both cases with Native people acting as guides, providing access (e.g., with Nlha7kápmx canoes or Aleut baidarkas), trading European/Russian goods and intermarrying (Harris 1997). The mutually profitable fur trade connected culture groups in an “economic symbiosis” according to Fisher (1987:47) where neither benefited from hostility. The Russians occupied Old Sitka from 1794 until June 1802 when the Russian settlement was attacked and destroyed by the Tlingit (Andrews 1922:8; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1990:8; de Laguna 1972:170).

The Battle of 1802 aligns to Harris’s (1997) conflict phase of colonisation. In colonisation of the Fraser Canyon, conflict arose as the number of miners increased, and with it violent attitudes toward Natives (Harris 1997). Several explanations are presented of underlying tensions between Tlingit and Russian people that culminated in the Battle of 1802 (Andrews 1967; Bancroft 1970; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994; Dauenhauer et al. 2008; de Laguna 1972; Khlebnikov 1994 [1861]; Krause 1979[1885]; Okun’ 1939; Tikhmenev 1861). Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1987:4) refer to Tlingit legends stating the cause of the revolt as the Russian imprisonment of the influential shaman, Stunuku, of the Sitka Kaagwaantaan lineage (in Grinev 2005:115). Kan (1989:225) describes the battle as instigated by sentiments at a potlatch in Chilkat where the clan was disgraced for allowing a small number of Russians to dominate them, “ultimately turning themselves into slaves,” (in Grinev 2005:124). The dissatisfaction with hunting in Tlingit aboriginal territorial waters, depleting the sea otter stock, plundering Indian graves, and the “disdainful treatment from some of the Russian promyshlenniki,” are noted as other contributing factors (Grinev 2005:115-125). NPS signage at Old Sitka aptly summarises pre-battle positions of both:

The Tlingit viewed the Russians as intruding foreigners with inferior trade items and alliances with Aleut, their traditional enemies; and the Russians viewed occupation as a right of territorial expansion as Tlingit were not viewed as landowners. The Russians were frustrated with Tlingit free trade and an inability to control these, “savages in need of assistance and salvation” (Field Research, July 2000).

Violence and conflict go hand in hand with “aggressive encroachment” upon another’s territory which Meinig (1982:71) refers to as “one of the great processes of history.” The conflict phase of colonisation noted by Harris (1997, 2004) is evidence around the globe (e.g., New Zealand, Canada, America, Australia et cetera).
The Russians returned in 1804 when, according to the *Sitka Official Map and Guide* (1997) the Russians demanded that the Kiks.ádi surrender their village, or according to Chevigny (1943) Baranov asked the Natives to leave with the Tlingit responding:

> since the Kolosh nation first was, this has been the home of the Sitka Kwáan…Our totems are here and our spirits…What you ask is impossible (p 218).

A request of the Tlingit to leave their homeland must inevitably end in warfare. The Battle of 1804 led to the Russians first destroying the homelands sites including the Kiks.ádi village Noow Tlein (now Castle Hill), and then Shis’k’l Noow, the fort at Indian River (now the Sitka National Historic Park). Various accounts have been recorded capturing details (Lisianskii 1968[1814]; Khlebnikov 1973, 1976; Krause 1979[1885]) including many Tlingit oral accounts (Andrews 1987; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1987; National Park Service 1992; Hope 1982; Hope and Thornton eds. 2000; Hopkins 1987). Hope (1992, cited in Chaney, Betts et al. 1995) tells of the Tlingit killed in the 1804 Battle buried in, “shallow graves to the east of the fort,” with the Tlingit intending to return to exhume the bodies to cremate them according to their custom:

> However according to Point House Oral History, the Russians had exhumed the bodies and the Kiks.ádi were not able to recover and cremate them (p 114).

The importance of proper disposal of the dead means the physical victory would also have had spiritual and emotional consequences for the Kiks.ádi. Significantly, the Battle of 1804 was the last major conflict between Europeans and Tlingit Natives effectively marking the start of Russian governance.

In Sitka, the return of the Tlingit to the area represents Harris’s (1997) compromise phase of colonisation. In 1821, according to a report by Chaney, Betts et al. (1995:114), the Russians permitted the Tlingit to return to settle outside the walls of Novo Archangel’sk so the Russians could keep a closer eye on them. Eppenbach (1994) notes the Tlingit were invited to return in 1821 and the “Survival March of 1804” historical plaque® erected at Castle Hill (Field research 2000), suggests a negotiated return. Jacobs Jr (1987) recalls the peace talks:

---

® The plaque states, the Kiks.ádi journeyed by foot to Chaatl’ K’aa Noow, a fort site in Peril Strait…[there they] continued to watch over their territory and each spring returned to harvest herring eggs alongside other clans that remained in the area…The Kiks.ádi people returned to Sheet’ka (Sitka) and peace negotiations led to the Kiks.ádi granting Noow Tlein to the Russians in return for the Double Eagle Badge, now in the State Museum in Juneau,” (Field Research 4 July 2000).
It was at this peace treaty that the present Castle Hill was given to Baranov in exchange for a double-headed eagle badge,\(^{87}\) which is depicted on the totem pole. It was explained to mean, From now on and forever, we will be brothers. You look one way and we the other way (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:5).

During these discussions, the consideration represented by the material ‘badge’ was an expression of compromise, a willingness of both cultures to move forward. Writing about a later period, but indicative of mutual interests, Kan (1999:170) notes that despite their independence, by 1867 the Tlingit were a part of the Russian trading system, reliant for foods, tools and artefacts, thus willing to ‘tolerate the Russians,’ whose relations he describes as

a somewhat uneasy symbiosis, a relationship which both sides needed but did not fully trust each other and maintained a significant spatial, social and intellectual distance from each other (p 170).

In colonial situations, close contact and mutual influence can result in changes to both cultures (Meinig 1982).

Strategies of Native resistance to settler infiltration during colonisation lead to culture change as Harris (1997, 2004) shows in British Columbia. Structural changes to social organisation of indigenous peoples allow for the incorporation of selected White ways into traditional cultures (Thornton 2002, Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994, Harris 2004, Haycox 2002a, 2002b). For the Tlingit in Sitka,\(^{88}\) a significant resistance strategy was The Survival March where the Tlingit physically left the area in order to preserve their way of life, or what Herb Hope\(^{89}\) refers to as “through our own backyard to a planned destination,” (in Hope and Thornton 2000:51). Although a displaced people, the Kiks.ádi retained their social order and ties to homeland, to which they eventually returned. Other survival strategies appear in later stages of Sitka’s development journey.

---

\(^{87}\) The round knob on the bottom of the totem represents Castle Hill, the only piece of real estate ever given to the Russians (NPS interpretive sign, Field Research 4 July 2000).

\(^{88}\) Teichmann (1983[1925]: 196) notes that sick Tlingit refuse to receive American medical attention, preferring “to sit patiently and have incantations changed over them for days by their medicine men.”

\(^{89}\) Hope (Hope and Thornton eds. 2000:67) cites three reasons for the tactical retreat: “keep their women and children from becoming slaves to the Russians, keeping warriors alive to fight another day, and leaving the battlefield with their honour intact.”
3.2.4 NOVO ARKHANGEL’SK – THE PARIS OF THE PACIFIC

Following the Battle of 1804, Baranov raised the Russian flag\(^9\) on the promontory at Castle Hill as the second Russian settlement *Novo Arkhangel’sk* [New Archangel] (Khlebnikov 1973), the natural vantage point strategically selected as the former Tlingit homelands site *Noow Tlein*. The flag representing ‘Imperial Russia’ again achieved a physical marker on land denoting ownership. Despite this period of *compromise*, relating to Harris’s (1997) final phase of colonisation, ongoing tension remained between Russian and Tlingit inhabitants:

The native inhabitants, the Kolosh, have remained our perpetual enemies since we defeated them and took this area a second time. Leaders have enjoyed the Russian favours, however quickly can become dissatisfied or begin to fight with our promyshlenniki, or Aleuts, then grab their guns and knives and with a rage found only in savages (Khlebnikov 1994 [1861]:181).

By 1825, the threat from the Tlingit diminished as Sitka residents are reported as feeling able to go on “walks and picnics to the deep woods near Indian River,” (Antonson and Hanable 1987:35 in Chaney, Betts et al. 1995) and Golovin (1983:118) describes the walking trail to Indian River in 1861, where “…now everyone goes to this stream and in fact they go unarmed.” Black (2004) also refutes navy inspector Golovin’s view that:

residents did not live in a constant state of fear, under siege by the Tlingit...Trade flourished, town market was held daily, and local Tlingit dignitaries and visiting parties were entertained by the officials, privately and at feasts imitating Tlingit traditional customs given by the chief manager himself (p 278).

The effectiveness of *compromise* in these sentiments is questioned however if considering Teichmann’s (1983) visit in 1868 when he was concerned over his safety (e.g., he felt compelled to stay within the stockade, or carried a gun if he ventured outside). Outward appearances of *compromise* do not necessarily capture deeper underlying sentiments held by inhabitants as illustrated in the settlement stockade.

The wooden palisade built at Novo Arkhangel’sk was a physical testament to ongoing conflict between the Russian and Tlingit people:

The port is separated from the Kolosh village by a high palisade extending from the seashore to the north of Swan Lake and for about thirty sazhens on its opposite shore...the port is protected by a blockship with three guns...there are four towers three stories high at the corners of the palisade...the cannons directed toward the Kolosh village (Tikhmenev, trans Pierce and Donnelly 1978:420).

---

\(^9\) Three flags currently fly at Castle Hill: American, Russian and the State of Alaska (see Photo 11).
Many of the logs from the Tlingit fort at Indian River were reused by the Russians (Hope 1982:3), and “almost a thousand trees were cut for the stockade,” (Chaney, Betts et al. 1995:114). According to Andrews (1922):

> Native houses were removed, and along with them more than a hundred burial houses with the ashes of the bodies which had been burned (p 25).

These material changes to the Tlingit homelands were significant. Razing sacred houses, desecrating burial areas and recycling the Tlingit fort represent physical and psychological conquest of the indigenous culture typically found in colonial contexts worldwide (Duncan 1990, Harris 2004, King 1976, Marie 1999, Meinig 1982, Yoon 1986). These historic contexts (period and place) affect contemporary understanding as the Battery Tower (armed fort lookout) that persists in the contemporary landscape. On one hand it serves as a historic reminder of Russian influence, a legitimate part of the development of Sitka. On the other hand, it acts as a physical reminder of Russian violence, the ongoing division of race and the use of former building materials that were imbued with Tlingit spirit.

In Sitka, both the Tlingit and Russian preference for a settlement on the promontory (‘kekur’ in Russian) of the now Castle Hill location (the highest point in town and commanding a view over the islands and channels of Sitka Sound), reinforces ‘strategic location’ as an important settlement consideration. Photo 8 depicts Castle Hill at 1827 and Photos 9-11 show Castle Hill views today. Discussing the Canadian experience, Stelter (1986:28-29) suggests the role of the state and the “military function” for colonial towns is not emphasised enough particularly where “territory lay between two aggressive empires” under ongoing “threat of war.” The Tlingit community’s segregation from the Russian settlement with a stockade illustrates this point. The military control aspect explains the choice of Castle Hill as a strategic decision, but other explanation needs mention.

Environmental determinism aids in explaining how Sitka’s natural promontory of Castle Hill was initially the Tlingit choice of fort location, then centre of the fur trade operation and governance of the Russian American Company (and later America and local government). While power and politics account for overlaying of different cultural displacements, the physical promontory (height) however weathered, remains a contemporary focal point for Sitka with its bowels retaining past remnants that continue to occupy archaeological interest for the lessons it holds of the past. New cultural geography focuses less on observing the physical environment and more on interpreting
meaning and knowledge...of socio-cultural systems...[that] belong to, and emanate from, the symbolic domain of images, signs, texts, representations (Wylie 2007:92).

At times this too can be simplistic. New cultural geography can be meaningfully supplemented by the examination of persistent features in the material landscape that represent evolution of landscape through various cultural influences, dominance and power relations. The environment as a causal factor influencing landscape need not continue to be avoided in modern studies (Buttimer 2006).

Considering the ‘Russian’ cultural influences upon Novo Arkhangel’sk, Rozman (1976) describes other early Russian towns that:

characteristically had two centres, the kreml’ or residence of the local prince (royalty) and the market within the posad (p 49).

The settlement development also resembles French’s (1983) discussion of very early Russian towns, again emphasising physical geography:

commencing as a single walled cell with a location, invariably on a good defensive site, commonly a high bluff overlooking a river…would lead this first cell to be called a high town (p 237).

Rozman (1976:47-52) speaks of the ‘kreml’ which, during the 15th century, was established at strategic locations and housed military and administrative offices, major churches, cathedrals, and the residence of the local prince and/or chief people.

‘Kreml’ functions would be typical of those in a higher order settlement. Christaller’s Central Place Theory (1966) can apply to explain the Kreml function as a ‘central place.’ Sitka was administrative headquarters from 1808 (Gibson 1978) serving as central place to the RAC ‘hinterland’ of fur trading activities for posts down the west coast to Fort Ross in California. Swagel (2007) writes of Sitka as:

the most substantial European settlement on the West Coast of North America…in the 1840s and 1850s…when Seattle barely existed and Los Angeles was mostly a mission, Novo-Arkhangelsk boasted a metal forge and a sawmill, a college and a 40-bed hospital, even a scientific station (p 28).

In this larger geographic context, the location of Russia’ permanent settlement in Sitka Sound was also logical. Sitka’s warehousing facilities provided a central link across the Pacific for markets in Russia also giving it a ‘higher order’ centre status with its broader administrative and strategic controls.
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In the early Russian town development, a new second cell or commercial quarter (posad) is added as the population increases (French 1983:237). In Sitka, a defined Tlingit marketplace and Russian merchant trading place developed that was located closer to the governor’s house though not as a result of population increase, but perhaps the threat of Tlingit attack. This development represents a variation on Von Thünen’s (1966 [1826]) concentric ring theory. Figure 7 illustrates the location of the chief of the RAC residence, the walled fort that surrounded it, and the marketplace areas separated for Tlingit and Russian merchants. Central core street patterns and ringed urban development in Bukhara is similarly traced back to Islamic and central Asian influences by Sobti (2005:221). French (1983) mentions ‘trade corners’ where artisans could concentrate on their metal working and other trades in Moscow. Over time they were pushed outward with most noxious aspects moving to the outer cell, a trend supported by modern public choice theory (Mather 1986, Pinch 1985). In Sitka, there were some trades (e.g., rope making), located nearer Indian River away from the settlement’s core. The ring development and the movement of noxious activities outward resembles Von Thünen’s (1966 [1826]) concentric zone theory, albeit on a limited scale (i.e., within the bounds of the stockade). This ring pattern informed the development of the spatial zones used in this analysis (see zones in Map 3 legend). Both the seat of government and the marketplace areas persist in the present landscape around Castle Hill and downtown, respectively.

Part of successful colonisation is satisfying the psychological security of settlers needing culturally familiar environments (Duncan 1990, King 1976, Meinig 1982). In an attempt to recreate home, Black (2004) writes that:

Shelikhov dreamed his settlements in Alaska as cities, where commerce, trades, crafts, and art would flourish (p 111).

This statement supports Fisher’s (1987) views of colonialism contributing to cultural development through classics and art. Increasing sophistication influences of the classical Renaissance period would affect Imperial agents with links to Russia (Stelter 1986). Archaeological digs in the Castle Hill area (1995-1998) at the former Governor Baranov’s Castle found artefacts representing Sitka’s

---

91 Black (2004) and Fedorova (1973) report no more than approximately 500-600 Russians lived in Sitka at any time.  
92 Chevigny (1943:231) describes the governor’s house at New Archangel in 1807 as: “two stories high, crowned with a beacon tower to guide ships entering the sound, stood riveted to the old Kolosh rock with long metal bolts. Upstairs were fine sleeping apartments and downstairs an office overlooking Sitka Sound, reception rooms, kitchens, and a large banquet hall with an enormous fireplace and a dais at one end for musicians. Steps from broad veranda led down to a bastion commanding the harbour with a force of sixty guns. The settlement below, surrounded by a high, strong palisade, comprised bakeries, kitchens, storehouses, a commissary and the homes and gardens of almost a thousand people. Military discipline prevailed; the guard, which saluted smartly and was changed at stated times, was composed
diverse cultural and social offerings during Russian settlement (e.g., coconuts, hazelnuts, bamboo, and exotic woods, and Japanese coins):

During the early nineteenth century New Archangel (the “Paris of the Pacific”) was the largest and most cosmopolitan settlement in the North Pacific. The settlement was a port of call for traders who also visited Europe, Asia, and the Sandwich Islands (Hawaii), and settlements along the North American west coast, (www.dnr.state.ak.us/parks/oha/castle/ introd.htm#anchor130618, accessed 03.03.2007).

Chevigny (1943:231) describes the library in Baranov ’s Castle with 1200 volumes covering a range of subjects from theology to metallurgy, navigation and literature with half in Russian, and the others in varied languages (e.g., French, German, Latin, Spanish and Italian). Pierce (1986) tells of the moveable partitions in the Chief Manager’s House that could be turned into a ballroom, creating a miniature of the Imperial Court at St Petersburgh. Balls, musical and theatrical performances were frequent diversions (p 45).

Sitka was a well-known and regarded central place along the coast, boasting its Russian heritage through clubs, dancing, official dinners.

Interactions with agents of imperialism, like the Hudson’s Bay Company, or the Russian American Company (RAC) represent British or Russian monarchy interests and thus influence culture change through their close proximity to colonised people (Meinig 1982). The indigenous in the Sitka area were most influenced by the Russian American Company (RAC) (Grinev 2005:273). The British Hudson Bay Company for example, “tended to believe in a managed, stable, socially stratified society,” contrasting gold seekers from California who also had influence thus hybridising the culture so that today there is evidence of both “retrospective Britishness,” and “heady exuberance of a gold rush,” (Harris and Warkentin 1974:289-290). The RAC, also a monopoly and agent of the monarchy, emphasised a stratified society and class structure (Black 2004). Russian relationships with Natives were influenced as:

rank and class mattered, not the color of one’s skin or the shape of one’s eyes...there was no racial discrimination whatsoever (Black 2004:278).

The culture exchange was two-way as demonstrated with Russian and Tlingit cultures amalgamating to create a new Creole culture (Bhattarai 2004, Harris and Warkentin 1974, Meinig 1982). King (1976) discusses the dualism reinforced through naming in colonial contexts, with binary constructs no longer of the sick and infirm but of men specially assigned to that duty, some of whom had seen military service at home."
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(like half-caste in India), created for ‘mixed’ heritage people. In the case of Sitka, Russian and Tlingit progeny were called ‘Creoles.’ These cultural evolutions contrast with American cultural assimilation policies that absorb minority groups into the majority White settler group (Bhattarai 2004). In Sitka, the role of the church reinforced colonial approaches to support the dominant power as discussed next.

3.2.5 THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH: LINKING STATE, ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

In Novo Arkhangel’sk, the role of religion formed a fundamental part of the social infrastructure of creating a stable home environment for settlers bringing civility to a potentially fractious (e.g., looting, pillaging) situation (King 1976:39, Schmidt 2005). While literature on the role of religion in location and economics is increasing, examples linking religious activities to the state and commercial interests focus on power aspects in cultural relationships (Cooper 1992 in Park 1994; Duncan 1990; Kong 1990, 1993; Kong and Tong 2000; Kong and Yeoh 2003; Levine 1984 in Park 1994; etc.). There is vast scope for further study (Park 1994; Kong 1990, 2000; Kong and Yeoh 2003).93

The social structures behind religious imperatives link the church and state and the church role reflects the state’s power (Isaac 1959-1960). Close theological and political ties are described by Clowney and Clowney (1982) as:

reflecting the belief that the Emperor and the Patriarch were representatives of the ‘the halves of God’ (p 36).

In Sitka, the link between the Imperial palace and the church is exhibited in the RAC being endorsed by the Tsar, in Imperial support for the Russian Orthodox Church and the Lutheran Church so that the settlers would have social and political links to their homeland and with church representatives and activities being closely linked to the RAC operation. Support for religious organisations were part of the second 20 year ukast (charter) issued in 1821 by Nicholas I wherein:

93 Kong (1990) cites (Jacobs 1992:195) who discusses how religion and economics have been frequently discussed in sociology (Weber) and in economic relations of production (Marx and Engles), however, “in many ways, such analyses adopt, albeit implicitly, the untenable assumption that religion (culture) is, ‘the super structural icing on the Marxist economic cake.’”
the Russian-American Company was bound to assist and further missionary activities of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America (Woolsey 1992:5).

RAC resources were committed to ensure a good infrastructure for the clergy (e.g., gardens, residences for priests and brothers, church schools, the Bishop’s House and numerous places of worship).

Clergy and Imperial links remained strong during colonisation. When in St Petersburg, Veniaminov [later Saint Innokenti] was invited to the Winter Palace and “became a frequent guest, often teaching the imperial children about Alaska,” (Black 1997:77). Veniaminov’s diary entries (1993) record two celebrations held in New Arkhangel’sk for the Emperor Tsar Nicolas’ 1st ascension to the throne, first on November 19th celebrated with a prayer service and:

“an all day ringing of the bells...[and] a 7 shot cannon salute from the shore batteries and the ship.” A second on December 6th another celebration of prayer service, “for the help of his Majesty the Emperor Nicholas and the entire Imperial family,” was also accompanied with cannon salutes (pp 64-66).

The cause of two celebrations was a delay in receiving news from Russia. Gibson (1978) used this to illustrate disassociation between colony happenings and Russia noting the delay in important news reaching Sitka, though the duplicate commemoration also emphasises the importance of remembering the colony’s link to Imperial Russia.

In Sitka, politics from Russia influenced the location and description of spiritual sites:

Specially designed sacred buildings link to social and political developments, representing the growth of the centralised state. Perhaps God was always embodied in local chiefs and shaman, but now kings and emperors began to take on divine characteristics as part of their right and duty to rule (Humphrey and Vitebsky 1997:8).

The role of “directed cultural change” associated with religion is discussed by King (1976:215) in Delhi after 1877 which included missionary schools. The Sitka at 1845 model displays four Orthodox churches at the height of Russian occupation: one at the Redoubt outside the study area; a second near the current Cathedral in the centre of town; a third being the new Cathedral (under construction); and a fourth ‘Kolosh’ Church, Trinity Church, built into the fortification of the Russian blockade to meet the needs of indigenous Orthodox Christians (Bill Kleinert, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000). The church and monastery development within the marketplace area is
consistent with King’s (1976) description of the Delhi experience and with the development of early Russian towns (Rozman 1976). In colonial contexts like Delhi, King (1976:198) notes the institution of religion was accommodated first, through a burial ground north of the palace walls and then a setting for community worship before associated structures like missionary societies, education establishments, or economic and social/recreational activities.

Delhi’s placement of religious supports is similar to Novo Arkhangel’sk (King 1976:253). The head of government in both places was located prominently on the highest knoll. Similar building materials to residences meant a place of worship would only be, “distinguished first by its prominent location,” (Howarth 1985:17). The Russian and Lutheran church locations are near the centre and seat of power at Castle Hill. The prestige of centre is a well-accepted human spatial value (Tuan 2001[1977]:38). The official church in Delhi was immediately left of Government House, and symmetrically opposite the house of the Commander in Chief, making a triangle connecting the head of the religious, military and government institutions. In Sitka, the Russian Church was immediately right of the Governor’s House and the military barracks were similarly within the power triangle described by King (1976) and found in Kandy (Duncan 1990). Other religious groups had locations in lower status areas (King 1976) illustrated in the study area with Sitka’s Catholic Church developed later and in a non-central location.

In Novo Arkhangel’sk, the Lutheran Church was close to the seat of government. During field research the location was initially surprising, however, given the strong Finnish connections in the RAC, the location became justifiable and expected. Baron von Wrangell was RAC Governor from 1830 to 1835. He and his wife, and the subsequent Governor from 1838-1845 Etholen and his wife, were Lutheran. Establishing the Lutheran congregation required the RAC Board to officially seek Imperial approval. Numerous Finns lived in Sitka brought there to utilise excellent boat building and carpentry skills needed in the colony. According to Dr Jim Davis, the Lutheran worship was here about 18 years before the Russian church:

The Metropolitan in Russia wouldn’t allow a Lutheran church but they wanted to bring Finnish workers here. The Russians…promyshlenniki [fur traders] had no education, no skills, couldn’t read and write – so they had to bring someone else in. The Finns brought the skills…but did not agree to coming unless they could bring their pastor and church. The Metropolitan in Russia said no way…[it] wasn’t interested in Christianising Alaska, but also didn’t want Lutherans to be here with the church.

94 At the height of Russian settlement, Andrews (1922:58) reports 5 schools including the seminary, church schools, and girls school, all which closed after the teachers left post-transfer.
After 18 years of this knocking back and forth, the Metropolitan finally agreed that they could bring their religion as long as they didn’t look like a church…it had to look like a dwelling house. So they came—and it looked like a dwelling house. Inside there were no photographs. I have seen some photographs in Moscow—and I did a drawing - you can’t get to the Archives in Moscow anymore—they’ve shut those down – I spent 3 months there. A Russian colleague would allow him into some areas - and they wouldn’t allow me into other areas. Nobody knows why (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

The Lutheran Church structure remained less sophisticated and similar to other utilitarian Russian buildings with no external symbol indicating its religious function over time as discussed further in Chapter 6.

The Finnish motivation to come to Sitka is summarised by Alanen (2009):

Following the emergence of Finland as a Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire in 1809, hundreds of ambitious and adventurous Finns, ranging from scientists and Lutheran pastors to carpenters and laborers, found employment with the Russian America Company (RAC)...Other European groups from the region - Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Germans, and Swedes...also made their way to Alaska with the RAC, but it is the Finnish legacy that still remains most evident (http://www.finevoyages.com/FinnFest2009_Sitka-comprehensive .html accessed 10.10.2009).

Hixie Arnoldt’s husband Ole Sunde, was originally from Norway (her second husband in Sitka was from Germany). Ole came to Petersburg Alaska when he was 16 years old as it was difficult to make a living back home. A retail shop he started remains in downtown Sitka and bears the Sunde name (Interview, Sitka, 28 June 2000).

Despite the long Lutheran presence in Sitka, it was observed that “very few Tlingit go to the Lutheran church for some reason,” (Joe Ashby, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000). This may be since the RAC ‘official’ and overt support was toward the Russian Orthodox Church. Another explanation is the closed nature of the Finnish society represented as an enclave of settlers amongst the more numerous Russian inhabitants. Uno Cygnæus, Sitka’s first Finnish-Lutheran pastor wrote his sister in October 1840 illustrating this:

> The governor, or actually his wife has managed to establish a Girls’ School…She has established a boarding house where fourteen students are presently enrolled…students spend each Saturday at the Governor’s….In this way a whole bunch of them are educated into becoming quite adequately presentable women (Enckell96 2004:106).

95 Dr Davis advised during one of his Moscow visits that he “happened to meet the great-grandson of Princess Matoutoff – who was stuck in the back of a very dark storage area [in the Moscow Archives]. He was stuck in there – he was royalty – you can’t have that – so they had to give him something to do. Well he and I became pretty good friends. He came here to see me after this,” (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

96 Joe Ashby (Interview, Sitka, 7 July 2000) mentioned Maria Enckell visited Sitka in June 2000 “carrying around several shopping bags of letters from her grandfather, Uno Cygnæus,” Sitka’s first Finnish-Lutheran pastor. Enckell has since completed several publications based on these letters (See Bibliography for further details).
Establishing separate education for Lutheran students reinforces an insular aspect to preserve Finnish culture. Further separation in Finnish society is demonstrated in Chapter 5 with the spatial concentration of the Finn neighbourhood and street names.

The placement of the Lutheran Church typifies the spatial arrangements in colonial settings where physical proximity to power acknowledges a closer relationship. Cultural dualities are similarly emphasised spatially with Russian and Tlingit inhabitants having physically separated markets, cemeteries, and churches reinforcing the division. Resurrection Church was “built into the palisade” boundary (Black 2004:244) between the Tlingit village and Russian town translating mental racial divisions into spatial form. Russian churches were not to be used by the Tlingit, who attended a separate church, which:

had two doors – one for Tlingit to enter and worship, and the second that opened on the Russian side for the Bishop to enter and exit during services (Bill Kleinert, former City of Sitka groundskeeper, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

The separate entrance ways for the Russian clergy and the Tlingit believers kept both cultures physically distinct. This split can be explained in several ways. First, is that the Tlingit had lower status to the Russian settlers, though Creoles could attend the Russian churches. Second, the Tlingit Orthodox congregation worshipped in the Tlingit language thus warranting a separate building. Third, the threat of attack by Tlingit (demonstrated by the presence of the palisade) warranted physical separation in places of worship. Golovin’s 1862 Report (1979) supports the separation for protection viewpoint:

…the Kolosh almost never attend it, and when they do occasionally go inside, they do so out of curiosity; they squat down, smoke their pipes, and then walk out. At the time of the 1855 affair the Kolosh occupied the church as a vantage point from which they could inflict damage on our garrison; they held it until the end of the negotiations. They ransacked part of it and damaged the icons (p 55).

Yet compelling rationale emphasising a “qualitatively different” Russian-Native relationship, and close link between the Tlingit culture and Orthodoxy, is provided by Oleksa (1992) and Black (2004:xiii) distinguishing the Russian to other indigenous and coloniser experiences. Three examples illustrate this different nature of the Russian experience: the role of Russian Orthodox priests, the church’s involvement in the smallpox epidemic and the continued support for the Russian Orthodox Church post transfer.
The church played a key role for Tlingit inhabitants during Russian settlement. The Russian church approach to Christianisation was less ‘imposing’ than later mission efforts, as illustrated with the goodwill and efforts of priests Netsvetov\(^98\) and Veniaminov who advocated teaching in the indigenous languages and learned about the cultures in the area (Kamenskii 1985, Kan 1999, Veniaminov 1993). There is a similarity between the role of the Tlingit shaman and the Russian Orthodox priest who has a well-defined social ‘leadership’ role of the congregation:

In reality, the Orthodox priest is not just the head of the church – he’s the representative for Christ – he’s there to teach, like the Apostles (Maggie Zabinko, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

Still, several interviewees noted that it was not originally the intention for Russia to “Christianise the Natives,” (Dr Davis, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000). Maggie Zabinko added:

People converted to Orthodoxy on their own...When [the Russians] first came to Alaska, they brought their clergy to administer to the needs of the Russians. They did not expect them to convert the Natives as they did – it happened through the missionaries who were nice to them...in a church that defended the Natives against the Russian promyshlenniki (Interview, Sitka, 08 July 2000).

Father Sokolov was criticised for not conducting \textit{missionary work} in Novo-Arkhangel’sk (Black 2004:239), while Veniaminov’s efforts to appreciate the Tlingit culture facilitated syncretisation of many aspects of traditional and Orthodox beliefs (Oleksa 1992:125-126). Veniaminov\(^99\) was an exceptional human being by all accounts (carpenter, artist, musician etc.), and he personally contributed to the imprint left both on the landscape and both the Russian and Tlingit cultures (for further reading see Veniaminov Journals 1993; Pierce 1973; Kan 1999; Oleksa 1992; Black 1997, 2004). Despite the Tlingit church no longer remaining in the landscape, the nature of the Tlingit relationship with Netsvetov was so strong that his final resting place connects him to this former church. He is buried at the entry of the Tlingit church, now marked with a small stone monument and overhead by a wooden shelter with cupola and Orthodox cross (See Chapter 6, Photo 55).

Russian-Tlingit relations grew closer again through the smallpox epidemic. Though Russians were first blamed for bringing the epidemic, Tlingit people valued the cleric actions to vaccinate. The

\(^97\) See photo for illustration of Tlingit church built into palisade (Figure 80 courtesy Richard A Pierce, in Black 2004:244).

\(^98\) “Netsvetov, himself of Aleut descent, the eldest son of a Russian Old Voyageur and an Aleut, Mariia Alekseeva, of Atka,” served in the Yukon before coming in 1863 to Novo-Arkhangel’sk to become the priest to the Orthodox Tlingit of Sitka (Black 2004:240).
Tlingit population was decimated by the smallpox epidemics of 1835-1840 with Gibson (1982-83:72) estimating a drop in population from 10,000 to 6,000 in the period. The devastation of the population was interpreted erroneously as Kan (1989:98) cites Fr Ioann’s exaggerated interpretation of the epidemic:

[It] was the most important epoch in Kolosh history…the verge, at which the dominance of coarse ignorance and savagery ended and the dawn of their enlightenment and humaneness had begun (1984:434-435).

The introduction of Western diseases to New Zealand similarly impacted the Māori relationship with their tohunga (traditional healers100). The *Suppression of Tohunga Act* in 1907 outlawed Māori traditional healers and religion, undermining traditional knowledge regarding the environment, arts, spirituality and secular behaviours until it was repealed in 1962 (Consedine and Consedine 2001:68). Kan disagrees as no evidence asserts Tlingit socially disorganisation, rather that they rebuilt their society by inviting new lineages and houses to Sitka and intermarried to increase the population (Kan 1999:98-99). Tlingit sentiment toward Russians following the epidemic, both regarding their medical knowledge and good intention, along with recognising the inadequacy of their own shaman to remedy the situation is also supported by Grinev (2005:174). However, Tlingit elder, Big John, discussed a more active Tlingit response to the White religions by the shaman:

After the white man came the tribes ‗chose’ religion and white ways to survive and maintain their own cultures. The religion and white ways were chosen, not forced upon the people. All shaman around would know each other…They ‘decided’ to join with white man rather than fight (pers comms, Sitka, 08 July 2000).

In this regard, joining the White religion formed a part of the Tlingit culture survival strategy of which there are various examples over the development of the landscape.

Finally, the ongoing Russian state support of churches and schools post transfer in 1867 indicated a commitment by the church to its faraway parish. The church continued efforts to make education accessible by introducing trilingual (Native, Russian and English) teaching in contrast to unilingual and family separate policies of the Presbyterian Mission post transfer (Black 2004:247). In the latter approach, the church ‘assimilates’ indigenous cultures ‘physically,’ into the coloniser’s culture (symbolised through merging into one church doctrine and one language). Religious structures for

---

99 “Besides being a missionary, he was an educator, author, ethnologist, astronomer, naturalist, historian, master mechanic in wood and metals, and a first class watchmaker. Also he was a great traveler, musher and seaman…He was a super man physically, mentally and spiritually” (Kashevaroff 1947:np).

100 Ryan (1989:61) defines tohunga as “expert, specialist, priest.”
the indigenous people in Delhi (King 1976) and the Kandyan experience (Duncan 1990) also employed assimilation. The role of worship in assimilation provides a path from indigenous to ‘mainstream’ settler with the church effectively acting as physical gateway separating ‘us’ from ‘them,’ but also symbolically able to physically and mentally transform heathen to civilised person. The distinctive Russian colonial experience described above ended in 1867 with the divestment of its North American holdings. The context for Russian divestment is discussed in the final section on the Russian occupation of Sitka.

3.2.6 DIVESTMENT

In the last half of the nineteenth century, Russia's economy was developing slowly (more slowly than Germany, the United States, and Japan), her population was rising (with most former serfs living in rural communities), and the number of Russian radicals from the 1860s was also rising. These factors contributed to Russia divesting its Alaskan interests. The noted adversities of the remote location (climate and ‘space friction’ with the distance from Moscow), plus threatening Tlingit attacks also deterred Russia’s successful occupation (Gibson 1978:58). Further, Black (2004) asserts, the Russian presence in Alaska was never about settlement at all given settler numbers. Divestment arguments for Russia’s retreat are summarised by Black (2004) as mainly:

the impossibility of defense against foreign powers (notably Great Britain), bolstered by wildly exaggerated or nonexistent dangers: Native attacks, an influx of Indians from Western American territories, the emigration of Mormons and of hordes of gold seekers and unruly whalers. The second line of attack was criticism of the company’s activities in the American territory…which encompassed not only support for laissez-faire economics (e.g., the company’s conservation practices as measures infringing on individual freedom), but also the notion of the civilizing mission of the advanced nations, the “White Man’s Burden, [e.g., failing to “Russianize” Native men] (p 280).

After the 1867 transfer, nearly all of the Russians departed Sitka. The Russian school in Sitka closed in 1917 (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:567). In 2000, during field research, no interviewees could identify any Russians living in town. The temporary nature of colonial settlement is typical of areas where resource extraction is critical to the economy (Meinig 1982, Haycox 2002a). Such attitudes were found in British Columbia gold rush areas where most “did not

---

101 A student from St Petersburg working in the Russian gift shop who was returning to Russia in the autumn, was interviewed for this work and in 2004, a Russian born immigrant moved to Sitka, Eugene Solovyov, as noted by Swagel (2007).
expect to be there long,” and “those who stayed did so by accident,” (Harris and Warkentin 1974:299). In Sitka, in-depth interviews support this position with several people suggesting they did not expect to have remained there so long (M Sarvella, D Farrell, H Arnoldt, pers comms, Pioneers Picnic, Sitka, 05 July 2000). Meanwhile, the imprint from Russian settlement remained with the Tlingit culture.

The cross-cultural relationships and spatial implications from the Russian occupation of Sitka can be categorised with the following references from Meinig (1982:72-73): political authority, direct contact with imperial agents, culture change overall, predatory aspects of relations and manipulation of local symbols/prestige “to invoke respect, fear and admiration.” Geographic changes resulting from these characteristics include: the Russian American Company (RAC) assuming control over the central strategic location of Castle Hill; direct contact with RAC and church officials through religion and trade (though residences and markets are physically segregated); the creation of Creole, a ‘visibly distinct third people,’ (Meinig 1982:72) creating a separate social category changing both Tlingit and Russian cultures. Visible displays of the colonial presence provided physical attestations to the power relationships (e.g., Baranov’s Castle, Russian Orthodox Cathedral, fortress walls resembling a kreml and separate Native and Russian parts of town).

Hybridisation of cultures also included religion, as Russian Orthodoxy influenced schools, churches (the introduction of a Tlingit Orthodox church) and later law courts (with priests arguing on behalf of indigenous people). Tlingit customs affected Russian eating mores and caused the adaptation of religious texts in line with indigenous language, however Russians maintained their connection to St Petersburg as demonstrated by the celebrations of the Russian aristocracy, Orthodox festivals, and Russian songs. Those that remained in Sitka post-transfer further strengthened the hybridisation of the Tlingit culture through intermarriage. Tlingit were also changed around the role of the shaman with Orthodox priests often represented by those with a Creole descent in the early transfer days. Alaska overall remains the highest Orthodoxy distribution across the USA further reinforcing the influence from Russia.

A consequence of colonisation regarding Tlingit homelands sites is the geographic consolidation of settlements which Thornton (2008) translates to fewer seasonal habitation sites:
today most kwáans consist of a single permanent town or city, [meaning] areas peripheral to the present villages are less visited because of the time and costs involved in reaching them (p 37).

The influences of modern civilisation on the location and siting of the Tlingit people are further elaborated in Goldschmidt and Haas (1998):

the desire of traders and governmental officials to have the Natives congregated in larger units in order more efficiently to trade with and administer the territories; the improvement of boats enabling Natives to move to and from their summer hunting and fishing areas over longer distances; the tendency of encroaching Whites to drive the Natives away from certain areas or to deplete the fish and game in such areas; the reduction of the numbers of Natives as a result of wars and diseases, introduced with the advent of the whites, so that certain communities were nearly wiped out; and the natural desire of Natives, when possible, to live in larger communities and enjoy the benefits of wider association and larger groups for common action (p 8).

The disassociation with places is combined with changes to the Tlingit social organisation linked to the fur trade, as Oberg (1979[1937]) observes:

Trapping had always been an individual enterprise for it supplied a man, his wife and their children with necessary parts of dress and bedding. But as compared with the collective activities of fishing, hunting and the acquisition of hides, trapping for furs was of lesser importance. The coming of the fur trade disturbed this balance, the individual activity of trapping was now given a centre place in the economy...With the intensification of fur hunting, the fur bearing animals began to lessen in number with the consequence that the formerly undivided clan territories began to be cut up in to small sections, to each of which an individual laid claim (pp 60-61).

This change included a major shift for the Tlingit from the subsistent use of natural products, to the overuse and destruction of the sea otter population,102 and moved the Tlingit social orientation from a communal to a more individual focus regarding the means of production (Oberg 1979[1937]:107). The evolution to the Tlingit social structure would continue through other dramatic events post-transfer, including the introduction of the Presbyterian Mission. These actions are discussed in the next section, the American settlement of Sitka, which introduces a new colonisation approach. In a parallel to James Belich’s (2001) metaphor of Paradise Reforged, the more recent settlers to the area adapted a new culture that fits within American policies and practices, yet remains distinct from the contiguous states.

102 “Before the advent of the White man the Indian valued furs in the following order: sea otter; marten; beaver; otter; black fox; cross fox; mink; wolverine; wolf and bear. The sea otter was the highest and the bear was the lowest in value. White traders set the following sequence: sea otter; black fox; cross fox; beaver; marten; otter; mink; wolf; wolverine and bear...The sea otter appealed to the Indian as it did to the Chinese Mandarin and the European aristocrat. The fur of the sea otter was of the ideal size reaching from the shoulder to the ankle. The fur was fine, glossy, dark brown, extremely durable and warm. Hence the general demand for it and the fact that the sea otter has gone the way of the American bison and the passenger pigeon,” (Oberg 1973:111).
3.3 American Transfer (1867-present)

For over half a century, Frederick Jackson Turner’s (1996[1920/1893]) *Frontier Thesis* formed the reference point explaining America’s westward expansion. Emphasising the role of the individual and America’s destiny to inhabit the west, Turner stressed a “form of society, rather than an area,” (p 205), comprised of people with:

> diverse and conflicting ideals and social interests, having passed from the task of filling up the vacant spaces of the continent…[They have] determination to hold fast to what is original and good…making it an open-minded and safe arbiter of the American destiny (pp 220-1).

Turner recognised free land as ‘the gate of escape’ leading to “individualism, economic equality, freedom to rise, [and] democracy,” (p 264) and the ‘pioneering spirit’ needed to succeed. His thesis has also been linked to the “surge of interest in preservation of Western wilderness,” (Cosgrove 2008:112). However, the drive for westward expansion was a politically motivated activity. The last frontier was conquered by economic and settlement factors that can be considered in a colonial core-periphery context familiar to European dominance over indigenous people and places. Turner does it more dramatically however, depicting it as the ‘spread of civilisation’ into the ‘wilderness.’ Still, Meinig (1982) emphasises:

> We must face the fact that there were no empty lands (though some may have seemed so to invaders at times), that every frontier represented an encroachment of one people upon territory claimed and used (however lightly) by another (p 77).

Instead of focusing upon the rugged free-spirited character depicted in frontiers people, this geographic exploration asks questions about power relationships during times of America’s expansion. It explores American cultural influences upon Sitka’s spiritual landscape development according to the space and time of establishment (Harvey 1994), and applies models of colonisation impacts (Harris 1997, 2004; King 1976; Meinig 1982). Reference to social constructions of race and nation provide insights to cross-culture group relations including impacts upon Sitka’s first American citizenry, the church and the state. This section begins by considering the rationale for America’s purchase of the Alaska territory. It then covers policy and legal aspects as context for American settlement, government supported education and mission activity, and infrastructure investment.
3.3.1 ECONOMICS AND TRADE

Economics and politics led America to acquire the Russian Territory of Alaska. Both countries sought to expand their geographic reach as illustrated in Figure 8. The new settlers in Alaska “embarked on planting a traditional American society,” like any other colonial enterprise, complete with agriculture, commerce, law and acculturating the Natives (Haycox 2002b:37-38). Settlers called ‘boosters’ or ‘boomers’ by Boorstin (depending on their plans to stay longer or shorter in the west, respectively) would go west to increase material wealth through the exploitation of natural resources before returning, “with their new wealth to the more settled regions,” (Haycox 2002b:134). This transient nature of settlement continues in Alaska today.

Figure 8: The Two Young Giants Ivan and Jonathan reaching for Asia by opposite routes (circa 1870)


A précis from the Committee on Foreign Affairs Report (18 May 1868), presents the official government record of motives for the United States purchase of Alaska including:

The laudable desire of the citizens of the Pacific Coast to share in the prolific fisheries of the ocean seas, bays and rivers of the Western World; The friendship of Russia; The necessity of preventing the transfer by any possible change of the Northwest Coast of America to an unfriendly power; The creation of new industrial interests on the Pacific necessary to the supremacy of our empire on the sea and on land; and to facilitate and secure the advantages of an unlimited American commerce with the friendly powers of China and Japan (Shiels 1967:1).
Anti-British sentiment was fresh in American minds and the acquisition of Russian America would, strengthen the position of the United States as a “maritime rival destined to humble [Britain’s] pride,” (Shiels 1967:32). Gibson (1978) similarly notes the American:

unabashed regard the entire North American continent as destined to be theirs (p 58).

Over time the oil, lumber, gold, and natural resources of Alaska would far exceed the American’s $7.2m purchase price. At the time, some critical commentators mocked the purchase as “Seward’s Folly,” “Seward's Icebox,” and the “polar bear garden,” as depicted in period cartoons in Figure 9. Seward, Secretary of State under Lincoln, is seen penniless after the transfer (right); and lands are depicted as empty housing few voters (left). One population estimate at transfer cited: 500 Russians, 1500 Creoles, 300 Americans/Foreigners, and 24,000 to 29,000 Natives (Sheils 1967:146).

Figure 9: American Cartoons Depicting the Alaska Purchase and Seward’s Folly

![American Cartoons Depicting the Alaska Purchase and Seward’s Folly](source)

Historic assessments of Alaska emphasise America’s commercial interests, politics and propaganda, lauding their prowess as traders, but often failing to acknowledge negative cultural impacts resulting from their actions (Gibson 1976, 1978; Grinev 2005 and others). Gibson (1978) for example, acknowledges Tlingit use and possession/occupancy of the territory stating:

[u]nluckily for the Russians, New Archangel had been founded right in the heart of Tlingit territory (p 53).
He presents the Tlingit as barriers or obstacles to trade failing to recognise Tlingit cultural ties to the land or their *nation* status (i.e., with governance over their own land). America’s commercial focus yielded a different result to the Russian experience. Americans for example, did not intermarry with Native people as part of colonisation (Black 2004), choosing instead to support assimilation policies (Bhattarai 2004). Trade and economic policy influenced American settlement and occupation.

Politics and economics frequently relate to the physical environment regarding trade commodities like lumber and fish, but often miss considering the influence of natural topography. Environmental determinists might recognise this gap considering how politics of settlement with political borders do not adhere to natural landscape patterns. Political boundaries are largely artificial:

> dissect[ing] natural boundaries willy-nilly, without regard to natural physiographic features, integral ecosystems, or perhaps most significant, cultural units. Alaska provides a graphic representation of this (Haycox 2002a:21).

The incongruence of politics and natural geography is illustrated with the tension created by map boundaries. Politically constructed boundaries, like between British and American territory in 1846 (49th parallel) for example:

> cut the [Hudson’s Bay Company’s] main supply line to the northern interior leaving it without a practical route to the east (Harris and Warkentin 1974:293).

In the study area, the natural trade patterns were previously established along the “north-south grain of the topography,” (Harris and Warkentin 1974:293), in the same fashion as the Russian American Company from Alaska to California.

Political geography and the need to draw lines on a map are significant to economics and colonisation through its reorganisation of space. In British Columbia, Harris (2004) illustrates how map aids reorganization of land by ‘erasing Native people’ and ‘reconfiguring’ the wilderness) thus:

> flattening space, compartmentalizing it, renaming it, and assimilating these representations into the geometry of the Cartesian grid (Brealey 2002:10, cited p 175).

Politics and economic colonisation drivers combine to illustrate an ongoing division in thinking. Human detachment from nature as illustrated by the decline of the *mappamundi* continues through
the commodification of nature and expanding capitalism (Harvey 1989). While environmental determinism can be criticised for simplistic causal relationships, in peripheral locations its role must be considered with the strong economic ties to nature. Canadian and American contemporary examples illustrate how topography impedes the economics of trade as government settlement policies require trade subsidies to support less economically sound areas. American settlement policies similarly impact the context for Sitka’s first ‘citizens’ as demonstrated next.

3.3.2 SITKA’S FIRST CITIZENS

When Russia sold Alaska, Article III of the Treaty gave all inhabitants:

“with the exception of uncivilized native tribes,” a choice to return to Russia within three years, or remain and enjoy, “…all of the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States…protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States, may from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country (Convention Ceding Alaska, 13 March 1867, in Golovin’s 1862 Report (1979:227-8)).

White settlers and ‘Natives’ were separately categorised perpetuating a colonial duality that Harris (2004:165) refers to as “the initial ability to dispossess.” American occupation represented the second dispossession from their lands for the Tlingit despite never ‘selling’ or relinquishing their interest in the land:

A Kolosian chief…angrily remarked that “true we allowed the Russians to possess the Island, but we did not intend to give it to any and every fellow that came along.” (in Shiels 1967:171).

The ‘transfer’ took place within a European land exchange system where Russia had previously laid claim and occupied the territory. The “physical power” exerted during colonisation and in the transfer reinforced the American ‘ability to dispossess,’ (Harris 2004:165). The US Army withdrew its troops from Alaska in 1877. A Customs Collector and Postmaster were the only federal officials (Andrews 1922:82), leaving a weak imperialist position hindered by a lack of colonial ‘agents’ physically present in Sitka (Meinig 1982).

103 Marxists discuss the new relationships with the land and the social structures that ensued. Land became the means of production and proletariat (workers) separately shaped the detached land for profit. In modern times the division between work and home continues further detachment from the environment by categorising work and home spaces separately.
104 Maritime provinces have received significant subsidies in Canada since Confederation when natural European trade patterns were affected by political decisions, grain subsidies in the Prairie provinces provide another example.
Settler safety post-transfer was tenuous as General Davis (Photo 12) asserts the Tlingit “were known to be both warlike and treacherous,” (Sheils 1967:148). During these “dark days for Sitka,” (Andrews 1922:80), Chief Katlian is cited saying:

The government does not care for the country. They have abandoned it. It belongs to us anyway; why not take the town and do as we wish with it? (Andrews 1922:83).

The American lack of respect toward Tlingit leaders resulted in “an era of frontal assault on their traditional way of life,” (Kan 1999:225). In response, Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994) report:

The Tlingits asserted their civil rights by tearing down the stockade segregating them from the rest of Sitka, and the Whites were afraid. There was an increase in street fighting and random killings. In 1879, an English warship “came to the rescue” of Sitka, with Navy rule following for the next 6 years (p 50).

Firsthand accounts of the early American transfer are presented in DeArmond’s works (1981, 1993, 1995), with one undated article in the Alaska Times describing early American occupation as equally ‘treacherous’ in a different way:

The soldiers, being stationed in the heart of the city, went around spreading contamination, disease and a state of demoralization which was only surpassed by that which existed at the time Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by an avenging God (De Armond 1995:19).

The lack of civil government presence is discussed by Sheldon Jackson (1880) as the US replacing the relatively civilised Czarist regime in Alaska with a “frontier experience of economic exploitation, alcoholism, and general social degeneracy,” (in Carlton 1999:23). His comments support the notion of Alaska as an American colony (Haycox 2002a, 2002b) and “Alaskan stepchild,” (Carlton 1999:23).

Describing the relationships in this post-transfer period is important to give the context in which America began its relationship with Alaska. Considering Harris (2004) and Meinig’s (1982) characteristics of successful colonial or imperial relationships, the early post-transfer days of Sitka lacked supporting government infrastructure or linkages to commercial profitability to drive settlement through a physical presence. The post-transfer period largely became an exercise in competing religions, as these were the only ‘infrastructures’ offered to settlers, an expanding duality (extended to Creole/Russian settlers), and latent afterthoughts of government tools of resettlement (e.g., Harris’s reference to maps, laws, population).
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Life for Russian, Creole and Tlingit residents in early transfer years was bleak. Two petitions\textsuperscript{105} from 1897 help understand the mood and political climate. The first was to Imperial Russian Ambassador to Washington, His Excellency Kotzebue, from over seventy Russian and Native descendants seeking protection from acts\textsuperscript{106} like the demise of the Tlingit cemetery. Blashke’s (1836) map identifies the Tlingit burial grounds, though they were not mentioned in transfer documents thus downplaying its deemed cultural importance at the transfer. The petition sought a representative:

\text{… to forbid him [Mr Brady, the Governor] to destroy buildings and other property in the process of construction of the road, we do not lay claims on the land which he now owns, despite the fact that it had been the property of our ancestors since time immemorial and was used by them as a cemetery.\textsuperscript{107}}

It is enough that he illegally took possession of that land and used some of the bones to bank his road, while he threw others in the water (in Kamenskii 1985:135).

The second petition (abridged) to the US President was signed by various native leaders including Khliantych, Head Chief of the Sitka tribe:

\begin{quote}
We know that the Russian government at the time of transfer…did not sell us as slaves but obtained certain rights and privileges. Section 8 of the Organic Act…provides the civil government for Alaska says that neither the Indians nor other persons inhabiting this territory shall be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use, occupancy, or claimed by them… we understood that civil government was sent there by Washington to punish criminals, whether white or Native and that justice would punish them equally…But in reality such equality never existed. It is true that the first four years of our life, under the protection of the American eagle remain in our memory as a period of pure peace without any cloud of misunderstanding between a white man and an Indian…but in the remaining time there was no justice at all. It does not exist right now either. It has perished…Several examples are given including 28 people who were innocently killed at the hands of the white people while their killers still enjoy total freedom (Kamenskii 1985:132).
\end{quote}

By the 1882 visit by the Krause brothers (1993[1881/1882]:173), Sitka seemed “an entirely unimportant place,” with less than 300 white residents and “complete abandonment…a matter of time.” The division between culture groups that existed since transfer was widened by the government’s actions (Governor Brady) and inactions (failure to adequately govern Sitka’s settlers). This conflict situation made a ripe environment for missionary efforts to intervene.

The stages of colonisation that applied to Russia (Harris 1997) also apply to the new American cultural experience, though the involvement of Russian and Creole groups presents two separate

\textsuperscript{105} Cited in the Russian Orthodox American Messenger (vol.1, no.12 pp240-246), in Kamenskii (1985).

\textsuperscript{106} The first petition was for a representative “to hear appeals in cases of persecution of their faith and not infrequent cases of violation of other provisions of the…treaty. The Orthodox Natives, Indians, numbering no less that 482, are continually subjected to abuses of every kind. They cannot find protection in the courts and other official places dominated by the Presbyterians,” (in Kamenskii 1985:132-3).
situations. For example, between Americans and existing inhabitants (Russians and Tlingit), the intent behind transfer documents indicates a desire by the Americans to cooperate with existing inhabitants, recognising occupancy. The conflict position is captured by safety concerns initially conveyed by post-transfer visitors (Teichmann (1983[1925]), and the continuance of the cannons pointed toward the “Indian village,” which desist over time as noted when Lady Franklin arrives in the compromise phase (Photo 13). In parallel, the Russian cultural influence via Orthodoxy, can similarly apply Harris’s (1997) framework as cooperating upon transfer, conflicting with Presbyterian mission efforts, and then compromising in present day. New American settler experiences in religion and legal systems are illustrated below.

3.3.3 GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR THE PRESBYTERIAN MISSION

A current Presbyterian website, regards ‘the surrender’ of Alaska and ‘the call to American churches’ to enter and ‘possess the land for Christ’ following the transfer:

On the eighteenth of October, 1867, Alaska was formally surrendered by Russia to the United States, and the call of God’s providence came to the American churches to enter in and possess the land for Christ, (http://www.yukonpresbytery.com/, accessed 12.04.2007).

A new kind of colonisation with the Presbyterian mission assimilation emphasis was supported by government policies to ensure speedy implementation. The church was synonymous with civilisation:

Missionaries and colonial administrators were in the business of exporting European culture and religion (Consedine and Consedine 2001:67).

Former Governor Swineford praised the Protestant success in “eradicating” Tlingit superstitions “through the influence and teachings of the Christian missionaries,” (Jones 1914:240) with eradication often referring to disposing of pests or nuisances.

Following a decade without government interest in Sitka, Captain Beardslee arrived in 1879 and:

---

107 When asked about the specific siting of the former Tlingit cemetery as depicted in Blanshke’s 1836 map, Joe Ashby responded that he had “never heard that. They buried them up behind the village, over on the upper side of Katlian. It is very, very steep…in behind the old houses. I’m sure that’s where they buried,” (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

108 Beardslee’s census at 1880 was 444 (being 92 citizens by birth, 123 citizens by naturalization and 229 citizens by treaty. This population is as compared with 400 people in 1825 and 620 people in 1818 (including 190 Russians, 72 Creoles, 173 male and 185 female Aleuts), (Andrews 1922:85).
appointed an Indian police; established more sanitary conditions in the “Ranche,” [Indian village] numbered the houses, and compelled the attendance of the Indian children at the Mission School. A school was opened in the old Russian barracks building in 1878 by Rev John Brady and Miss Fannie Kellogg of the Presbyterian Mission (later Sheldon Jackson Mission School) (Andrews 1922:85).

The American re-colonisation of Alaska brought a specific form of settler capitalism linked to the Presbyterian assimilation policies. This conscious effort by the federal government used education to integrate the Native population. The sentiment of one missionary follows (in Shales 1998):

> We should let the old tongues with their superstition and sin die-the sooner the better-and replace these languages with that of Christian civilization, and compel the natives in all our schools to talk English and English only. Thus we would soon have an intelligent people who would be qualified to be Christian citizens (S Hall Young, missionary, p 75).

Such depth and breadth of the Christian ‘conversion’ resembles the Australian experience in 1823 when Aboriginal peoples faced “two centuries of systematic oppression and genocide,” with policies that directly conflicted with “a spirituality that had sustained Aborigines for more than 40,000 years,” (Consedine and Consedine 2001:69).

The Sitka mission was located in the former Russian hospital, with approximately 120 day students and 30 boarding students (Krause-McCaffrey (trans) 1993[1881/1882]:113). The change of use between the Russian hospital is important for two reasons: One, because the Russian occupation of Sitka is referred to, which is superimposed by the Protestant mission; and two, it reports on approximately 150 Native students at the mission and the rate of spread of Protestantism within the Tlingit culture (e.g., approximately 10% conversion of the total number of Native people at transfer) by the late 1880s.

Governor Brady was a former Presbyterian priest offering government endorsement of the mission, which was the most dramatic change for the Tlingit inhabitants post-transfer:109

> While many Tlingit parents were interested in having their children learn to read, write and speak the language of the whites so as to compete with them successfully in the economic sphere, they resented the forced school attendance and other forms of Presbyterian pressure, including a prohibition on speaking Tlingit in the school and attacks on potlatches, shamanism, and other traditional native beliefs and ritual practices. In fact, the entire Tlingit way of life, from communal living in lineage houses to the use of bodily adornment, came under fire from the Presbyterians supported by military

109 Kamenskii describes another incident where the children of the man Katlian were approached by the assistant teacher of the Indian public school, Mrs Campbell, along with one of the Presbyterian brothers to tell the children that they will be going to the Presbyterian mission, apparently following the Governor’s order. The judge intervened and said, “No one had any more right to take a man’s children away than to take his head,” (Kamenskii 1985:131). Following this, the governor’s office denied giving such order to Mrs Campbell.
and civil authorities. Finally, Tlingit members of the Presbyterian Church soon realized that being Protestants did not automatically give them a respectable position in Sitka’s society and protect them from discrimination. As a matter of fact, several Presbyterian leaders and their supporters in the local government, including the future Governor of Alaska, John G Brady, became involved in various abuses of the natives, including taking over their land, exploitation of their natural resources, and so forth (Kan in Kamenskii 1985:7).

The spread of Protestantism entered all parts of Tlingit life, banning Native language and traditions as endorsed by the government.

The Protestant mission was unaccepting of any Tlingit customs and ways as the following illustrates. In early 1906, Rudolf Walton110 buried his wife and remarried under great controversy:

According to Tlingit social custom, Mary Davis, the second Mrs. Rudolph Walton, was an appropriate second wife for Mr. Walton because she was a widow and a prominent Kaagwaantaan. Rudolph Walton was Kiks.ádi, and the Kiks.ádi often married into the Kaagwaantaan clan... but the marriage was apparently arranged according to ‘heathen custom’ or according to Tlingit tradition, which is why the Presbyterian Church officials were so upset about it (Shales 1998:151).

So in order to progress, Tlingit needed to externally show their assimilation and developed a cultural survival strategy:

Walton…became educated in the beliefs and values of the Western world, and used that education, along with their knowledge of Tlingit culture and tradition, to lead us into the New World, (Shales 1998:215).

This example presents one approach to combating assimilation policies; though a high risk if traditional practices are not maintained. Kan (1999:235) points out that assimilation did not guarantee acceptance into the American community, citing separate worship facilities as evidence, with Tlingit joining Orthodoxy, “which was opposed to segregation and discrimination in principle.”

Comparable assimilation policies are found in New Zealand (Marie 1999) and Canada (Francis 1992). In New Zealand, Consedine and Consedine (2001:128-129) discuss how the philosophy of assimilation entered into Treaty history texts by assuming a Pākehā (non-Māori European) readership and little regard for how Māori readers may feel loss or dispossession. Similarly in Canada, the role of Canadian government policy toward Native people after 1812 meant:

--

110 Rudolph Walton was a man whose life story, was documented by his granddaughter, Shee Atiká shareholder Joyce Walton Shales in her doctoral thesis. Shales provides a firsthand account into Tlingit society as Walton was born into a high status Kiks.ádi family in April 1867, a month after the Russians sold their interests in Alaska to the United States, and was one of the first graduates of Sheldon Jackson School.
Officials began to think in terms of civilising the Indians so that they might assume a role in mainstream Canadian society... Reserves were created as places where Indians would be taught to behave like Whites (Francis 1992:200).

Assimilation, enforced through different aspects of the Indian Act (paradoxically including segregation policies), insisted that Native people were not capable of managing their own interests. Christianity and schooling would enable the Indian:

attain a level of equality with their White co-citizens... to aid in the development of the country, and [give] unity to the [Canadian/White] race. But not as long as they remained Indian. It was the *sine qua non* of government policy that Indians had to abandon their identity as Indians before they could become full Canadians. In other words, Indians had to be destroyed so they could be saved,” (Francis 1992:216).

In Sitka, a Tlingit elder (name withheld, pers comms, Sitka, 06 July 2000) summarised the goal of the “[Presbyterian] mission to turn Indians into good little civilised people.” Mission activity supported by the government also severely impacted Russian settlers and their church contributing to the exodus of 186 Russians in 1868 (DeArmond 1993).

Contrasting the American and Canadian government approaches with the Russians draws upon a parallel of early French occupation in Canada. The Russian approach is characterised by mixing with the Native women for mutual advantage. Khlebnikov (1994[1861]:83) comments how Russian ties with the Kolosh women “may serve to strengthen an alliance between future generations.” Many Creole formerly worked in the RAC:

111 in 1867, a Tlingit leader, speaking to an American officer, characterised the Russians as ‘good friends’ and expressed the hope that Americans would prove to be the same,” (Kan 1999:574, citing an account from Congressional transfer documents). 111

Creole were similar to the French and Native offspring, referred to as Métis, often held positions of rank and social status in the community. As in Canada, Russians had greater regard for the existing population adapting through mutual respect and mutual gain. Kan is careful to note both Russians and Presbyterians both sought to spread Christianity (in Kamenskii 1985),112 though Orthodoxy was not more tolerant of Native customs. Kan notes the Russian approach:

---

111 US Congress, House, Russian America, 40th Congress, 2nd Session 1868, Executive Doc. No. 177.
112 In some of Kan’s earlier publications (1983, 1984) he argues that Orthodoxy was more popular among the more conservative, less acculturated Tlingit since Russian missionaries lacked the power to fight them, did not want to appear as demanding as Presbyterian rivals and were less committed to westernising the Indians. He also noted that Orthodoxy offered a much more elaborate ceremonial system to a people that valued rituals, sacred artifacts, singing etc...though the meaning they attributed to Orthodox communion, baptism, icons and so on was often quite different to what the Russian missionaries preached,” (in Kamenskii 1985:12).
vaciated between considerable tolerance and a wide use of local languages and attacks on native
cultures combined with an emphasis on Russification (in Kamenskii 1985:8).

Russification was not an outcome sought for Russian occupation (Black 2004). Kan overemphasises
similarities whereas Russians and American methods were distinct, better matching experience to
Canadian results where strong French roots persist today.\(^{113}\)

The physical landscape was altered with the first Presbyterian services ‘for Whites,’ conducted by
Rev John Brady in 1878 in Baranov ’s Castle with Alonzo Austin holding Sunday school ‘for
Natives,’ in the old Russian barracks. The first Presbyterian ‘place’ of worship was at the Mission
school in 1884. The first ‘church building’ was downtown but, “so crowded and inconveniently
located...people...ceased to attend,” (DeArmond news article, Arnoldt Collection, nd.). On 24
November 1889, Dr Jackson, Rev Brady and Elder William Kelly, organised a second Presbyterian
Church,\(^{114}\) known as ‘the Community Church,’ or ‘Presbyterian Church:’

“This organization is for the white people,” announced The Alaskan, adding, “the two churches are
necessitated by the fact that the Native church could not understand a sermon in English, while the
white church could not understand one in Tlingit (news article by DeArmond, Arnold’s collection,
nd.).

These separate facilities for White and Native worshippers perpetuated the duality of colonisation
between American settlers and Native Tlingit. The intercultural issues that presented through the
religious structures of Russian Church and Presbyterian mission greatly influenced racial constructs
and subsequent intercultural relations as the next section illustrates.

3.3.4 CONSTRUCTS OF RACE AND NATION

Selected American research compiled in the early 1900s is combined with Tlingit oral history
(Goldschmidt and Haas 1998) to illustrate some racial sentiments of early American times. Passages
cannot extrapolate to all Americans but provide windows into different perspectives (Bakhtin 1986)
regarding White/non-White colonial duality. Jones (1914), Salisbury (1962 [1920]), and Oberg

---

\(^{113}\) The 30 October 1995 referendum whether Quebec should secede from Canada to be an independent state was
narrowly defeated with 50.58% voting ‘no,’ and 49.42% ‘yes.’

\(^{114}\) After about six years, the ‘white’ Presbyterian church was abandoned (coinciding with the exit of the military from
Sitka and the ‘dark days’), and the property was foreclosed upon, then sold in 1938 and converted into apartments. The
(1979 [1937]) represent historian, anthropologist and economist views with eight passages providing a sample of the breadth and depth of racial prejudice by Americans (though there were many to select from):

1 - Jones (1914) talks of the poor design, and “no care” in putting together the [Tlingit] home and criticises the Tlingit for knowing nothing about carpentry: “…the rude, dilapidated, windowless huts and hovels have been replaced with frame houses having windows and chimneys and shingled roofs…but still, the people are improving in their building and give promise of approaching, at least the ordinary home and architecture of the white man in the near future,” (pp54-55).

2 - Goldschmidt talks of the hostile environment they encountered, between Indians and whites during his visits. He refers to indigenous ownership of water and the power plant and cannery and says, “the whites, of course, would say that they are incapable of running such a thing, but the nature of aboriginal Tlingit culture makes it clear that they do have the ability,” (1998:xxviii). Regarding prejudice, he cites, “various forms of derogation to subtle expressions and unspoken assumptions about their capacities…As every student of human behaviour knows, the result of such attitudes is self fulfilling, refuelling the original prejudice,” (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:xxviii).

3 - “But as Rome was not built in a day, nor the English race evolved in a week, so they [the Presbyterians] know that it takes time to lift a savage to a high plain of civilisation. And what is more, if the vicious of their own race did not impose so many obstacles, even this could be done much quicker than it is,” (Jones 1914:244).

4 - Salisbury (1962) talks about the progress made by the Tlingit, “to one who knows the savage state of the natives 30 years ago, the progress they have made in the direction of civilisation is almost impossible to believe,” (p7).

5 - “They take what they can understand and ignore the rest; therefore they have the simplest of beliefs- that of a loving, almighty god. It is vain to expect much more from them and why should we?” (Salisbury 1962:209).

6 - “They no longer wear blankets and deer skin moccasins. They are suitably dressed and in most cases in modern attire…of course when it comes to accepting the white man’s ways and ideas concerning many things, they suit themselves,” (Salisbury 1962:11).

7 - “The men on the cannery boats also would tell the Natives to go away, and when we protested, it never did any good. They always threatened us with jail, if we didn’t shut up,” (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:140).

8 - “During the present century, the Tlingit have become American citizens, they vote and pay taxes. This equality is really more apparent than real…favouritism and discrimination in the giving of fishing and traffic licences and the preference of white employers for white labour, make the lot of the Tlingit economically difficult,” (Oberg 1979[1937]:6).

In these examples, the Tlingit way of life is attacked and viewed as ‘inferior’ to “White ways,” or the only acceptable way of living (Shaw 2001). Tlingit housing is inferior quality to ‘ordinary’ White houses, clothing of blankets and moccasins must be changed to proper white attire, and Tlingit are not clever. ‘Progress’ is similarly assessed according to the level of Tlingit assimilation
to the White way of living. The expectation is that it will take time for the savage ways to become civilised, marking much progress after 30 years. The comments underestimate the Tlingit ability to acculturate those aspects they choose to adopt and which they pass over (Bhattarai 2004). The ability of the Tlingit is perceived lesser to White ability, with simpler beliefs. The contention that the prowess exhibited during the fur trade would not transfer to operating canneries, again underestimates the mental capacity of the indigenous people. This discrimination toward the Tlingit denotes an unlevel playing field within White structures including the justice system. Interestingly, Black (2004:276) observed no jails pre-transfer existed in Sitka, though the barracks were soon converted to one. Harris (2004:176-177) details how laws enforce geographic dispossession. Tlingit not complying with White rules were eliminated from the system.

Teichmann’s (1983[1925]) earlier spatial description of Sitka in 1868 also reflects White racial constructs of Tlingit. He suggests the furthest Tlingit dwellings were more primitive and less important, with all facing the water and built so regularly as to, “resemble the block-houses of the white settlers…with the exception of the residence of the chief by a staff flying the American flag,” (p193). Teichmann’s explanation for the house siting relates to his Western mindset presuming Native houses wish to replicate the White homes, and that distance from the American town is less important. King (1976) and Tuan (2001) discuss distance from the seat of power (centre) as having lesser importance. In contrast, Charlie Joseph Sr115 (in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:350-351), speaks of the positioning of community houses in Sitka describing the importance of each in relation to its location to each other. Teichmann notes also how the presence of the American flag must be the chief’s house assuming his association with the flag reflecting his affinity to American ways since he has greater commitment to the new country.

The above examples illustrate racial prejudices toward Natives, but competition between denominations also created duality demonstrated with animosity between Russian and Protestant missions (Kamenskii 1985; Kan 1989, 1999; Krause 1979[1885]; Oleksa 1992). In one account, Oleksa (1992) notes an example of the racist behaviour of the Americans toward the Russians in 1889 regarding religion:

115 A series of taped interviews with Charlie Joseph Sr of the Eagle Moiety, Kaagwaantaan Tribe (born December 18 1895 in Sitka and died on 5 July 1996) were conducted by Bill Brady in Sitka, 23 January 1978, and translated later into English by Charlie’s daughter, Ethel Makinen, and Nora Marks Dauenhauer. A number of his stories are set out in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994) and form useful contributions to this study.
Father Kedrofskii complained that his church should not be called ‘Russian’...if there is a ‘Russian’ or ‘American’ religion, I know of none. I know only that there is a Christian religion, to our misfortune divided into two...If you happen to address someone with a question about religion, do not ask: Do you want to have a Russian or American religion (p 174).

Kamenskii (1985:138), parish priest in Sitka for three years from 1895 noted the Presbyterian Mission defined “Orthodoxy to be the enemy of the American freedom.” When the Presbyterian boarding school burned down in 1882 it blamed the Russians for setting it alight (Krause 1979[1885]:230). Such views place Russian Orthodoxy within an ‘anti-American’ category.

The following entertaining funeral account by Fr Anatolii summarises the competition between sects, and illustrates how the government’s power strengthens Protestant and civil governance at cost to Native and Orthodox interests. An Orthodox Tlingit woman, wife of Katlian, dies and is placed in an Orthodox coffin in her place of residence, when prior to the burial, a Presbyterian funeral procession heads to an already dug up grave at the Protestant cemetery expecting the woman would be buried there:

“We saw the following picture. Two Indian policemen...and under the direction of the minister A.E. Austin and the assistant teacher of the Indian Public School, Mrs Campbell, were dragging the coffin. They were followed by Governor James Sheakley, Marshall Williams, the government interpreter Si Kostromitinov, several employees of the Presbyterian Mission and behind them, a huge crowd of Indians, stretching along the entire village and filling the air with crying, howling, and wild lamentations...Little as I know about American laws, I have a good idea nevertheless of the duties of the marshal and the governor; I understand very well that property issues are not within their jurisdiction but within that of the court.” Kamenskii confronted Mr Marshal, particularly for disposing of his priestly regalia on and near the coffin: “I consider your actions to be disrespectful of the Orthodoxy, amounting almost to violence against it...In the name of the law, I protest against the actions that have taken place here and find it impossible to perform my duties with regard to the funeral.” The governor’s response to Kamenskii, as told by Kamenskii follows: “I...a foreigner and a newcomer...was the cause of the entire trouble...he considered me a “bad” and “imprudent” man,” and since I had come to America, I should know how to behave myself...if I did not like the American laws, I could leave Sitka...On the contrary, I was trying to have these laws followed properly...when authorities interfered, the affair assumed an official significance, since the government represented of themselves were violating the freedom of worship...I had come to them not as a foreigner but as a representative of the local Orthodox church, among whose members were American citizens, and that I was defending their rights rather than my own personal ones (Kamenskii 1985:124-127).

A debate ensued with Protestant and Orthodox churches, with the Judge advising Katlian:

to ignore any interference or threats and to take the body of his wife and bury it...that he himself would choose, and to use any coffin he liked, even a cracker box (Kamenskii 1985:128).
The woman was finally buried in an Orthodox manner. However, so as not to cause offence to the Protestant casket maker, Katlian buried his wife in both.¹¹⁶

This rich account demonstrates the power used by the American government in favour of the Presbyterian Church and how these actions influenced the behaviours of others. The judiciary appeared balanced, though it is expected these matters depended upon individual integrity. The Tlingit family affected appears victimised from both religions, and it is surmised a different outcome could result without Russian priest intervention. Russian departures from Sitka would affect future preservation of Tlingit rights with greater pressure to assimilate within the White system and religion. Joe Ashby commented on the rise of the Presbyterian religion post transfer:

The Natives were all taking it up – the Presbyterians made an awful inroad into the Orthodox [worshippers] too, when they put the boarding school in there. Especially after the White men had been around for awhile - the fathers and the relatives and the mothers even…it was a big thing if you could get your kids an education – the Natives were smart – they knew that you’d need to have an education in the White man’s ways to make out (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

The important role of religious agents to represent culture groups is noted to emphasise the power held within these social structures. The links to nation (Russia and America) are also noteworthy since dualities link denomination to nation. Nation constructs are affected with cultural mixing and colonisation in similar ways to racial constructs as discussed below.

Evolving definitions of ‘nationhood’ result from legal, political, planning and policy changes by government. The Tlingit journey is compared and contrasted to Anderson’s (1988) study of Chinese in Vancouver, Harris’s (2004) study in British Columbia and work of Marie (1999) and Yoon (1986, 1991, 1999) regarding Māori in New Zealand. For this discussion, broad legislative changes affected ways Tlingit organised themselves (Thornton 2002) including establishing representative groups like the Alaska Native Brotherhood and subsequently Sisterhood. Local planning and zoning changes (e.g., national designations, historic designations) within Sitka and at the state level are also considered alongside the drive for ‘statehood’ and what that meant to Alaska in terms of policies and access to services.

¹¹⁶ Regarding the placement and prioritisation of coffins, “…The governor and the marshal found out for the first time that the deceased whose body they had been carrying was lying in an orthodox coffin and not a Presbyterian one. More correctly, she was now lying in two coffins, since the mission coffin, being larger and made later, served only as a container for the Orthodox one. All of this was confirmed by Mrs Campbell…The marshal ordered Mrs Campbell to transfer the body of the deceased from the Orthodox coffin to the Presbyterian one immediately and then walked out, slamming the door. The governor confirmed the order of his colleague,” (Kamenskii 1985:126).
In Marie’s (1999:95) work on the construction of Māori ethnicity in a mental health context, she discusses how since 1984, “a new type of Māori identity…based on tribal affiliation” has been “promoted by the state,” (Durie 1998):

The term ‘Māori ethnicity’ has been subject to considerable methodological and constitutional manipulation,” with Census data including and excluding some Māori groups based on inconsistent logic since 1921, then looking to how government policies have sought to ‘close the gaps,’ used a post-colonial emphasis to coexist (through biculturalism), with now over half a million New Zealanders having a ‘feeling of cultural identity’ based on merging of ancestry and self-identity concepts (pp 95-98).

Given the changing playing field, “contemporary manifestations,” (Harris 2004:165) are required for cultural survival. Rational choice theory pertains here to discuss the Tlingit definition of ‘nation,’ within a context where the group is strategically motivated to seek incentives and rewards (such as profit sharing of resources (Marie 1999:90), or in how cultural groups respond to new ideas (passively or actively) to socially advance their cultural group (e.g., cultural transfer and exchange of ideas, knowledge skills (Marie 1999, Yoon 1986)). In such instances, culture groups may:

- heighten their allegiance to a particular ancestral location, or make an appeal to structural autonomy within the nation state to lay claim to political and economic resources, or alternatively to access institutional or local bodies where they are under-represented (Marie 1999:88).

There is success for groups that can clearly link their nationhood to resources. Thornton (2002) discusses such structural changes to the Tlingit organisation being necessary to access resources. In an indigenous ‘response’ to Harris’s (2004) effective argument of how colonisers use the system and tools to dispossess, the important survival strategy by indigenous groups involves knowing how to operate within the White system.

An overview of ‘the system’ drivers operating in Sitka will assist understanding how Sitka fits into the wider American government ‘system’ including policies and legislation and how these impact nation status. The industrial revolution in the late 1800s through to the push to support the war effort in the 1920s changed the American economy and urbanised mainland USA. It put “previously unsettled parts of the continent into one economic interdependent entity,” (Handlin 1984:71). In Sitka, economic development began with the set up of the Chlopeck Fish Company (later called Booth Fisheries Company), a cold storage plant in 1913, later two salmon canneries, and an increase in fox farming, all of which attracted people to the area. By the late 1930s, major economic
investment came from the Columbia Lumber Company of Alaska (setting up a saw mill at the mouth of Swan Lake Creek), and with the Navy plans for a $3m development on Japonski Island.

Land was needed to assist economic expansion. Mark Jacobs Jr (SASSY 1994:26) tells of land confiscation in Sitka during WW2 when the town was under martial law, and the military, “almost took Sitka’s Native village to make it into a destroyer base.” Gil Truit advised that when the US military arrived, they did not take anything to Sitka:

Japonski became the naval base – the land was taken from the Tlingit – it was not claimed under the Constitution…Other places were ‘claimed’ such as places where the Tlingit smoked and dried fish and had veggie gardens. There were several areas inhabited by the Tlingit before “statehood”…There was also a discussion about creating three reservations before statehood was granted (pers comms, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

There was differential treatment surrounding land confiscations of Natives and others:

The Navy gave some of the Natives one dollar, so they could use their property for the war. The Natives thought they were going to get their property back, but after the war the city stepped in and took the property…even today people are trying to get it back (Albert Davis in SASSY 1994:17).

Following the war, there were concerns of future economic stability\footnote{Juneau was designated the territorial capital in 1900 (effective 1906) and became the state capital in 1959. Government agencies began relocating to Juneau from the early 1900s. The Navy wireless station on Japonski and federal Department of Agriculture left in 1931 (DeArmond 1995).} if the Navy withdrew. By 1948 however, set up of the Bureau of Indian Affairs opened up a boarding school for up to 600 pupils and a 200-bed tuberculosis hospital were established in Sitka (DeArmond 1995:209-248).

The \textit{Mt Edgecumbe School and Medical Facility} provided 350 of the 796 beds for tuberculosis across the state and the sanatorium housed children from all over Alaska. Lucille Gray commented that, “Mt Edgecumbe Hospital was strictly for Natives with few exceptions,” (SASSY 1994:21). The added infrastructure brought other amenities to Sitka and an increase in population:

For the 5 previous censuses, the Sitka population was under 1400, it had no bank, phone service or paved street with footpaths interspersing planks and concrete sections. People began arriving to fill job vacancies in the 1940s and 1950s and changed the economic foundation of the place (DeArmond 1995:210).

Joe Ashby moved to Sitka in 1945 just after WW2:

I’ve been here 50 years [in 2000]. When I came they didn’t have any telephone. They only had some bush planes, no landing field (airport) and you couldn’t call anywhere in Alaska. You had to use a telegraph, dat-dat-dat, you know. Many of these people came from villages that didn’t even have a telegraph. Nowadays, it’s all satellites and emails (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).
There were no Japanese people in Sitka when Joe arrived (because of Pearl Harbour), but he recalls in 1941:

There was an old laundry –the Japanese ran this laundry, and in 1941 they [the Army] sent a detachment of 10-12 marines over there - rifles and the whole bit – and took them down across to the islands, put them on a boat and sent them down to the internment camp. The Moose Lodge tore [the laundry] down and used the land for their hall…It would be an interesting story…to see where they [the displaced Japanese] went (Interview, Sitka, 3 July 2000).

After the war, Joe noted that many of Sitka’s Japanese residents came back:

They like the fish. A lot had married Tlingit woman. After the war a number of them had Tlingit wives and they came back and picked up where they left off. You’ve got to give them credit really, because their Tlingit kids - some of them are really sharp guys working in the fish industry, canning...

(Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

Post-war, it was Japanese investment in a new pulp mill that significantly bolstered the economy and assisted Alaska’s case for statehood.

The Japanese unsuccessfully tried to enter forestry in Sitka before WW2, as Joe Ashby advised:

In the 1930s, thousands of acres of spruce and hemlock were wanted for paper, pulp etc – [the Japanese government] would do a lot of negotiating…they wanted a lot of subsidies. The Russian’s hadcornered their timber supply in the Kurils, so the Japanese didn’t have materials for rayon (for panty hose). They finally got it [approval in 1956] and the first production began in 1959. A lot of people complained initially that they would send in a whole lot of Japanese to work in the mill, but they didn’t have any labourers at all. A few foresters and a few top office men were Japanese – the rest was local labour. They offered better wages at the mill than anywhere else…They could produce 250 tons of pulp a day according to the blueprints, but they kept increasing the amount until in 1978, when they quit, they were producing twice that. They were eating these logs like mad. The environmentalists were jumping up and down about killing the bears and so on. But then the world market changed and they started making pulp down in Southeast Asia with cheaper labour (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

After the closure of the pulp mill in 1993, Sitka’s economy stabilised. Joe estimated approximately a third of those working in the mill stayed as they were “making good money, had a boat, and a really good life.” The company and State rehabilitated the workers, but notably not a lot of the Japanese stayed. Hixie Arnoldt could recall only one Japanese resident in Sitka:

When the Japanese pulp mill closed…there weren’t any Japanese left over…[there were] no labourers as all the Japanese were in upper management and everyone moved out. Now there is only one Japanese lady in town who works in the fish place. She has nothing to do with the neighbours and her husband used to come up and back to Japan (Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 2 July 2000).

Cultural conflict did not appear a factor in why the Japanese left Sitka in the 1990s. Joe Ashby recalled few occasions where excessive drink would lead to racial slurs. Overall, there was little
animosity toward the Japanese post-war; “They buried the hatchet when the pulp mill got going,” (Joe Ashby, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

Joe Ashby summarised the Japanese presence in Sitka as: “Good neighbours, good citizens,” citing several material cultural imprints on the place:

There’s a big playground – on Etolin [Street] – that had a loggers contest each year – all these savages would climb these poles and slice a piece off – the Japanese would donate the straight log – worth $1000 a piece and they’d use their equipment to get it there…Whale Park out of town was donated by Kinju Mayaki… [and] an executive housing project was all Japanese – they built new houses, built trailer parks – with beautiful lawns. One of the houses was a school with two Japanese tutors/teachers so after school the 25-30 Japanese kids had to put in a few hours in Japanese (Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 2 July 2000).

Alongside these industry changes, other physical infrastructure added during Sitka’s early growth period contributed to its economic viability. The airfield on Japonski Island was completed in 1965, and the bridge to Japonski Island in 1972 (DeArmond 1995:209-248)). The discovery of oil shifted the focus of the Alaskan economy toward the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline from 1977 when the state became the second largest US producer of crude oil after Texas.

Reflecting on the Japanese cultural influence upon Sitka, the economic nature of the relationship between Sitka and Japan dominates. While the Japanese culture notably influenced Sitka’s physical landscape, as the above examples illustrate, their persistence dominates any apparent ‘invisible’ cultural changes as these were not emphasised during interviews with elders or residents during spiritual landscape discussions. A comment from Robert Sam regarding the Shinto link to the Tlingit spiritual beliefs and an ongoing relationship with Japanese colleagues appears person specific, rather than linked to Tlingit and Japanese or American cultures. In this way, the Japanese cultural influence signifies a different cultural imprint than the previous Russian cultural influence, or the mainstream American influence.

Traversing back to Sitka’s growth period, Alaska received statehood in 1959. This change brought challenges to Alaska in how to continue economic growth but importantly, how to resolve rising Native land claims. The deferral to resolve Native land claims from the Organic Acts of 1884 and 1912 were not resolved until the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA). LaDuke (2005:247) offers ANCSA as a snapshot of how colonialism and neo-colonialism are repeated, with the discovery of oil driving a federal mandate to redress aboriginal title questions and finding a
tenable legal loophole to secure an 800-mile pipeline through the heart of Alaska (for which the government received an estimated $562 million from oil companies). As with other colonial locations, legislation was a means to resolve competing interests. Harris (2004:177) and others discuss property law and contracts as having the “capacity to annihilate space by law,” (citing Mitchell 2001) incorporating the legal concepts, ideas and values of the colonisers. There were different cultural interpretations for example for ‘Indian possessory rights:’

Depending on the group and the resources in question, this might be tens of thousands of acres, land travelled for hunting migrating caribou, or deer or moose, or in might be traditionally used fishing sites many miles from winter villages (Haycox 2002a:276).

Similarly, there are different interpretations as to the efficacy and impact of ANCSA.

One perspective is that the coloniser’s role to set legislation is increasingly influenced by the colonised. After the state recovered from a massive earthquake in 1964, Native leaders developed “substantive and meaningful” contributions (Haycox 2002a:285) to resolve the claims impasse incorporated in the ANCSA. Tanaka Chiefs Conference president Alfred Ketzler wrote of the effort:

Native leaders of Alaska have given great attention to the structure of the settlement...Indeed, the concept of the development corporation is ours (in Haycox 2002a:285).

LaDuke (2005:247) argues ANCSA was passed “without a voice or vote by Alaskan Native people or the general public.” Legislation included establishment of twelve geographically based, for profit, Native regional economic development corporations, and a payment of $962.5m in compensation for the extinguishment of Native\textsuperscript{118} title to all but 44 million acres of Alaska’s land (Haycox 2002a:283). Thornton contrasts Haycox (2002a, 2002b), stating the Act:

speaks the language of self-determination, but it does so with a distinct accent of termination and assimilation (in Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:xi).

He notes the major provisions as:

Permanently extinguishing Aboriginal land title; compensating for loss of 90 percent of Alaskan lands at $3.00 per acre, a total of $962.5 million; Natives receiving title to approximately 10 percent (44 million acres) of Alaska; Twelve regional Native corporations (a thirteenth was later added for Alaska Natives residing outside of the state) were established to control the settlement lands and money. Eligible Natives became stockholders in these for-profit corporations, though those born after 1971, “afterborns,” did not receive stock. Because ANCSA distributed the settlement money on a per capita basis, Southeast Natives, 20 percent of the state’s Native population, received some $250 million. Aboriginal hunting and fishing rights were extinguished (in Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:xxi).

\textsuperscript{118} The ANCSA defines ‘Native’ as a US citizen with $1/4$ degree or more Indian, Aleut or Eskimo ancestry, (Haycox 2002a:283).
Neither polarity adequately addresses the current complexity. Both perspectives offer glimpses of reality.

ANCSA has not put an end to the claims mentality as current Sitka resident and Tlingit elder Gil Truit states:

The Federal Government wanted to pass this act and extinguish all other opportunities to claim. But there are still land claims to be made. It is a small issue for individuals. The Sitka Tribe of Alaska includes North of Sitka to Excursion Inlet. The army moved them away and they were supposed to get replacement land. That was almost 50 years ago. There are other claims that are quite valid – under the American Indian Allotment Act of 1906, natives were allowed 160 acres each but none of that land was received (pers comms, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

So dispossession issues and claims continue. The significant change under ANCSA to the way Tlingit organise into ‘corporations’ brings them to operate in the White Western economic capitalist (profit) structure and system. Similar to when the New Zealand government created Māori ‘iwi-based’ structures (Marie 1999) the corporate structure is incongruent with traditional collective clan (and iwi) based socio-economic principles described earlier. However, simplistic interpretations of traditional structures are problematic if they hold back self-determination of indigenous groups.

Higher valued natural resources further complicate matters as increased land use competition affects ownership rights and conservation interests. LaDuke (2005:248) cautions in this regard that under the new system, the for-profit corporate structure is similar to the “termination era” of the lower 48 which liquidated many Native assets.

As with the evolution in New Zealand, Alaskan Native corporations\textsuperscript{119} have adapted and now enjoy successes (to varying degrees) within the White economy. Alongside this, is also a resurgence of traditional practices,\textsuperscript{120} such as language, education and cultural activities. Adapting and prospering within the coloniser’s legal frameworks, institutions and instruments demonstrate tenacity and resourcefulness of Native cultures. These changes to cultures and nation definitions represent areas worthy of geographic study with implications for understanding intercultural relations over time and in contemporary settings (Meinig 1982:75). Without these changes to ‘nation’ concepts, this study

\textsuperscript{119} For a comprehensive discussion on the evolution of the Tlingit social structure to compete in the white economy, see Thornton’s, “From Clan to Kwáan to Corporation: The Continuing Complex Evolution of Tlingit Political Organisation,” (2002:167-194).

\textsuperscript{120} In 1980, the federal Alaska National interest Lands Conservation Act (94 Statute 2371), establishes a: “priority for subsistence uses and wild resources over sport and recreational uses and an allocation preference for rural residents over
would not be necessary. Operating on a level-playing field (e.g., through corporate structures) can take seriously, different ways of managing land and perhaps open mindsets that engage with traditional knowledge to benefit the wider social setting across Sitka, Alaska and the global economy. Without implementing the ANCSA survival strategy, such discussions would be redundant.

**3.3.5 IMPACT OF WHITE SETTLEMENT**

This section considers impacts of American settlement and numbers of sacred places. At transfer, Americans took over existing places including *sacred places* as set out in the Transfer inventory\(^\text{121}\) on 18 October 1867 (Shiels 1967:156-165). Americans agreed to allow ownership of the following spiritual sites by the Greco-Russian Church:

the “Cathedral Church of Saint Michael (timber, situated in the centre of the City),” the “Church of Resurrection, (timber, commonly called the Kalvshian (sic) Church (situated near the Battery 2 at the palisades separating the city from the Indian village,)” a double-storied timber building for Bishop-house with outbuildings, a timber house for Church-warden, a timber house for the Deacon, timber houses for lodgings of Priests, lots of ground belonging to the Parsonages; a tomb; 3 cemeteries 2 outside the palisades and one by the Church of the Resurrection (Lutheran), and various settlers retained land ownership in fee simple [of which 5 of the 21 names were Finnish, the rest Russian].

No mention of Tlingit ownership of land was made in the transfer inventory. Population growth led to the addition of sacred places in the landscape as illustrated in Figures 10 and 11 representing growth in places of worship (from 3 at 1867 to 25 at 2007), and cemeteries (from 3 at 1867 to 9 at 2008) respectively. Joe Ashby was asked to comment on the *rate of growth* in the number of churches pre and post WW2:

More are popping up now, but nothing like after WW2. They looked on this place like a mission field. Every outfit under the sun that had a little church sent a group up here. A lot of them came up and rented houses. They’d have church in the little houses. When I came up here there was just the Presbyterians, you know the Sheldon Jackson out there. It was all Presbyterian to begin with. It was a Presbyterian mission. They had a nice Lutheran Church and the Russian Orthodox Church and that was it up until WW2. Then they started building them more. There are some nice churches around, that persisted, or survived, but a lot of them have gone. They just couldn’t make it here…converting the people…They all had the idea for some reason to convert the Natives. It attracted a lot of these [denominational] offshoots to convert these Natives to their faith as they see it (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

---

\(^{121}\) As part of the transfer from Russia to America, a full account of all the buildings (location, condition, architecture) was compiled by J L Stephens, correspondent from San Francisco as at 9 October 1867 (in Shiels 1967:149).
Earlier discussions in this chapter covered the growth context over time relating to the increased number of churches and cemeteries. Chapter 6 considers these sacred places in greater detail and discusses cultural connections in Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape. To end this chronology chapter, the impact of White settlement upon the indigenous Tlingit culture is briefly discussed next.
During Russian settlement, all aspects of colonial life were managed through the Russian American Company (RAC) as sanctioned by the Tsar (e.g., paying for church, clergy, RAC workers, establishing locations of churches, cemeteries, intermarriages, etc). Joe Ashby recalls the Russian presence that persisted through the former school at the Bishop’s House commonly referred to as ‘the orphanage:’

...that orphanage title went back to the days when there were Russians here. They would take a Tlingit wife – the Orthodox Church was pretty strict about them marrying the lady – not just live with her. When Russia sold Alaska to the US, a lot of those Russians left to go home and left the woman and the child behind. The Tlingit wouldn’t let them come back to the village, and no Tlingit Indian would marry them and adopt the child, so [the Orthodox Church] provided schools and living quarters in the Bishops House for Russian offspring. When I came here you could spot one of them by their speech and their penmanship – remember that old style that you used to have to practice – a great beautiful script – as soon as you saw it you’d think there’s a Russian Orthodox child. They weren’t really orphans either – they had a mother – but no one wanted them. The Russian church took over until the revolution in Russia – then they stopped getting money to support the Russian program because there wasn’t enough Orthodox people to support it (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

In addition to this social dimension, the Russian settlement led to some dispossession of land as “areas beyond the fort at Sitka remained in Tlingit control,” (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:35). The major influence was from the church through an evolution in some Tlingit beliefs. Retaining traditional ceremonials according to Jim Marks, was enabled as the “Orthodox church did not place the same value on acculturation [as] the Presbyterian,” (in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:442). For example, changes in burial practices over cremation represented a difference in physical form, however the retention of afterlife concepts is illustrated in repatriation efforts suggesting a hybridisation of Tlingit beliefs but not a loss of traditional concepts (see Chapter 4).

Adherence to teachings of the Russian Orthodox Church left imprints on the Tlingit culture (see Kan 1989, 1999; Oleksa 1992 and others). Russian and RAC agents, like Veniaminov, Governor Etolin (Etholen), and Baranov, each also made cultural connections and influences at an individual level (See Black 1997, 2004; Dauenhauer et al. 2008; Pierce 1973, 1984, 1986; Chevigny 1943, for fuller discussions on these agents of change). Those Tlingit that chose to adopt some or all of the Orthodox teachings continue to bear witness to the ongoing influence of the Russian church upon Alaskans in the present landscape. However, the tenacity of the Tlingit to hold on to their views around death rituals, use of shaman, place and people naming and ceremonies (e.g., potlatch, house blessing) are testament to successful cultural survival strategies. In addition, not all communities reflect the same Tlingit and Russian cultural influences. Married to the Russian Orthodox priest in
Kodiak for 20 years, Maggie Zabinko provides a different perspective on how contemporary communities reflect their Russian heritage:

On the Aleutian chain there was a lot of intermarriages – here [in Sitka] there was not. You don’t see a lot of Russian people here – you see Tlingit people here...There is a difference in the two places: here you have history – there is a good job of maintaining and preserving history. In Kodiak, you see more of the Russian and Native traditions blended...In Kodiak you get both blended (Interview, Sitka, 08 July 2000).

Therefore, while the overall Russian government interventions upon the Tlingit people do not appear as dramatic in impact as the post American transfer period, there are interesting geographic variations observed regarding the depth and breadth of cross-cultural influence.

The introduction of missionary activities is captured in Goldschmidt and Haas (1998) who summarise the cultural changes from a Tlingit perspective:

As a result of nearly eighty years of American administration and close contact with white miners, traders, missionaries, school teachers, canners and government officials, the old legal system of the Tlingit and Haida has been greatly altered. Yet there remains a surprising continuity in their customs, attitudes and patterns of behaviour where these were not in direct conflict with Christian ethics and American law. Slavery, the potlatch as a legal expression, old shamanistic rites and the secret societies are no longer found...[T]he recognition of ancient clan rights to land and the old status system and the status of earlier clans and the rules against intermarriage within clans – these are all still poignant in the lives of the Natives of the southeastern portion of Alaska (p 16).

In a cultural geographic sense, there were major changes to the Tlingit culture from White settlement: a change from matrilineal to patrilineal inheritance; the potlatch as system of ‘recording ownership’ was changed to the use of written ‘titles;’ subsistence living became less important than the ‘production for market’ (though trade is noted as always important); the Tlingit ‘evolution’ of religious/spiritual beliefs, particularly around burial practices presents a material change; and various government legal and policy changes that impacted the Tlingit land relationship as outlined previously by Thornton (2002, 2008).

Dangel’s (2003:44-46) research confirms the changing nature of subsistence use due to cultural change (e.g., Western influences and loss of traditional culture and language), depletion of resources due to development (e.g., logging and over-fishing), and increased population pressure of non-natives (e.g., settlers and tourists). The impact toward indigenous people from loss of land has been well researched with Yoon (1999) and Marie (1999) providing New Zealand examples, and LaDuke (2005) noting loss of sacred places across North America, each linking emotional well-being to the sense of place. Wilson (2002) demonstrates the importance of cultural links to land for maintaining
physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health (i.e., the four elements of life captured in the medicine wheel), using interviews of the Anishinabek (Ojibway and Odawa) in northern Ontario Canada, where she explores beliefs and values toward health, particularly how these relate to land and place. Her work is relevant in its Western ‘conceptualisation’ of health (e.g., spas, baths), noting the absence of traditional indigenous perspectives in research, and the promotion of Western-centric ways of perceiving therapeutic landscapes. Enhanced understanding of cross-cultural values can balance conceptualised landscapes by dominant cultures.

The government influence on places of worship was mostly indirect during the WW2 years with federal infrastructure investment resulting in population growth. The current role of government is focused on permitted zoning and legislative frameworks (e.g., freedom of religion protected under the Constitution and statutes). Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994) comment on the impact of the American period:

For the first time, newcomers began to settle in great numbers on Tlingit territory, seize Tlingit land, push the Natives aside, and deny them use of their ancestral land. The American missionaries and educators saw no value in the old language and culture. They were determined to wipe away all traces of the traditional religion, language and culture, replacing them with those of Victorian England and America (pp 35-36).

Regarding impact on the Tlingit people, the government influence grew over time to the peak post-transfer when segregated churches, legislation backing Indian schools and separate reserves, and legal prohibitions were placed on Native traditions like the potlatch. The government role has decreased their impact upon the culture, but another government construct (the tribal structure) was introduced leading to Native governance within a White framework. Elements of control and power are still in force, but these are increasingly controlled by Native interests.

In contrast, joint efforts by indigenous and government organisations can lead to meaningful partnerships as evidenced by the repatriation effort in Sitka in July 2000: The Journey Home. During the 1940s and 1950s, 138 Alaskans with tuberculosis (Natives and non-Natives) died while in care at Mt Edgecumbe Hospital on Japonski Island. Most bodies were placed in the Mermaid Cove mausoleum with 18 bodies in John Brown’s Beach crypt, both former ammunition bunkers, sealed to prevent the spread of the disease. “The bones are being taken back to the villages they came from,” (H Arnoldt, Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 2 July 2000). The return of the bodies to their families was significant as:
people explained they didn’t know where their parents are, or their brother or sister. It meant closure to a lot of heartache (Murray 2000:1).

Traces of cultural tension surfaced as Joe Ashby recalled issues of discrimination of Tlingit people surrounding the TB burials that were raised in the newspaper, saying “there were half a dozen nurses that had TB buried there [in the bunkers] as well,” (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000). When the suggestion of an apology for the treatment of those interred was raised by a Catholic priest, Frank Mielke, the Alaskan Transport official during the repatriation effort noted, he was quickly criticised with a response that:

These people – the Public Health Service (PHS) – saved our people - we might have all died out if it wasn’t for their efforts. The PHS nurses and doctors were praised for their efforts, and the ceremonies were partly a tribute to those efforts that saved so many (pers comms, 26 October 2009).

The exercise gave the Native community closure: “a return home” and burial in the proper manner, that is why Frank recalls, “we named it the Journey Back Home,” (pers comms, 25 September 2009).

The “Journey” incorporated several days of activities including an official commemorative ritual at SJ College with government officials on 8th July 2000 (see Chapter 7, Photo 71) where various stories were shared:

I knew a widower for over 45 years, so far as I know, she never knew where her husband was buried…She died a few years ago and never knew he was here. She never had the chance to look at his grave and say, “I’ll lie with you some time.” She never had the chance to explain to her grandchildren or great grandchildren… (Reverend speaker at The Journey Home ceremony, Sitka, 08 July 2000).

A dinner followed at the Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) Hall with indigenous rituals and a remembrance ceremony at the mausoleum site the next day.

In reflecting upon The Journey Home, it is noted in Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape, Japonski Island is absent of visible sacred places:

All of the bunkers were demolished shortly after the bodies were repatriated. A plaque was placed at a dedication ceremony on the US Coast Guard base a year after the bodies were removed (Frank Mielke, retired Alaskan Transport official, pers comms, 25 September 2009).

This repatriation history raises two aspects for considering future spiritual landscapes: the first is how residents and families of those formerly interred on Japonski Island consider the ‘invisibility’
of this former burial ground; and the second is the process of erasure in the spiritual landscape and required or desired protections for such historic cultural influences shaping it.

In *The Journey Back Home* repatriation, Robert Sam gained a resolution from Alaska Federation of Natives to entrust the Sitka Tribe to act, and followed procedures for moving graves in “a respectful and dignified manner,” (*State Committee Minutes* on Bill 187 dated 09.04.2001 http://www.legis.state.ak.us accessed 24 September 2009). This included the observance of tribal burial practices¹²² (e.g., Eskimos were buried where they are born), and religious and spiritual rituals as described by Frank Mielke:

> When the mausoleums were opened for the first time, an elaborate ceremony was held, which included a minister and a Shaman (for want of a better term) a ceremonial fire and smoke bath using herbs and the drinking of devil’s club juice at all four points, as well as the sprinkling of eagle down (pers comms, 25 September 2009); refer also http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/pe_reporter/2002/feb-mar/pros.htm accessed 26.09.2009).

Given the care and ritual observed in clearing the site and the reunification of bodies to loved ones as appropriate to their homeland with matrilineal/patrilineal family “closes the circle for a lot of families,” (Robert Sam, Interview, Sitka, 2 July, 5 July 2000). I surmise the circumstances of this effort has left Japonski Island ‘healed’ of the part of its history where it housed ‘lost’ bodies for over 50 years. Similar to the Māori *tangi*, the event offered a gathering place for those families that needed to reconcile their years of grief, offer consolation to each other and acknowledge the historic events that led to the separation of children and families, thus offering forgiveness to those involved in the past. Frank Mielke felt the Native community was not harbouring ill feelings toward the repatriation:

> It was important that these people be returned home. [Their families] were grateful rather than resentful because they were being dug up and put somewhere else...It was a win-win-win for the airport project, the Native community and those people that got ‘home’ (pers comms, 26 October 2009).

Frank recognised the series of events as “good fortune” despite years of effort where people were totally intimidated by the scope and uniqueness of the project. “Once we started doing it, things came along well,” (pers comms, 26 October 2009).

The material erasure within the landscape is another aspect to consider in Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape. A plaque remains in the visible landscape to mark the former presence of those
This remembrance puts *The Journey Home* in a different cultural context compared to the former Tlingit cemetery bones used to bank Sitka’s first roads. There was no evidence to show Japonski Island as having sacred site status (e.g., as a homelands site) for the local indigenous people prior to the establishment of the mausoleum. Thus, there is no intentional erasure of a former culturally significant site. Contextualising Sitka’s experience within a wider context, the removal of burial grounds for airport expansion purposes raises a larger issue of protections.

Erasure in the spiritual landscape and the role of protections is discussed by Kong and Yeoh (2003) referring to debates in the late 1970s in Singapore where clearing burial grounds for national development was seen by the government as in the public interest. Resistance to exhuming graves is portrayed as “battle sites [where] constituents of a nation compete for ideological hegemony,” (Kong and Yeoh 2003:73). In addition to overt destruction of such places, neglect of existing sites is a related issue. Speaking to Bill 187 ‘An Act relating to the destruction, desecration, and vandalism of cemeteries and graves,’ Robert Sam advises:

> Cemeteries in Alaska are disappearing on a daily basis because they are not protected [Sam encourages public involvement] attracting people to cemeteries, in order to cultivate the desire to preserve and protect...to take ownership. To him, a sign of a healthy community is a well-maintained and clean cemetery (State Committee Minutes on Bill 187 dated 09.04.2001 http://www.legis.state.ak.us accessed 24 September 2009).

How we conceptualise value and preservation of sacred places illustrates a dimension of how we value multi-cultural heritage as well as notions of past, present and future. Celebrating the diversity of the cultures in this multi-layered context, both invisible and visible can inform heritage value and protection dimensions. The success of the *Journey Home* event exemplifies the opportunity presented by working across cultures, across Sitka, for Alaskan families and with government. Given the important role of death in the Tlingit cosmology, multi agency sponsored events like the *Journey Home* offer an opportunity to work together and bridge gaps of the past while going a long way to create a strong future platform for cross-cultural partnerships. Such actions are particularly necessary in government agencies that define and act on the public interest.

---

122 Almost one-third of the relatives wanted their kin buried in Sitka.
3.4 Summary

This chapter has presented the relations between and within culture groups as influencers in developing Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape over the past two centuries. The chronology and analysis according to epoch of cultural settlement is an important dimension to understanding Sitka’s visible spiritual landscape. It aids the comprehensive approach by setting the site and situation context. First, stressing the importance of environment, as a shaper of landscape via climate, natural resources, food, and access as was well established in the reasons for settlement by the Tlingit people in the area. The Tlingit initially chose sites for their contribution to their means of production: summer gathering grounds, promontory for defense, winter village sites wherein occupying the area stabilised the economic advantage and to promote socio-cultural development. These environmental factors influenced the adaptation of Russian colonisation that led to the hybridisation of Tlingit and Russian cultures (e.g., religion and food). Second, acknowledging the economic drivers for colonial interests in the area, including furs, timber and natural resources, within respective national settings, and for immigrants needing to create a setting that reminded them of their homeland and way of life, remnants which are left in the area. Third, the establishment of places of worship and cemeteries throughout the development and growth of Sitka served to stabilise settlement. Fourth, exploring power relationships between culture groups and how these have influenced relationships between groups and shaped the landscape. Fifth, the strong links between the state/ruling power and religion/sacredness demonstrated by all three cultures, influenced through power relationships, and shaping siting of places of worship and cemeteries (e.g., central place of Russian church and government transposed by American government).

Highlighting social constructions and government role in shaping spiritual landscape provided another lens and context. Sitka’s development saw numerous constructions of race and evolving notions of nation (discussed further in Chapter 4). Constructions between races lead to spatial preferences and policies reinforcing segregation through applied power. Divergent cultural views of sacred places show how deep rooted sentiments and values are established and perpetuated through physical spatial constants. The physical remains, without time and place context, lose their deeper meaning. Conflict continues if past sentiments remain physically locked without resolution. While some regard the past as past, the reconciliation ceremony held in October 2004, 200 years after the Battle of 1804, is testament how deep cross-cultural wounds lie. Descendants of the Kiks.ádi
warriors and a descendent of Russian Baranov\textsuperscript{123} came together in the bicentennial observance to ‘put away’ two centuries of grief for these cultures, including a traditional Tlingit ‘Cry Ceremony’ to formally grieve lost ancestors.\textsuperscript{124} Cross-cultural diversity and conflict is not easily forgotten, and should not be underestimated.

Academics comfortably argue economics of competing land use, but fail to regard to spiritual landscape and insights linking church and state. No spiritual mention appears in Wylie’s (2007) landscape text. Yet his own Antarctic research indirectly illustrates Judeo-Christian concepts of ‘chosen’ explorers, “selected to witness privileged and exceptional scenes,” of nature, and refers popularity of walking (during 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries) as having moral connections [spiritual links] (Wylie 2007:129-130). Historic geographers focus on church and state power, but do not sufficiently address the lack of study featuring spiritual landscapes and politico-religious links in land conflicts. Religion is important. The construct polarises people with its very utterance. Yet, if cultural geographers go beyond to beliefs and structures within religion, there are useful insights for human relationships. Proctor (2006) applies such reasoning to “various forms of imperialism, nationalism, communism, and especially industrial capitalism,” (in Buttimer 2006:198), and Harris (2004) unbinds colonial influences to recognise spatial impacts of systemic structures (e.g., maps and laws) that are missed with power generalisations of ‘colonial impacts.’ The structural frameworks of the spiritual broaden understanding among and within culture groups to breathe new insights to the historic development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape. The complexities of power and ongoing intercultural land conflicts require a further disaggregation of beliefs and behaviours.

Disaggregating beliefs is complicated, particularly since during colonisation accommodations are made by all cultures (Meinig 1982) with some creating positive hybrid identities through amalgamation (Bhattarai 2004). Interestingly, these are not always static formations. In times of trial, deeper traditional beliefs can resurface, as with a plea to the God of the Sea to return a lost seafarer (2008) in New Zealand. A Tlingit elder described it this way:

You can take away from us, all that makes your culture, Christmas celebrations, Easter, your McDonald’s…if you do that, you have nothing, but for us, we still have our dances, our songs, our heritage (Tlingit elder, name withheld, pers comms, Sitka, 06 July 2000).

\textsuperscript{123} “Irina Afrosina, traces her family through Baranov’s second wife, a Native woman from Kodiak, accepted the clan’s invitation,” (Griffin 2007:1).

Do we truly understand how belief structures change in these hybrid identities? Can the deeper beliefs underpinning traditional cultures expand ways of seeing to enhance our cross-cultural understanding? The next chapter on geom mentality assists with these questions considering cultural beliefs linking cosmology and space.
CHAPTER 4: GEOMENTALITY – REVEALING SPIRITUAL AND SPATIAL BELIEFS IN CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT ATTITUDES

In the world as a whole, there are few more inviting themes for the historian of attitudes toward the earth than the role of the sacred (Glacken 1967:249).

Chapter 3 set out relations between and within culture groups during Sitka’s settlement to provide one dimension in its contemporary visible spiritual landscape. The purpose of this chapter is to consider Tlingit, Russian and American geomentalities to provide another dimension: spiritual and spatial beliefs and attitudes that influence cultural geospatial behaviours. An original contribution of this work is the formation of American and Russian geomentalities not available elsewhere. For the Tlingit geomenity, this research contributes to anthropologist Tom Thornton’s (2008) highly developed appreciation of Tlingit notions of place including space, time and experience. It makes an original contribution by adding to Sitka’s local and regional knowledge through the discussion of Tlingit, Russian and American cultural influences in the ‘spiritual landscape.’ This discussion provides insights for cultural attitudes used for explaining geospatial patterns in subsequent chapters.

Similarities between Thornton’s (2008) work and ‘Tlingit geomentality’ referred to in this research warrant further distinction. Thornton, for example, relies on similar study objects as those used to ‘reveal’ geomentality (i.e., myths, legends, songs, history, art and rituals). Many disciplines focus upon such things (e.g., sociology, psychology, history and others). Interdisciplinary social science collaborations are important ways to attain different lenses upon similar phenomena. Cross-discipline connections are intimated in Thornton’s (2008:xi) introduction where he states: “social and physical geography are inseparable in Tlingit concepts of place.” This research makes original contribution through its deliberate objective to strengthen the cosmology aspect within geomenity. Both Thornton’s (2008, 1997a, 1997b, 1992) anthropological and Yoon’s geomenity research (1986, 1991, 1994, 1999) do not formally link cosmological and spatial beliefs as advocated in the comprehensive theoretical framework illustrated in Figure 5. This research incorporates Thornton’s (2008) vital Tlingit spiritual concepts and notions of sacred places
to enhance the comparison of Tlingit, Russian and American geomentalities showcasing spiritual landscape as a rich study subject. A final distinction is the contribution geomentality makes to regional knowledge relating human-environment attitudes to cultural geospatial preferences rather than merely describing such associations (illustrated in Chapters 5 and 6).

Geomentality offers a more profound explanation of landscape than some conventional methods alone, particularly in geography and religion subjects as a reference point for a culture’s direct experience expressed on earth. To enhance how geomentality is used, two modifications are proposed: first, to acknowledge how social constructs influence the visible and invisible landscape (e.g., ideas and beliefs) since social construction theory developed after Yoon conceptualised the term; and second, to strongly link cosmology. Considering a social construct lens, geomentality links to Rapoport’s (2005:93) suggestion to focus on what is important, constant and universal regarding culture, to “dismantle ‘culture,’ in response to a problem of excessive abstractness.” Formally emphasising cosmology in geomentality improves its utility as an interpretive aid.

Religion has long had a role in making places. Alongside Glacken’s (1967) invitation to the role of the sacred, cosmological beliefs reflect and influence built environments. Pueblo and Apache buildings repeat “the cosmological order in microcosm,” and Kandy’s monarchy used religious texts to justify control through “ritualised building programmes,” (in Johnson et al. 1990:522). Still, the link between invisible spiritual beliefs and geospatial behaviours has not received sufficient attention (Yoon 2006). Geomentality provides a powerful explanatory framework for geography and religion that highlights cultural worldview and connects material and non-material expressions of culture. King (1976:11) acknowledges this ‘culture’ level of analysis as having merit to, “penetrate value systems that transform behaviour.” Concentrating Yoon’s (1986, 1991, 1994a, 1994b, 1999) prior geomentality approaches on geographic phenomenon with cosmological elements sharpens the tool for exploring spiritual landscapes, an area with much promise in cultural geography research.

This chapter approaches diversity on a level playing field to illustrate Russian and American geomentalities alongside Tlingit perspectives to give depth when explaining spatial patterns in Sitka’s spiritual landscape. A multicultural assessment is not articulated in past histories which tend to focus on how Tlingit culture changed under colonial influences. Spiritual aspects within geomentality build awareness “of the nature and significance of different cultural attachments to
place,” (Murphy 2006:10) to inform cross-cultural land debates. Contemporary applicability of research findings is enhanced by relating Sitka’s experience to New Zealand, a country where the landscape visibly reflects its indigenous culture. Discussing similarities across indigenous geomentalities may enhance understanding of the nature of indigenous culture-land relationships in a realistic way that clarifies fundamentally different attitudes (starting points in modern culture-land discussions). Having lived and worked in New Zealand’s planning and policy environment for 15 years, that country offers useful examples on how to incorporate indigenous mentality. This research contextualises Māori mental concepts alongside Tlingit observations when meaningful demonstrations might aid contemporary applications to policy and planning practice that better reflect diversity.

A study objective is to show geomentality as a powerful comparative conceptual framework able to systematically explore the inner workings of culture. The deliberate use of ‘geomentality’ classification responds to this objective, reinvigorating its use and application as a research tool beyond the existing body of knowledge (de Freitas 1998; Gilbert 1993; Yoon 1986, 1991, 1994, 1999). Ways to promote geographic value must be considered in response to Murphy’s (2006) call to better position ourselves in public debates. Rationale for focusing upon the construct ‘geomentality,’ rather than another geography of the mind, or cosmology alone, is two-fold. First, geomentality more accurately reflects the combined spiritual and spatial connection and lasting cultural attitudes. Second, the desire to apply findings to broad public settings requires a succinct and simple term: ge (earth) and mentality125 (state of mind or mindset) conveys at a basic level, ‘a culture’s state of mind toward the earth.’ Geomentality is a ‘user-friendly’ term with reasonable likelihood to bridge frequent academic-practitioner gaps while remaining accessible to public debates.126

To reveal geomentality, a number of sources are used. Cosmological study objects, like creation myths, together with other intangibles like legends, folklore and proverbs are used to reveal a depth in cultural attitudes to the environment that enhance the reading of the spiritual landscape. Myths,

125 Reference to cultural mentality toward ‘land’ implies “environment, landscape, territory, or natural surrounding,” (Yoon 1986:15) as distinguished from the legal land title system used to register ownership.
126 In a similar example, the main title of Yoon’s (2006) book on East Asian geomancy is The Culture of Fengshui in Korea. The author selected fengshui in the main title despite his admission that geomancy better reflects the subject regionwide. Marketing influenced the title decision: Yoon’s (2006:3) search of Global Books in Print in 2003 yielded 1202 responses to ‘fengshui’ titles but only 41 for ‘geomancy’ (pers comms, Auckland, 24 October 2009).
for example, hold powerful information about how a culture structures the universe and convey deep rooted geospatial beliefs. Distinctions between myths, folklore and legends are not always apparent as their veracity differs between cultures. Despite folklore fiction, Bascom (1965:284) notes merits in recording folklore to provide leads to “cultural details” otherwise overlooked and “a non-ethnocentric approach” to explore important but “esoteric features,” (cited in Yoon 2006:311). Myths are studied for a variety of reasons. In this research they are used to reveal integrating factors for humans, society, culture and nature and represent worldview, the subconscious, charters of behaviour, social structures and institutions, and various religious communications as discussed by Honko (in Dundes ed. 1984:47-48). These narratives are powerful in revealing Tlingit, Russian and American geomentalities since they are:

accepted as true and accurate accounts of the past by the people who foster them (Bascom 1975:12, cited in Yoon 1986:28).

They also “carry thumbprints of history,” (Yolen 1986:5) and link cultural activities and beliefs to the local environment. Places in the local landscape that are linked to a culture’s origin or significant functions (e.g., places of worship, afterlife and heritage) provide important links between intangible beliefs and the ‘visible spiritual landscape.’ Kong (1990:367) urges geographers to spend more attention on folk religions and myths.

This chapter shows how exploring invisible spiritual beliefs provides salient subject matter in making and re-making place. There are five sections to this chapter that focus upon three areas of inquiry: What is the nature of human nature?; What is the relationship between humanity and its natural environment? (incorporating Glacken’s (1967) notions of environmental influence and humans as geographic agents); and How individuals should relate with others? (incorporating Yoon’s (1986, 1991, 1994a, 1994b, 1999) notions of environmental ideas reflected in ways of living, and values discussed by Gilbert (1993) and de Frietas (1998)). The first section focuses upon creation myths to set the context of the origin of the universe, humanity and nature for Tlingit, Russian and American cultures. Subsequent sections focus upon cultural attitudes toward nature (including what is sacred), rules for living, death and afterlife, and nationhood. The chapter summary emphasises aspects of geomentality that express values (i.e., priority and preference). Geomentality elucidates intangible beliefs, behaviours and attitudes, linking the visible spiritual landscape in the analyses of people and place naming and geospatial patterns in subsequent chapters.
4.1 Creation Myths and Beliefs

This section first introduces creation myths and beliefs for the Tlingit, traditional Russian and American cultures, then compares these across several dimensions. A theory of creation is common for all cultures. Yoon’s prior works on geom mentality (1986:28) rely heavily on myths to explain the “origin (creation) of things in the world,” including plants, animals and humanity. The following sections use creation myth insights to extract cultural attitudes toward the environment and highlight rules for living, notions of death and nationhood.

4.1.1 TLINGIT RAVEN CYCLE STORIES

Revealing Tlingit geom mentality begins with Raven cycle myths and the Tlingit story of creation to give breadth to Tlingit beliefs and ways of living. Russian and European versions of Tlingit creation myths illustrate Tlingit values and relationship to nature and the environment as viewed from outside the culture. Tlingit cosmology references by Russian priests (Kamenskii 1985, Veniaminov 1993) and by American commentators (Jones 1914, Salisbury 1962 [1920], Teichmann 1983[1925]) assist social construction analysis, showing cultural (mis)understanding or elucidating Tlingit mentality. Traditional Tlingit concepts and numerous oral narratives are found in the Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer series (1987, 1990, 1994). The following presentation of myths is lengthy but necessary for analysis and for transmission integrity of indigenous approved texts.

For Tlingit people, creation and other Raven cycle myths occur during the “mythic age” when spirits transformed between animal and human states and clan or migration stories began. Aboriginals in Australia refer to this as *The Dreaming*. After European contact, historical events have been recorded in written accounts.\(^{127}\) Oral Tlingit traditions continue to preserve their heritage. Creation myths are more universally shared despite Raven cycle stories belonging to the clans of the Raven moiety. The selection of myths used for analysis allows for comparison across versions. Four

\(^{127}\) Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994:24) cite Chan, Chin, Inada and Wong (1991:11) who caution the use of non-Chinese autobiographies as problematic where they, “serve to authenticate racist stereotypes.” It is also important however, to view these perspectives in the time and place in which they are written. Some reading is needed to consider insights into understanding cross-cultural beliefs from a social construction perspective; though it is agreed caution is needed so as not to rewrite history.
creation myths\textsuperscript{128} are referenced to reveal Tlingit geom mentality as told by three Tlingit people and one by Russian Bishop Veniaminov. The myths collectively relate to different dimensions of the creation cycle including how the sun, moon and stars came to be, the creation of rivers and lakes, and how various living creatures received their distinguishing features (e.g., bird colouring).

The following creation myth as told by Margaret McNeil, of Tlingit descent born in Juneau, was recorded around 1850 by Heinrich J Holmberg in Sitka. This Tlingit version\textsuperscript{129} covers the main aspects found in most of the creation myths reviewed for this work and is succinct, balancing a preference to provide full oral narratives while mindful of length:

In the beginning there was no light. Raven, the most powerful of all being had made the animals, fish, trees, and humanity. He had made all living creatures. But they were all living in darkness because he had not made the sun.

One day Raven learned that there was a great chief living along the banks of the Nass River who possessed the sun, the moon and the stars in a carved cedar box. The great chief also had a very beautiful daughter. Both the girl and the treasure were guarded well.

Raven knew that he must trick the villagers in order to steal their treasure, so he decided to turn himself into a grandchild of the great chief. He flew upon a tall tree near their house and turned himself into a hemlock needle. Then, disguised as the needle, he fell into the daughter’s drinking cup. When she filled it with water, she drank the needle. Inside the chief’s daughter, Raven became a baby and soon the young woman bore a son who was so dearly loved by the chief that he gave him whatever he asked for.

The stars, the moon, and the sun were each held in a beautiful and ornately carved cedar box which sat on the wooden floor of the House. The grandchild, who was actually Raven, wanted to play with the stars and the moon and would not stop crying until the grandfather gave them to him. As soon as he had them, Raven threw them up through the smoke hole. Instantly they scattered across the sky. Although the grandfather was unhappy, he loved his grandson too much to punish him for what he had done.

Now that he had tossed the stars and the moon out the smoke hole, the little grandson began crying for the box containing the sun. He cried and cried and would not stop. He was actually making himself sick because he was crying so much. Finally, the grandfather gave him the box. Raven played with it for a long time. Suddenly though, he turned himself back into a bird and flew up through the smoke hole with the box.

Once he was far away from the small village on the Nass River, he heard people speaking in the darkness and approached them. “Who are you and would you like to have a light?” he asked them. They said that he was a liar and that no one could give light. To show them that he was telling the truth, Raven opened the ornately carved box and let sunlight into the world. The people were so frightened by it that they fled into every corner of the world. This is why there are Raven’s people everywhere. Now there are stars, the moon, and the sun and it is no longer dark all the time, (Smelcer 1993:17-18).

\textsuperscript{128}McClellan (1963, 1970a 1970b, 1975) another non-Tlingit ethnographic researcher has produced works on Tlingit myths and the connections to ceremonialism and social structure (cited in Grinev 2005:8).

\textsuperscript{129}This version is from, A Cycle of Myths - Native Legends from Southeast Alaska, a compilation of myths collected by Smelcer (1993).
Another version\textsuperscript{130} tells of how Raven created rivers by stealing water and dropping some from his beak to make the Nass River with smaller drops to make streams (Postell and Johnson 1996:7). This myth revealed the link between Raven and naming places in nature, including the Nass River (Photo 74) a common ‘place of origin’ for various Native people.\textsuperscript{131} Other Tlingit myths explain: why salmon run up the creeks; naming the north, south, east and west winds; different races and languages spoken; why tides rise and fall; how the blow hole came to be in the great killer whale; significance of the shaman’s stick holding power; creation of rain, fog, and more (Hooker 1996:12). One of these myths recorded by George Emmons is “The Whale House of Chilkat,” which explains how different bird species get their distinguishing characteristics. This additional aspect of the creation myth illustrates the breadth and range of elements captured in the Raven cycle stories, with all living things having a creation context within the traditional Tlingit belief system. In the story, Raven tells them ‘the fire ate all the flesh of the fish,’ and there was none left for them (though Raven really ate the fish himself):

Then all of the birds felt very badly, the little chickadee cried bitterly and continually wiping its eyes with its feet, wore away the feathers which ever after showed a white stripe from the corners down. The blue jay was so angry that he tied up the feathers on top of his head which ever since formed a crest, (for when the Tlingit are angry they tie the front hair up in a knot), while the robin in his grief sat too close to the fire and burned his breast red (in Hope III 1982:86-87).

The final version of creation (Raven cycle) myths, is from the Russian priest, Veniaminov (Hope III 1982:25-30). This version gives a different culture’s perspective on the Tlingit creation myth revealing how the European mind synthesises the Tlingit views within their own cultural context (e.g., flood story). The text is slightly abridged while highlighting relevant similarities and differences:

There was a time, say the Tlingits, when there was no light and all the people lived and moved in darkness. At that time there lived a certain man with his wife and sister. He loved his wife so much that he did not allow her to do any work. She spent all day sitting in the House or outside on a hillock (like the Tlingits do today.) His wife had eight live little red birds, the kind that live in California (the Tlingits call them kόon), four on each side. They were always near her and would instantly fly away from her if there was any interaction, even a very modest one, between her and men other than her husband. The husband was so jealous that he locked her in a box when he was absent. Every day he worked in the woods where he made boats or canoes. He was an expert in his craft.

\textsuperscript{130} This version is based on adapted stories in Swanton’s \textit{Tlingit Myths and Texts}, with content approved by the Sitka Alaska Native Brotherhood, satisfying the criteria of Tlingit approved origin.

\textsuperscript{131} A parallel to the Nass River place of creation is, “Jerusalem [as] in the centre and all nations/countries are around her, with the Temple Mount as the centre of the world provide common roots for Judaism, Christianity and Islam,” (Dyer in Howarth 1985: 2).
His sister, whose name was Kéetxooginsée (i.e., daughter of a killer whale) had several sons from an unknown father, but the suspicious uncle destroyed them one after the other. The Tlingits disagree among themselves about the method he used to destroy them. Some say that as soon as the uncle saw that his nephew was approaching maturity and especially if he noticed that he began to turn his attention to the uncle’s wife, he took him out fishing and upon reaching a far distance from the shore turned the boat over. Other Tlingits (in a different area) say that he sealed them up in a hollow log. One way or another, this suspicious and inhuman uncle had already destroyed several of his nephews.

Their mother could only cry about the loss of her children, but was unable to do anything about it. Once she was sitting on the beach overcome by grief, she saw a school of killer whales passing by very close to the shore. One of them stopped and started a conversation with the poor mother. Having learned about her troubles, the killer whale told her to go into the water to pick up a small rock from the bottom, to swallow it and wash it down with salt water. As soon as the killer whale went away, Kéetxooginsée immediately went in to the water, picked up a small rock (a pebble) from the bottom, swallowed some water...

As a result of this unusual trick Kéetxooginsée became pregnant and after eight months, gave birth to a son whom she considered to be an ordinary person but who was really Yéil. Before he was born, the mother hid from her brother in a secret place.

When Yéil began to grow up, his mother made him a bow and arrows and taught him how to use them. Yéil became fond of this exercise and very soon became such a skilled shot that not a single bird could fly safely by him. He killed so many hummingbirds alone, that his mother managed to make a parka for herself. To be able to indulge fully in his hunting, Yéil built himself a small hunting hut. One morning sitting there in the early dawn he saw a big bird landing near the entrance to his hut. It looked like a magpie with a long tail and a very long, thin, shining bill, strong as iron, which the Tlingits call gus’yadooli (bird high in the sky). Yéil immediately killed it and skinned it very carefully (the way it is done for a stuffed bird) and put it on right away. As soon as he did that, he felt a desire and an ability to fly. He quickly started flying upwards and flew until his beak struck a cloud and he was hanging there, being able to free himself only with great difficulty. After that he returned to his hut, took off his skin and hid it. At another time he killed in the same manner a big duck, skinned it, and put it on his mother. As soon as she put the duck skin on herself she came to swim in the sea.

When Yéil reached mature age, his mother told him about his uncle’s deeds. As soon as Yéil heard this, he immediately went to his uncle’s place. At that time his uncle was working as usual. Yéil entered the house and opened the box where his uncle’s wife was locked up. The little birds immediately flew away from her. When the uncle returned home and saw what had happened, he became very angry. But Yéil kept sitting quietly and did not even move from his place. The uncle called him out of the house and put him into a boat and went with him to a place where there were plenty of various sea monsters. When they arrived there, he threw him into the sea, thinking that once again, he had gotten rid of a new enemy. But Yéil walked on the bottom of the sea and returned to his uncle.

The uncle, seeing that he could not destroy his nephew in any regular way, said in his anger, “Let there be a flood,” And the water began to overflow the shores and rise higher and higher. But Yéil put on the magpie skin and flew towards the clouds as he had done before, until his beak hit them. He hung there until the flood stopped and the water dried out. The water reached to the clouds and covered the mountains so that his tail and feathers were wet. When the flood was completely over, Yéil began to go down to earth as a light feather. While doing that he kept thinking: “How much would I like to fall on a good place.” He did fall where the sun sets. He did not fall onto the ground, but into the sea, on a kelp (geesh): from there a sea otter took him ashore. But the Stikine people say that he fell on the Queen Charlotte Islands and taking in his beak chips of a large spruce tree, flew over other islands. In those places where he dropped some chips, such trees grow but where he did not they do not grow.

Following the flood and his falling down on earth, Yéil went east and in one place brought to life some dead boys. He did that by tickling them in the nose with the hair that he pulled out of a certain woman. In another place he made a sea gull quarrel with a heron and in this manner obtained eulachon (saak)...But of all his adventures and deeds the most remarkable one is how he obtained light...
To convince the unbelievers Yéil opened the box and immediately the sun appeared in the sky in all its splendour. But the people he discovered ran away in all directions; some to the mountains, some to the woods, and some to the water and thus became animals, birds and fishes, depending on where they ran.

There was also no fire on the earth but it was located on some island in the middle of the sea. Yéil flew there in his magpie skin. He found the island, took a live branch in his beak and flew as fast as a bird could. But the journey was so long that, the time he reached the earth, his branch and half of his beak was gone (burnt). As soon as he reached the shore, he threw the coals down and the sparks fall into rocks and trees. This explains why fire is found today in them [trans note: that is, you could make fire by striking the rocks and burning wood (Kan in Hope III 1982)]

Before Yéil there was also no fresh water on the mainland and the islands but it was located on one small island, Deikinóo, which is located not far from Cape Ommaney (the eastern cape of the Sitka Island in Tlingit Sheey Lutú. It was in a small well on top of which lay the eternal immortal guardian Ganook – the hero and the founder of the Tlingits of the Wolf Clan. Using a funny trick (which he discussed later in the tale about Ganook) Yéil obtained water, taking it his mouth as much as he could. After suffering a terrible torture he flew to the islands and the American mainland, dropping water while he flew about the land. And where small drops fell, rivers and springs run today, while where big drops fell, lakes and rivers appeared.

Finally Yéil finished everything that people needed and went east, to his place- Sheey Lutú (as it was said before), which is inaccessible not only to people but to spirits as well. This is proved by the story of one daring spirit which decided to go to the place where Yéil lived. He was punished in the following manner: the whole left side of him turned into stone. This happened because while he was moving forward, he did not look to the sides and thus missed the House of Yéil. The same thing happened to the mark representing this spirit, which is in possession of one Chilkat ixht’,” (Veniaminov, translated by Sergei Kan, in Hope III 1982:25-30).

In summary, the common elements of the Raven cycle creation myths, from both Tlingit and Russian perspectives include: Yéil (the Raven) creating the ‘world’ and all living creatures, but they live in darkness; there is a great flood, following which, Raven comes to earth and his adventures there begin; Raven steals the stars, moon and sun to bring daylight to the darkness; and Raven steals fresh water from Ganook/Petrel to create rivers, lakes and streams. Variations found in different species (e.g., birds, trees) are explained in various supporting creation myths. These elements were not presented in linear fashion rather set out independently of each other. Events occur in mythic time where notions of time and space are continuous (ongoing cyclical). The analysis of the Tlingit creation myths follow the introduction to Russian and American Judeo-Christian beliefs discussed next.
4.1.2 RUSSIAN PAGAN BELIEFS

Although no previous work on Russian geom mentality exists, it could be conjectured that revealing it fully would be a complex exercise. Russia does not have a well-defined early history like America with ‘founding documents’ that give national identity and focus. It has undergone significant change during communism, and now, despite resurgence in Orthodoxy and Christianity, contains significant ethnic diversity to raise methodological questions of how to meaningfully reveal Russian geom mentality with relevance in this study. Historic studies tend to use Orthodoxy as a starting point to examine the Russian culture (Black 1997, 2004; Kan 1999; Oleksa 1992; Veniaminov 1993). However, it is a variant of Judeo-Christian beliefs used to discuss preliminary notions of American geom mentality (see section 4.1.3 below). For this study, a greater contribution would be to see how geom mentality might help substantiate the “qualitatively different” Russian-Native relationship and the close link between Tlingit and Russian cultures projected by Oleksa (1992) and Black (2004:xiii). For this reason, this discussion focuses on earlier traditional Russian culture with pre-Christian pagan beliefs. It also considers notions of Russian nationhood that relate to the period of Russian occupation in Sitka. Chapter 3 contrasted the Orthodox and Presbyterian mission approach regarding Tlingit relationships, and comment is made on Orthodoxy aspects distinguished from Protestant Judeo-Christian beliefs in Chapter 6 when discussing sacred places.

Preliminary comments on the Russian geom mentality in this and subsequent sections are based on: a collection of 50 Russian folktales from various sources (Afanasiev 1998, Cavendish 1982, Yolen 1986); personal experience with the Russian culture; songs; and byliny which are epic verse legends told “by peasants famed in their localities for their artistic talents,” (Cavendish 1982:290). Excerpts from these sources are analysed with explanations relying on interpretive comments from Zernov (1945) who discusses the Russian religious mind, and Fedotov (1946:ix) who writes of Russian religious consciousness including “attitudes toward God, the world and his fellow men.” In terms common to this study, Zernov’s (1945:x) study objects represent Russian cosmology, looking to spiritual life, ethics, songs, arts and “religiously tinged social norms.” Both convey the strong religious connections to the environment, the forest and other markers for the dead that parallel traditional Tlingit culture (see also Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:34).

---

132 Examples include the special role of Mary as the Mother of God, or the icons and pageantry of Orthodoxy.
The Russian people were not Christianised until the end of the 10th Century (988) and joined the Eastern Orthodox Church because it best suited the Russian people (artistic, music, colour):

The Russians before conversion had neither temples nor an organized priesthood; they worshipped divine power revealing itself through the various manifestations of nature. The sun, the wind, the earth and especially the thunderstorm, were considered by them to be the vehicles of divinity (Zernov 1945:8).

Unfortunately, there is an absence of accepted Russian pagan folklore for comparative purposes. Source materials refer to a nameless “Mother Earth,” or sky, which may be a result of the evolution in beliefs and/or loss of written recordings of traditional oral history (Fedotov 1946:7). The elements: wind, frost, sun and moon are the primary features in Russian folklore. The celestial deities (e.g., sky and heavens) play a secondary role. Fedotov (1946:11) considers these are less tangible than the focus on mother earth as the cycles of winter, spring, and the importance of grain-bearing soil are important for survival. Regarding nature’s cycles, springtime is a key part of the year for Russians, a time when the personified Father Frost (winter) is overcome by the will of new life:

Every spring a Russian witnesses the resurrection of Nature. After six months of immobility and death, life comes back to the Russian land. With noise and triumph, the rivers and lakes burst the ice which has kept them imprisoned for half a year. Grass and flowers appear...birds begin to sing; the air becomes scented; men and animals feel exhilarated and reborn. Life proves once more to be stronger than death (Zernov 1945:178-9).

Many pagan beliefs honour the springtime, a tradition incorporated within Orthodoxy (Kan 1989). Personal experience with Russian Orthodoxy at Easter reveals it as an event more celebrated than Christmas. Easter and springtime connect with the seasonal ties to the land, though for the Tlingit, springtime represented a period of economic production (gathering and collecting) rather than ceremonialism (see Figure 6, Chapter 3) in line with nature’s bounty.

Figure 12 has been developed based on the main components of the traditional Russian geomentality revealed by analysing available source materials. Mother Earth and the elements are the main anchors to the structure of the universe. Spirits, humans and animals co-exist together. Movement across each occurs (e.g., between the living and afterlife, and through ancestry to connect past, present and future). Action is into and out of the earth rather that relating to heaven, similarly found in indigenous Native American beliefs (Howarth 1985). Humans have no dominion over other life forms, nor are they closer to the creator, as all living beings are connected.
In the traditional Russian pagan geomantality there was no “fall from grace” myth, nor an explicit creation story, rather Mother Earth is creator/sustainer of all living things. Another feature is the connection to the environment illustrated through the personification of nature, a sense that people and nature are part of the same whole and all are subject to natural forces. Balances govern society including people and places, male/female roles, and continuous flows between levels of existence. The following sections elaborate on these concepts.

**4.1.3 AMERICAN JUDEO-CHRISTIAN**

Judeo-Christian cosmology is explored to represent American cultural geomantality for several reasons. First, as section 4.5 will illustrate, the American nation focuses upon Judeo-Christian concepts in its founding documents (e.g., the Declaration of Independence), the national anthem, and meaning in the American flag. The ‘creation’ of the nation compares to creation myths where
Judeo-Christian concepts integrate strongly with American identity as illustrated in Figure 13. Second, America’s espoused religious freedom makes it a secular nation with the First Amendment to the Constitution legally separating church and state roles. However, a 2007 survey reports most adults (78.4%) identify as Christians. America’s early religious influences included its former British colonies status and early settlement by European migrants bringing their Judeo-Christian beliefs. Third, the American geomentality does not reflect the influence from First Nations people and therefore this cultural influence is excluded from this discussion. Despite their geographic occupation, Native Americans were identified as ‘non-Christians’ and ‘heathens’ as illustrated in Chapter 3 where a duality between indigenous and settler people was based around Judeo-Christian beliefs (e.g., mission assimilation policies and land dispossession through ‘Indian removal policies’ (Harris 2004)). Finally, while Judeo-Christian beliefs are advocated to represent American geomentality, they are also acknowledged to influence other nations (e.g., Russia noted above). As this is a preliminary and seminal work for American geomentality, it is accepted that further research in this area would contribute to expand American mentality.

Figure 13 illustrates the main elements in this preliminary American geomentality analysis showing balances governing society, humans being closer to the creator (God), and the role of the individual superseding government interventions. The Judeo-Christian story of Creation is well known, as summarised in Genesis 1: 1-31, wherein God creates the environment and humanity over a six day period, focusing on one element each day: On the first day he creates light (from the darkness); on the second day sky and water; on the third day the lands, sea and plants; on the fourth day the sun and the moon; on the fifth day birds and fish; on the sixth day animals and humans. On the seventh day of creation God rests, creating a distinction between six days of work (labour) with the seventh day set apart “to remember” the Creator God through worship (see Ten Commandments). Further discussion of the Judeo-Christian belief system is referenced in subsequent sections.

---

4.1.4 COMPARING BELIEFS

This section highlights the following origin story aspects: the creation of light from darkness; the role of the creator; the evolution of creation; and the concept of time. Later sections discuss attitudes toward nature, rules for living, death and nationhood. In the beginning, the Tlingit believe the world was in darkness, void of light, similar to the Judeo-Christian (e.g., God creates light on the first day), and other cosmologies (e.g., Yin/Yang theory for Chinese). Creating the earth from nothing sets up a notion of invisibility in ‘spirit’ concepts. One example of the invisible manifesting in the environment is when God as Creator ‘breathes life into’ humans in the Judeo-Christian faith. The Tlingit have a similar vital force or essence of life (Chinese qi - chee), or the Pueblo po-wa-ha (water-wind-breath) where, “existence is not determined by physical manifestation, but rather breath, symbolised by movement of water and wind,” (Swentzell in Horwath 1985:25). For the Tlingit, this vital force runs through all things including inanimate objects (e.g., buildings like

---

134 The Māori cosmology begins when Rāngi (sky father) and Papa (earth mother) are created from “one undivided and unknown substance,” (Yoon 1994b:307).

135 For Māori, the separation of light and darkness was “through the application to each of the mauri or life-giving essence,” (Barlow 1991:55).
houses are sacred and have life/death). Jones (1914) discusses the Tlingit view that there is spirit in everything as an:

interesting cosmology...The sun and the moon as well as the earth are the abodes of numberless spirits; they are in the woods, around lakes, along trails, in the water, rocks, snow, and in every other object. For this reason, all things are conjured and nothing is contemptuously referred to (p 237).

A key difference is the agency involved in granting the vital force to creatures. In Tlingit mythology it is inherent, but in Judeo-Christian beliefs the Creator has the active role of designing humanity.

The evolution of beliefs in the Tlingit geomentality, when adopting Christianity, may have involved a similar transference of reverence toward the nature of God as it relates to this vital force. Dr Walter Soboleff discusses how Tlingit adapted to incorporate the Christian belief system:

We have one great word in our culture: haa shageinyaa. This was a Great Spirit above us, and today we have translated that reverence to God (http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/ANCR/Values/tlingit.html, accessed 07.3.2007).

Conceptually to use a Judeo-Christian link between cultures, the transfer might relate to the invisible “God’s grace,” articulated in Russian Bishop Veniaminov’s diary entry 11 January 1828 (1993):

In school after going over all that I had previously taught, I began to teach god’s grace, stating that it is an invisible gift of the holy trinity granted to every person who decides it and not granted by merit. It is invisible and, one might say, ineffable, for one can better feel the grace than define its essence. It is better, therefore to receive it than to try to come to know it theoretically. It also spoke briefly of the means for obtaining grace (pp 68-69).

A fundamental difference is the existence of the ‘essence of life’ without human intervention in traditional cultures set out above, and the need to be obtained by certain acts, rituals, behaviours in Veniaminov’s Russian Christian view. This distinction sets up a power relationship where humanity can supersede or influence the essence of life. Interestingly, in later years, even the introduction of Darwin’s theory did not alter this position as Commager (1950) comments:

far from eliminating God, it enhanced His glory...evolution made clear that the perfecting of man was the chief object of the creative activity of the universe. According to Darwinism, the creation of Man is still the goal towards which Nature tended from the beginning...we suddenly arrive at the conclusion that Man seems now, much more clearly than ever, the chief among God’s creatures (p 84).

In contrast, in Tlingit cosmology all living creatures appear at the same time and there is no evidence that supports Raven creating dominion over life forms or making humans closer to the creator. Humans, animals and other living creatures were already present when Raven created the world from darkness. The ordering of Judeo-Christian creation in first, second, third days et cetera,
and the preferences attached to humanity contrast Russian traditional pagan and Judeo-Christian beliefs from the Tlingit creation story.

Looking closer at creation and evolution, the Judeo-Christian ‘designed earth’ notion discussed by Glacken (1967) differs to the evolutionary process illustrated in Tlingit myths. In the Tlingit mentality, Raven assists humans by stealing the sun, moon and stars, and he forms rivers and streams. Raven, though viewed as all powerful, has a more harmonious relationship with all living creatures, and is presented as part of the whole natural system and order of things. He tricks animals for his own gain (e.g., food), impregnates a woman by turning himself into a hemlock needle, befriends sea creatures including his ‘mother,’ and freely transforms between animal and human states, sometimes wearing an animal skin, other times not. Raven’s role in the origin of the earth focuses upon how he “shapes the world and gives it character...through theft” of sun, fire or water. Raven’s interactions take place during a mythical time dimension and essentially represent changes or refinements to the environment due to an evolutionary process. This contrasts Judeo-Christian traditions of creation by God over a linear six days. The Tlingit ‘creation myth’ is set in mythical, not linear time. Such notions of time in Judeo-Christian faiths lead to the emphasis on historic events (e.g., commemorating Easter, Christmas, Hanukah) whereas Native spiritual teachings are “affirmation-based” and focus on introducing “a sense of order into a chaotic physical present,” (LaDuke 2005:13). Such concepts of time also impact views of ecological preservation and how social relationships are managed as subsequent sections discuss.

Prior to ending this section, a few comments on Yéil (Raven) are useful to contrast the Judeo-Christian concept of God.

The Tlingits say that all customs and the whole way of life...came from Yéil (Veniaminov, in Hope III 1982:16).

Veniaminov refers to Raven as ‘the Supreme Being,’ illustrating his own Judeo-Christian bias as Raven has few similarities to God (who resides in heaven and is separate from humans). Raven continuously moves between levels of existence in and out of the earth (Howarth 1985). The Tlingit do not have an omnipotent “God” figure as in Judeo-Christian cosmology (Sluentzell in Howarth 136

---

136 In Māori creation myths Rāngi and Papa beget five offspring, effectively the five gods: Tawhiri (wind and storm), Tangaroa (sea and fish), Tane (forest), Tu (people), Rongo (cultivated foods) and Haumia (wild foods). In Māori myths, the gods “struggle for dominance between relationships” to cause evolutionary changes to the environment (Yoon 1994:305).
Indeed, the reasoning behind the Tlingit construct of a raven as the creator is not well explained. Along with the eagle, the raven is among the most prominent birds on the west coast. Cunning and wisdom were characteristics described by Bob DeArmond (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000) regarding ravens:

They’re very large birds…I had a big yard and would throw out large bones (from larger pieces of meat). Two ravens would use teamwork to take the bone – they could carry very large pieces – they would steal them away from the dogs (collies). One would chase the dog, the other would pick up the bone. They’re the only bird I’ve ever really watched that plays. They play games with each other. They play chicken – go to 500-600 feet, close their wings and start tumbling to the ground. The first one that spreads its wings is the chicken.

The natural ‘human-like’ characteristics of ravens could contribute to that choice of construct, though this would suggest that humans are viewed as more important than other living things, which is not the case in the Tlingit cosmology. The Raven influence could also have come from the Eastern beliefs in the Shinto religion outlined by Robert Sam (Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000). The French anthropologist Lévi-Strauss (1933) proposed a structuralist theory suggesting the raven obtained mythic status because he was a mediator animal between life and death. The raven reference is not uncommon across several cultures. In pagan times, ravens reflected war and battle or death (as ravens have been seen to eat remains). In modern times Britain keeps ravens on the grounds of Windsor Castle to ensure she will never be defeated by another power while there are ravens there.

Two different Raven characters are presented in the Tlingit creation myths: Raven the creator, who sympathises and is generous toward humans; and Raven the trickster, often selfish, cunning and sly. Hooker (1996) refers to two Ravens as father and son:

Raven was first called Kit-ka’ositiyi-qa-yit ("Son of Kit-ka’ositiviya-qu"). When his son was born, Kit-ka'osifyi-qa tried to instruct him and train him in every way and after he grew up, told him he would give him strength to make a world. After trying in all sorts of ways, Raven finally succeeded (p1).

The Russian priest (later Saint) Veniaminov also refers to two Ravens, a father and his son, though he relates his understanding of Tlingit cosmology to the Judeo-Christian cosmology where the creator Raven is a person (not an animal, as humans are viewed as superior to other living creatures). Two creators, or a creator and a companion, are commonly found in North American myths testing each others’ strength, or competing over who has greatest knowledge or creates more valuable things (Rooth 1984:180, in Dundes ed.). Raven acts like a person within this cosmology.
where he ‘obtains’ the sun, ‘gives people food and fish’ and gets angry and sends them on misfortunes:

Most of the Tlingits recognise as the Supreme Being some person under the name Yéil… Yéil can do everything: he created everything in the world: the earth, man and plants. He obtained the sun, the moon and the stars. He loves people, but often in his anger, sends them on epidemics and misfortunes. Yéil existed before he was born; he does not grow old and will never die. Every year the Tlingits learn about his existence from the coming eastern wind. Yéil’s dwelling place is where the eastern wind (sáanáxeit) blows from, which the Tlingits consider to be at the head of the river Nass… Yéil has a son but no one knows who gave birth to him and when; this son loves people more than Yéil and often by interceding with his father, delivers them from his anger. He is also the one who gives people food and fish (in Hope III 1982:25).

It is difficult to establish Raven as two separate beings. It could be that there is one Raven who evolved from creator to trickster if applying a Judeo-Christian ‘fall from grace’ perspective (i.e., when he fell down to earth to begin his earth adventures); however, this is unlikely as there is no reference to the equivalent Christian ‘fall from grace’ Raven myth. Raven could be one being with a duality in his character that typifies good and evil, particularly as dualities are common in the Tlingit structure of the world (see below). The duality differs from the Christian consequences with rules for living defining good and evil. The most plausible explanation is that stories are told during mythical ‘cyclic’ times, where our present day logic and ‘apparent’ time perspective does not relate. Traditional pagan beliefs also take place in cyclical time around the seasons and universality of life rather than applying a linear Western approach.

### 4.2 Cultural Attitudes Toward The Environment

At a basic level, traditional origin stories connect humans and the earth stressing humanity emerges from the earth, or falls from the sky or is brought forth (LaDuke 2005:15, see also Dundes ed. 1984). The ongoing connection between humans and the environment is reflected through environmental attitudes that influence subsequent behaviour. This section presents Tlingit, Russian and Judeo-Christian cultural attitudes toward nature referencing creation and other myths, proverbs and folklore to describe the nature of the human-environment relationship. The discussion begins with how humans view the environment.

Tlingit mentality reflects no boundary between different living creatures in human or animal form. All are imbued with life force and spirit. Nature is personified and all living creatures co-exist
without one dominating the rest. These attitudes are illustrated in living creatures sharing the same characteristics and qualities: the chickadee cried, the blue jay got angry, the whales start conversations and both Raven and his mother become animals when putting on the skins of a bird and duck respectively. Grinev (2005:69) refers to Tlingit beliefs of “the sun and moon [as] living beings that understood human speech.” Similarly in Māori mentality, the land, oceans, rivers, and all living things are inherently tapu (sacred) as they were created with “the power and influence of the gods,” specifically the supreme god (Io) (Barlow 1991:128). The Māori mentality, unlike the Tlingit, sets apart the human role:

all environmental resources on the earth are subject to man’s (sic) manipulation and his rule, because he is the conqueror of the ecosystem (Yoon 1986:33).

Māori beliefs are influenced by the “law of conquest” in the Māori creation myth emphasising peoples’ right and domination of the environment.\(^{137}\) The domination of nature in the Māori mentality has similarity to Judeo-Christian attitudes. In Genesis 1:27-28, God tells humans to:

Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.

Humans are able to extinguish animal life to obtain food (Glacken 1967:157) in a different manner to that articulated in the Tlingit perspective, where the connection to nature is more equal. The imbalance in Judeo-Christian views is captured with early Americans who:

revelled in a Nature that was exacting but beneficent and found its generosity a sure sign of Providential favour...a drought, a depression...[was an] outrage (Commanger 1950:29).

This example illustrates the expectation that nature is there for human bidding with ‘outrage’ if nature does not deliver. There appears a qualitative difference between the Māori mentality and Judeo-Christian along this rationale. Humans have the right to use the environment, “so long as they use and manage it properly,” (Yoon 1994b:303) placing indigenous Māori and Tlingit attitudes more closely around the consequences inherent in human-environment beliefs if the environment is abused.

Contrasting these views, Russian folklore is useful to conjecture Russian attitudes to the environment. Fifty Russian folk tales and songs were reviewed having strong reference to nature in

\(^{137}\) The following Maori proverb captures this human dominance: Te toto o te tangata, he kai - Te orange o te tangata, he whenua. Food supplies the blood of people - Land supplies food (material warfare) for people (Kohere 1951:16, in Yoon 1994b:302).
their storyline as some titles illustrate: *the Bear and the Fox; Silly Old Grey Wolf; The Crystal Mountain; The Snake Princess; The Birch Tree and the Three Falcons* (Afanasiev 1998). In a children’s story by JP Lewis (1988), a cow, Buryonka, is given magic powers to assist a peasant family. The cow that is ‘loved like family,’ is able to speak to humans, and brings back to life the family’s dead children. This illustrates the personification of animals, the triumph of the peasant over the aristocracy and the attitudes toward the forest as a foreboding place reinforcing earlier traditional Russian attitudes toward their environment and the hierarchy of society.

Black (2004) spoke to societal rank and class distinctions during Russian settlement in Alaska, and an absence of racial discrimination. In *The Birch Tree and the Three Falcons*, a soldier returning from battle meets up with the devil who mocks him for not having anything including kin (e.g., relatives to go home to) and suggests instead he stay and watch after the evil spirits’ belongings (three falcons). The soldier agrees and is walking in the garden when:

…”the first thing he saw there was a birch-tree which said to him in a human voice: ‘Please soldier, go to such-and-such a village and ask the village priest to give you that which he saw in a dream this past night.’ The soldier did as the birch tree said…[and he returned with a book]…”Thank you my good man! And now stand here beside me and read!”…a maid fair beyond compare appeared from the birch tree…the daughter of a king… “The evil spirit carried me off and turned me into a birch-tree. And as for the three falcons they are my own brothers who tried to free me and were caught up themselves.” And she no sooner finished speaking than the three falcons came flying up, struck the earth and turned into tall and handsome youths…The king and queen rewarded the soldier richly and had him marry the princess and live in the palace with them (Afanasiev 1998:113-115).

The importance of ancestry is highlighted with the mocking of having no kin. The willingness of the soldier to listen to and obey the request of a natural object (birch tree) personified by speaking with a human voice, illustrates the connection between humans and nature with neither having dominion over the other. The reward for just actions to the soldier reinforce the behaviours deemed acceptable for societal norms. That the falcons came crashing into the earth and were transformed back into men also reinforces the power within the earth to create and give life, a core part of the traditional Russian cosmology.

The co-existence of spirits and humans along with nature suggests the universalism with which Russians see life/living. Zernov (1945) comments on this connectedness of all things:

A Russian does not divide life into compartments. Classifications and subdivisions, so characteristic of the European mind, do not appeal to him. He thinks and feels along the broad lines of the general and the universal (p 177).
The Russian attitude to life as *one and undivided*, incorporates a *collective sentiment* among humans and a strong sense of the mutual dependence, perhaps a response to the vastness of the Russian plains. This vastness is exemplified in *The Enchanted Princess*, where Baba Yaga asks the personified south wind, how far away the kingdom is and the wind replies: “It would take a man on foot thirty years and a man with wings ten years to get there, but I can carry him [the man] there in three hours.” (Afanasiev 1998:85). Baba Yaga is a common figure in Russian folklore, the *Leg of Stone, a very old and toothless crone* (Afanasiev 1998:84) whose role is similar to that of a shaman, who is wise and exists between the living and afterlife (e.g., her home is *at the end of the earth* in this tale). Her ability to *summon the south wind to assist* a man to find his lost kingdom illustrates the co-dependence of the living, natural and spirit worlds. The important role of Baba Yaga is also significant, emphasising the important female role within Russian culture. It is the female Mother Earth that is creator, sustainer of life, both human and animal, with elements as supporting roles.\(^\text{138}\)

It is part of the Tlingit spiritual responsibility to “renew the Earth”, which is done through ceremonies, “so that our Mother, the Earth, can continue to support us,” (Mann in LaDuke 2005:15). In a song sung by my babushka (grandmother), ‘mother’ underpins the Russian *universalistic view*. The transliterated Russian precedes the English translation:

\begin{quote}
*Usihdga budit səntse,* Forever/always will be the sun  
*Usihdga budit miesats,* Forever/always will be the moon  
*Usihdga budit mama,* Forever/always will be mama/mother  
*Usihdga budu ya.* Forever/always I will be.
\end{quote}

In this song, the ongoing cyclic nature of life is portrayed by the enduring nature of the sun, the moon, motherhood and humanity. The mother represents Mother Earth and embodies the matrilineal aspects of society. Mother Earth is similarly at the core of Russian pagan religion, where Fedotov (1946) illustrates the soil’s fertility and support to humans:

\begin{quote}
“Beneath the beautiful veil of grass and flowers, the people venerate with awe the black moist depths, the source of all fertilizing powers, the nourishing breast of nature, and their own last resting place.”
Songs emphasise, “mother earth, the humid,” alluding to the womb, honouring not beauty but fertility, where the preference is for mother, not virgin; fertile, not pure; and black, for the best soil (pp 12-13).
\end{quote}

\(^\text{138}\) The ‘mother’ link is articulated by Māori activist, Eva Rickard: *Whenua is land. It is also the placenta within the mother that feeds the child before birth. When the child is born the whenua is treated with respect, dignity and taken to a place in the earth and dedicated to Papatuanuku – the earth mother of the Māori people. There it will nurture the child because our food and our living comes from the earth. It says to the child that this is your Papakainga and it will receive you in death. This, I believe, is the spiritual significance of the land to the Māori people* (in Consedine and Consedine 2001:102).
Many ancient cultures choose female figures and the womb to represent the birth of creation, sustenance and nourishment (Tolle 1999:164). For this reason Māori women “are described as the house of mankind,” (Barlow 1991:147). From the Tao Te Ching, Tolle (1999:164) interprets Tao as “infinite, eternally present, the mother of the universe,” a female also represents the Goddess or Divine Mother. The strong female role is also illustrated in Hayishannák’w (Old Woman Below) who “guards and supports” the post holding up the earth so it does not fall into the sea, being “so powerful that she can resist even Yéil,” (Veniaminov in Hope III 1982:33-34). The important and powerful role of caretaker of the earth is given to a female in other cultures (Ceres in Greek mythology, Māori have a similar myth about Hine-Nui-Te-Po, and in Chinese cosmology, heaven is male and earth is female). Such dominance may explain the earlier matrilineal nature of societies, prior to the patrilineal power shift that occurred in modern times.

It is fitting to sharply contrast the concepts of the fertile, nourishing, life-giving force of Mother Earth with the harsh view of the land found in the Judeo-Christian fall of humanity as it influences attitudes toward the environment. The need to work hard is a direct result of the human ‘fall from grace,’ based on Genesis 3: 17-18, where the Lord said to Adam:

You listened to your wife and ate the fruit which I told you not to eat. Because of what you have done, the ground will be under a curse. You will have to work hard all your life to make it produce enough food for you. It will produce weeds and thorns, and you will have to eat wild plants (cited in Yoon 1994b:305).

The fall from grace is reflected in the “deteriorating condition” of the landscape and “the ground…under a curse,” (Glacken 1967:162-3, 379). Parallels of the Christian and Māori views are cited by Yoon (1994:305) explaining how the mountains remain as reminders of the sins of humankind (including Maui’s brothers for Māori). In the American mentality, the need to work hard as a result of the fall is expected. In Tlingit cosmology and traditional pagan Russian beliefs, there are no fall from grace stories. In contrast, natural landmarks in Tlingit geom mentality are personified and respected (e.g., the mountain volcano Shee (Edgecumbe) is consulted with to allow Tlingit settlement, as discussed below).

139 Turner’s frontier thesis (1996[1920/1893]) also has female reference: “[t]his great American West took them to her bosom, taught them a new way of looking upon the destiny of the common man…with her material treasures,” (p 267).
140 The pole resembles the cosmic pillar found in other cultures represented by the world mountain, the cosmic tree or fire (smoke hole) (Humphrey and Vitebsky 1997:18).
Following the introduction of light, the Yin-Yang theory and Māori myth introduce dualities of Yin (tranquillity) and Yang (movement), and Rangi (earth mother) and Papa (sky father), respectively (Yoon 1986). However, this same duality is not introduced explicitly in the Tlingit creation myth, rather is implicit in other myths and ceremonies regarding value preferences for particular qualities (e.g., hard, dry, warm). In the Tlingit cosmology, the qualities associated with “dark,” include soft, wet and cold. “Light,” is hard, dry and warm.¹⁴¹ House blessings are held upon the completion of a clan house to ‘dry the house’ (and are discussed below). Also, the sea, which reflects light is seen as safe and reliable, whereas the dark and misty rainforest can be dangerous and ventured into only when food is scarce. Light represents the ‘apparent’ forces while dark represents the ‘hidden’ forces of the Tlingit world.

Regional environment influences impact cultural beliefs for the coastal dwelling Tlingit. Although Tlingit settlement inland was physically limited by dense forests and mountains, another reason for avoiding settlement inland was due to the Tlingit beliefs about the woods:

> The word Tlingit means people of the low tide. It talks a little of who we are by that alone – because we live all along the shore. The deep woods – this was a place where the dead went, so you wouldn’t often go there, (D Kanosh, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

> The Tlingit word for the afterlife had to do with the woods, the deep woods. It can be a foreboding place…there were areas used for cemeteries for several hundreds of years. They were not readily marked…you would stumble on to them. There were no ‘designated’ spaces, (G Truit, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

This regional influence is contrasted with inland dwelling Māori views toward the forest and the sea. For example, when a Māori “entered a forest, he felt himself to be among his own kin,” (Best 1977:6 cited in Yoon 1994b:300) since the forest supplied humans with canoes and tools as means to feed themselves.¹⁴²

In the Russian culture, spirits¹⁴³ reside in all of nature. Spirits (Rusalki) were male and female and dwelt in the water (rivers) and forests. They could be very dangerous, luring in young men and

---

¹⁴¹ For example, the wet and cold forest is covered with soft and rotten trees and squishy moss. In contrast, the warm and dry Tlingit home, with hard earth floor provides a healthy and strong living environment.

¹⁴² Tane-mahuta (god of the forest) considered to be a relative in the personified environment in the Māori mentality; whereas Tangaroa, the god of the sea, waged war against Tane-mahutua, thus setting an adversarial relationship and an ongoing struggle in this natural environment (Yoon 1994b: 298-299).

¹⁴³ Archpriest Anatoli writing in the mid-1800s, talks of spirits (yéik) populating the whole world. “Yéik is a spiritual being which can influence man indirectly by assuming the form of a living being: a man, an animal, a bird, a fish, etc; or directly as an invisible force which is in most cases an evil, harmful one,” (trans by Sergei Kan in Hope III 1982:62).
tickling them to death (Fedotov 1946:12). Semple (1911) and Hultkrantz (1966) would rationalise views of the dark woods as environmental determinism influencing explanations for difficult access and navigability. In _Vasilisa the Beautiful_, she makes the sign of the cross before entering the forest (Yolen 1986:337) to protect herself from the evil spirits, illustrating the combined Christian belief systems sitting alongside the pagan. Yolen (1986) tells of this co-existence between living and afterlife worlds in Russian tales that include shape shifting between the living and spirit worlds:

In Slav countries children born with the caul over their heads were thought to be werewolves...bloodthirsty and able to change shape, and also to be lucky and crafty...[had a] magical conception and birth. In The Wizard Volkh, which may be a transliteration of Volk (wolf) since Volke means wizard, by age 12 the wizard has perfected martial arts and the occult sciences and is able to turn his army into ants to crawl unseen into the Indian kingdom (p305).

A Tlingit elder (Big John, pers comms, Sitka, 08 July 2000), spoke of children born with physical shaman characteristics like red hair and freckles. In both cultures, the ability to shape shift between the human and animal form and between the living and afterlife spheres are common.

In the final example regarding bears, the Russian Archpriest, Anatoli Kamenskii discusses how the Tlingit have a close spiritual kinship with the land otter and the bear, noting that the land otter, when chased by a hunter, sometimes stops and speaks with a human voice asking for mercy (Kamenskii 1985:64). He tells of the Tlingit not eating the land otter meat and how they bury its skin in the ground as the proper disposal rituals require. xxx

Kamenskii (1985) discusses how animals have human behaviours such as the bear’s qualities of honesty, pride and revenge. In the Russian pagan cosmology, similar traits are attached to the bear. Kamenskii suggests that eating the heart and drinking the warm blood of the bear would give the receiver bravery and strength, like the bear. Also, since the bear can sense unfriendly people, when women go in to the woods for berries or roots, they sing songs of praise to the bear. If they accidentally stumble upon a bear, they must “uncover the top part of their body being convinced that the bear would become embarrassed and would run away,” (Kamenskii 1985:64-65).

Conservation and custodial aspects are part of the environmental attitudes revealed within cultural geomentalities. The Tlingit for example, have strong respect and regard for their natural

---

144 See Thornton’s (1992) exploration of the brown bear in southeast Alaska that links cosmological aspects to the Tlingit people subsistence use.
environment wherein their Native language reflects traditional conservation principles outlined by Hunn, Johnson et al. (2003:101):

*aat ya’ ayunei,* “Respect everything provided by the Holy Spirit” (from Herman Kitka), is understood to require that one not harvest fish or deer, for example, in excess of one’s needs. The Tlingit phrase *a daat hayawdzitaakh,* “one cares for (or looks after) it,” describes the responsibility of clan or house leaders (*hi’t s’a’ ati*) to husband a salmon stream or other resource patch within the clan territory.”

These phrases are useful and relevant in contemporary co-management conservation efforts. Resource management principles are founded at the clan and house levels where each exercised trusteeship over harvests (places and quantum) in locations ranging from berry patches to salmon streams. The ‘trustee concept’ embodies two aspects according to Langdon (in Hope and Thornton eds. 2000:120): both the “welfare of the people of his clan or house group,” and a responsibility “for maintaining the resources.” The trustee concept is similarly found in other indigenous cultures. For Māori, the concept of *kaitiaki* encompasses the human-land role as “protector, caretaker, trustee,” (Ryan 1989:18) and for the Cheyenne, the “mutuality and respect,” between humans and the environment is summarised by Dr Henrietta Mann urging us to: “learn that you can’t just take, that you have to give back to the land,” (in LaDuke 2005:15). These guardianship attitudes contrast 19th century Americans who refused to think beyond the present:

Whatever promised to increase wealth was automatically regarded as good, and the American was tolerant...of speculation, advertising, deforestation, and the exploitation of natural resources, and bore patiently with the worst manifestations of industrialism (Commanger 1950:7).

Linear concepts of time support beliefs that nature offers limitless resources with no need to plan for the future. These views contrast the trustee notions of indigenous beliefs toward the environment. The articulation of the Tlingit concept of shagóon (heritage and destiny) further clarifies the distinction in environmental attitudes associated with concepts of time and space.

4.2.1 SHAGÓON

It was earlier noted that Raven cycle stories take place in mythic time, discussed as a cyclical (continuous) rather than linear time concept. Mythic time parallels the Australian aboriginal creation
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145 *Protection, restriction and conservation* concepts are embodied in the Māori term *rāhui,* which is a form of tapu “restricting use of land, sea, forests or other food resources,” (Barlow 1991:105) placed by an elder of high standing (mana) for various reasons (e.g., to restrict harvests (quotas) or due to a fatal accident occurring there).

146 In Tlingit refer to *tlakw* meaning ‘eternal,’ (Thornton 2008:21).
Referring to ‘place consciousness,’ Thornton (2008:106) links Aborigine *Dreaming* to the important Tlingit concept of shagóon that “posits a dynamic fusion of time and space in the landscape.” Thornton (2008:106) cites a Lukaax.ádi song capturing this connection to the land and its importance not only to the individual, but the clan, into the future, “Lest my ancestors’ land lie desolate, you will always hear my voice there.” There is a sense that ancestors inhabit the land, and over time will continue to inhabit that place. This respect explains the importance of giving “offerings” before hunting and seeking “blessings of other nonhuman persons on the land (e.g., bears, mountains...),” (Frank White cited in Thornton 2008:186). The Tlingit connection to ancestral land is similar to the Māori indigenous culture (Yoon 1980, 1986, 1994). Māori in New Zealand have a great respect for land *per se*, an exceedingly strong affection for his ancestral soil, a sentiment by no means to be correlated only with its fertility and immediate value to him as a source of food. The lands where on his forefathers lived, fought, and were buried were ever to him an object of deepest feeling…‘Mine is the land, the land of my ancestors’ was his cry, (Firth 1959:368).

The Tlingit concept of shagóon provides a deeper understanding of indigenous ties to place, and consequently, the impact of the loss of ancestral land or removal from place on mental health. Heritage and ancestry drivers of place underpin the importance of repatriation efforts like the Sitka based *Journey Home* event discussed in Chapter 3. The difficulty to repatriate the last Native American of the Yahi race (*Ishi*), who died in 1911, provides an idea of the difficulty of facilitating repatriation efforts across diverse cultural beliefs. Recounted in LaDuke (2005:73-75), Ishi’s brain was held at the Smithsonian and his ashes at a Californian cemetery. At the Smithsonian, one involved in the repatriation effort, Gemmill, recalls the ancestral body parts and ceremonial items; one glass case:

10 feet high, 20 feet wide, [was] filled with human skulls of Indigenous people. I am a Native American person. I could never understand that (LaDuke 2005:74).

It took years of legal struggle to repatriate Ishi to his homeland in the 1990s. The return of Ishi to his homeland was viewed as part of a “healing process [that] remains in sharp contrast to America’s colonizer’s traditions,” (LaDuke 2005:75). Further work is needed to complement past research that link emotional well-being to that sense of place (LaDuke 2005, Marie 1999, Yoon 1999) in order that land management decisions are made in a wider context of different geomentalities.

---

147 The Dreaming tells of the journey and the actions of Ancestral Beings who created the natural world. The Dreaming is infinite and links the past with the present to determine the future. (http://www.indigenousaustralia.info/the-
4.2.2 THE TLINGIT HOUSE

This section discusses the Tlingit House to explore geomentality exhibited in the honouring of the trees used in making their houses before they are cut down, thanking the trees as part of the house strengthening ceremony, and the ceremonial movement around the house following the movement of the sun.

Volume one of Plommer’s (1961) *History of Architectural Development*, focuses on ancient and classical architecture and begins:

[The] buildings of savages, considered on their own merits, have no place in this book (p 1).

The scant regard for Native house illustrates cross-cultural ignorance. The Tlingit house has a deep sacred and cosmological context. In Sitka, the house function is important as it represents Tlingit heritage, lineage and ancestry to connect the past and give an individual context and belonging to their society and the wider universe:

The Tlingit House can be considered a prime symbol of Tlingit culture, not only in its spatial relationship, but also in its mythical relationship…Social life and social values centre in the house, which is sacred. The name of the house is totemic and remains the same no matter how many times the house is rebuilt…the screen is painted with crest symbols and hides that part of the house which is the repository for the sacred ceremonial symbols (Oberg 1979[1937]:52).

This is a higher order function according to Coolun and Ozaki (2004) who relate layers of meaning to fixed features. While the Tlingit house would serve lower level functions (e.g., access, eating, movement etc.), the functional context within the Tlingit worldview, values of identity, status, and wealth relate to a higher level, as David Kanosh discusses:

When they came in [to the clan houses] – they come in crouched – bent over and crouched – which we sometimes do at our dance performances – bend down with our backs turned to enter - the same sort of way we enter into the potlatch… the clan houses are sacred. The [Eskimo People] asked Father Aleska (of the Russian Church) – where did you “exit” from – and he would say so and so’s house. And they would be [confused]. Different cultural terminology – they meant, ‘where were you born’ where did you come into this world. Likewise, their traditional houses are structured this way in their model of the world (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

A fuller discussion of house activities clarifies the multiple functions of the Tlingit house.

dreaming.html, accessed 30.03.2009)
Cedar was a preferred building material, used in clan regalia, and the carved box holding the moon, sun and stars in the creation myth, explaining why Grinnell et al. (1995) noticed the front house-entrance in cedar (as opposed to spruce or hemlock used if necessary). The Sheldon Jackson Museum display described the house building process:

Preparing for a new house took several years as large straight grained trees needed to be felled, post holes dug, load bearing posts erected, grooved corners and side posts, split planks, pit, floorboards, shingled roof held in place with stones or poles and the large opening directly over the fire pit...When house was completed, its members and clan gave a potlatch (feasting celebration) to pay for the house and to validate their right to use the crests and names associated with their clan (Field research, July 2000).

Inside the house, due to the house’s sacred status, profane acts (such as childbirth) were done outside in a ‘small temporary hut,’ (Oberg 1979[1937]:52). Inside, there is a:

…recognised place of honour across from the door, [the Tlingit] place a box used for storage of household utensils and cover it with a cloth or a woollen blanket (Krause (trans McCaffrey) 1993[1881/1882]:130).

Significance and status associated with the entrance is well documented (Tuan 1976, Rapoport 2005). Oberg (1973[1937]:122) noted “the highest honour that a host can pay a guest at a potlatch is to offer him his seat at the head of the house.” Charlie Joseph Sr. discusses the traditional House dedication, once a House was completed, which is included in full to illustrate key aspects regarding the house form, ceremonial ties to nature (function) and Tlingit cosmology:

When a House was finished, an invitation would be sent to the opposite moiety, to all the people who helped the clan. Now we call it a “Feast” [koo.éeex’; ceremonial]. Gifts, many things, money and other things- blankets- many different things are given there for those who worked. We call this the wóoshdei áwé yagaádukeéech, “they will solidify the House” or “they will dedicate the House.”

Everyone is now seated. Let’s begin; let’s start.” This is when the Tlingit would speak. Yes, the House would be strengthened. Yes a brother-in-law or an uncle who is related to a father of the host would be the one named to place the ochre paint in the corner. [the inside four corners of the House are marked with paint by a person of the opposite moiety, eds.] Peace would be made with the trees. They have life. They breathe, just like us is what our people believe. When we use them for our Houses, we hurt them when we use sharp things like tools on them. This is why we make peace with the spirit of the trees which we call aas Kwáani. This is why we put ochre paint on them, just as if they were human. As soon as the person to name the House and the one carrying the paint gets to the corner, he’ll say, “You all stand now. Be strong. Please don’t move in the wrong direction.”

I wonder how we knew why it was like this. The peace-making is the same. “As the sun moves across the sky,” is what we called it. Everyone inside is standing, including the man who is standing in the corner with the paint, and all with painted faces. As he raises his hand with the ochre paint, he will say “Goo-goo-gwáaaa!” All of us who are standing in the middle will be moving with the sun. At the next corner we will do “Goo-goo- gwáaaa!” and move as the sun, until the last corner, where the sun goes down, the fourth one. The ochre is applied in four corners. Following this, the person who was painting the corners of the House would give a speech and turn the ceremony over to the hosts. They
in turn would do the dances called yoo koonákk, the sway. Different ones, some with Haida type of songs would be danced. Some dance yéik utee dances, as they are told to sing by the song leader. When we finished each song we in turn would yell our “Goo-goo-gwaaaaa!” and we would turn around with the sun. Now this is how we are, how we bless our House, so that nothing bad would happen to it or to the people in it (in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:352-354).

The house strengthening ceremony functions to maintain balance with nature and society. David Kanosh relates this balance during a time of death and how society responds to keep the house strong:

There are things about the Tlingit culture – the potlatches – the memorials that we have that help us transition - when there is a death you never suffer alone in Tlingit society…My mother is of the…Beaver clan…If my mother died, the opposite clan will come and support…today they give money and food – they [Eagle moiety] will try to pay for all of the funeral arrangements and do the majority of the work – to help you stand – We will hold up the pillar of your house now that one pillar of your house has fallen – to keep your house standing (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

In this way, the Tlingit house is metaphorically conceptualised during the time of death.

In addition to societal balance, balance in nature is achieved by seeking protection from spirits and giving thanks to the trees. Rapoport (2005:26) discusses the symbolic settings with ritual significance, referring to the whole house as sacred, structured through sacred directions and movement, and imbued with sacred meaning. Charlie Joseph Sr discusses songs and dances used to strengthen a new house (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:360). These ceremonies reinforce Tlingit links to nature in a similar way to Pueblo First Nations aligning activities with the sun’s movement across the sky (Rapoport 2005). Regarding the importance of the trees, a Tlingit elder discussed how her grandfather would talk to the trees, saying:

“we are needing shelter”…and he would be told, “choose this tree.” To us, Spirit is in everything (Name withheld, Interview 15, Sitka, 06 July 2000).

The Pueblo Nation similarly, “feed their houses cornmeal after construction,” to nourish and care for them (Swentzell, cited in Howarth 1985:24).

There are some similarities between the Tlingit house blessing with the Māori custom (manāki whare). The Māori house blessing normally starts outdoors where prayers are chanted to “clear the land of any unwelcome influences or evil spirits,” with the priest touching the walls of the house with blessed bread or sometimes sprinkling fresh water, followed by a shared meal after the
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148 Salisbury (1962:180) refutes that dances are “merely an aimless hopping around,” by identifying three types, each intimately linked to the Tlingit social structure: those containing totemic animals (e.g., bear, whale, raven); those portraying a legend or incident; and dances of war, peace, for the dead, or marrying.
ceremony (Barlow 1991:65). The Russian Orthodox blessing of a building of worship is illustrated by Veniaminov (1993) regarding a church in Unalaska:

After the ground, the workers and the lumber had been sprinkled with holy water, I myself began the cutting of the wood, and then all the officials and attendants followed suit. When the cross had been raised up into the air, a salute was fired from the shore and from three vessels that happened to be there at the time (p 37).

Holy water is mentioned in the Old Testament (Numbers 5: 17), being water that has been sanctified by a priest or bishop to be used for religious baptism or ceremonies (as above). The human agency in ‘making the water sacred’ contrasts the inherent sacredness of the trees in the Tlingit house ceremony.

Socio-economic ties are also reinforced through the ceremony by honouring and compensating those who assisted building. For example, the male focus emphasises family roles and patrilineal links regarding shelter with the opposite moiety performing the strengthening tasks. Material goods and money collected are passed out to those who worked on building the home, “You have to tell each person what you are giving the money for, otherwise the person receiving would think that he wasn’t paid for the job he had done,” (Charlie Joseph Sr in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:356). Positioning of people in places of honour shows respect from one moiety to the other and formally recognises the roles played by each in establishing the house structure, and in keeping the wider social balance. In the west, ‘house warming’ parties, or ‘house blessings’ are celebrations, however, the ‘houses’ in this context reflect individual psychological aspects of ‘home,’ (Coolin and Ozaki 2004, Walsh 2004). Homes in this sense are not imbued with the same ceremony and sacredness evidenced in Tlingit cultural geom mentality.

4.2.3 SETTLEMENT MYTHS

This section explores geom mentality revealed in Tlingit migration and settlement myths to provide an alternate view explaining occupation of the Sitka territory from Chapter 3. Three theories are presented of how the Tlingit people came to inhabit the area, each with variable degrees of detail. The first connects the Tlingit to Athabaskan neighbours (in Alaska’s interior and Western Canada).
The second suggests a migration over the Beringia Land Bridge. The third is a view by Russian priest Veniaminov. This exploration contributes to Sitka’s regional knowledge.

Tlingit elder David Kanosh provided an overview of the Athabaskan first theory of Tlingit settlement (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000). The unstructured interview technique meant the respondent’s story was interspersed with numerous topics so a comparable version was sourced from the internet presenting key aspects in an uninterrupted format:

One year the people had a particularly poor harvest over a summer, and it was obvious that the winter would bring with it many deaths from starvation. The elders gathered together and decided that people would be sent out to find a land which was rumoured to be rich in food, a place where one did not even have to hunt for something to eat. A group of people were selected and sent out to find this new place, and would come back to tell the elders where this land could be found...These people travelled a long distance, and climbed up mountain passes to encounter a great glacier. The glacier seemed impassable, and the mountains around it far too steep for the people to cross. They could however see how the melt water of the glacier travelled down into deep crevasses and disappeared underneath the icy bulk. The people decided that some strong young men should be sent down to follow this river to see if it came out on the other side of the mountains. But before these men had left, an elderly couple volunteered to make the trip. They reasoned that since they were already near the end of their lives, the loss of their support to the group would be minimal, but the loss of the strong young men would be devastating. The people agreed that these elders should travel under the glacier. They made a simple dugout canoe and took it down the river under the glacier, and came out to see a rocky plain with deep forests and rich beaches all around. The people followed them down under the glacier and came into Lingít Aaní, the rich and bountiful land that became the home of the Tlingit people.149

The story emphasises the Tlingit structure of the universe including: the connection to nature/land for survival, the need to overcome great environmental challenge prior to settlement, and the collective communal needs surpassing individual need (i.e., the sacrifice of the elders). The Tlingit knowledge of the ice, glaciers and environment is emphasised in the siting in Lingít Aaní, a place respected as “rich and bountiful.” Long time resident Joe Ashby (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000) suggested common aspects of Tlingit and Athabascan ways of life are better explained by the Tlingit ways now embedded within Athabascan, rather than the other way around. In either case, cultural diffusion is involved with the migration of inhabitants to a new territory.

David Kanosh noted one aspect not covered in the above myth version, is that of the important role of the shaman in location decision-making (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000). Judson Brown, First Secretary of the Tlingit-Haida Central Council in an interview with Andy Hope (Hope III 1982:35) states: “Every important move that we made was prophesied by a shaman.” The myth The Shaman

and the Land Otter, in Postell and Johnson (1996:13), shows why the shaman’s advice was respected and obeyed by showing the power of the shaman to: foretell the future (the coming of the canoe to take him to assist the land otter people); see what humans cannot (the arrow point in the otter that needed to be removed); and to move between the world of spirits and humans (interacting with the land otter people and humans). With these super-human traits, it is not surprising the Tlingit would follow and obey shaman instructions as with building the fort at Shis’k’l Noow. The important role of the shaman in siting and providing location advice strengthens the argument in this study of religious/spiritual roles in positions of power, influence the shaping of landscape.

The second theory of Tlingit settlement is the migration across the Beringia Land Bridge. This theory was supported by the Tlingit elder responsible for sacred places management, Robert Sam, who referred to close ties between Tlingit and Japanese Shinto beliefs, such as the Raven creator:

In Shintoism, they have the 3 legged raven...2 legs you can see and one leg you can’t. They represent the 3 major races in Japan. Two of these still exist today in Japan. But the third disappeared. No one knew what really happened to them. Shinto priests...explained to me that many thousands of years ago, there was a great catastrophe in Japan...earthquakes and tidal waves...many took to their boats and to the ocean...they were never seen again...many think that these people drifted across the ocean...[with the] warm Japanese currents...and the Northwest Coast was transformed into what we know today...[influenced with] carving, totems, longhouses... (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000).

Several researchers refer to the Asian influence in the Tlingit culture (de Laguna 1972, Dundes ed. 1984). Gunther (1972:251) suggests Tlingit people could have learned iron processing skills from surviving crewmen of Japanese junks carried to the Northwest Coast (in Grinev 2005:31). This theory resembles a type of geographic diffusion of cultures. The resulting Tlingit culture could be considered the product of assimilation, either with the Japanese crew intermingling with existing inhabitants or if connected with interior Athabascan people (Bhattarai 2004, Meinig 1982).

The third perspective on Tlingit migration is posited in a variation of the Tlingit flood myth retold by the Russian priest Veniaminov. After the flood, people escaped on a big vessel or house. The vessel broke in half with the Tlingit coming from the east, originating on the American shores across from the Queen Charlotte Islands, and the other half of the nations dispersing across the world. The Christian worldview held by Veniaminov influenced his interpretation by linking the Tlingit story to

---

150 Text is approved by the Sitka Alaska Native Brotherhood.
151 See LaDuke (2005:113-129) Vampires in the New World for account of misused Havasupai community blood samples collected under auspices of diabetes research, but instead used to uphold Bering Strait Theory and challenge Havasupai oral history.
his version of the omnipotent God and Christian cosmology paralleling the Tlingit story to the
Biblical Flood story. The Judeo-Christian doctrine however, does not regard nature in the same way
as the Tlingit people. A Tlingit elder (name withheld) summarises the indigenous and Judeo-
Christian difference:

to you, God is your version – to us, it’s Spirit – it is higher than us and in every living thing (Interview
15, Sitka, 06 July 2000).

This contrary position illustrates a different reference point for explaining settlement according to
Tlingit and Russian (Judeo-Christian) beliefs wherein nature is a *lower order* to humans (Glacken
1967:196-204). The human-nature hierarchy represents a key difference in cultural geomentalities.

In addition to stories explaining Tlingit presence in the Alaska territory, different myth versions
were provided during field research of how the Tlingit came to settle in the locale of *Sheey At’iká*:

The Tlingit came here 12,000 years ago, but Edgecumbe was still rumbling and smoking. Finally
9,000 years ago they decided to settle, only after the volcano woman (Shee) had given permission to
locate there,” (Dr J Davis, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

Another interpretation by Herman Kitka reported by Dangel (2003) is of the Kiks.ádi clan claiming
most of the Sitka area:

They went to Kruzoff Island, where the volcano is located, to cut trees, and a lady in white came to ask
them why they were taking her trees. This lady’s name was Shee, hence the use of Sheet’ka Kwáan (p
8).

Hope (2000:32) notes how the Kiks.ádi had preceded others to the Sitka area, initially migrating
from the Nass River, which reinforces the Nass as the place of origin from the creation stories.

Finally, a third version from Tlingit elder David Kanosh:

The Tlingit call Mt Edgecumbe “Shee,” which means ‘volcano woman.’ There used to be many
villages on that island there – the volcanoes – the volcano woman was very upset that the Tlingit
abandoned her there – and made them promise they would never return there to live. Sometimes the
shaman would go there…so people lived nearby but not on the island (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

In these accounts, a delay in physical settlement occurs until the volcanic activity subsided and
*permission* is received from the volcano/volcano woman to settle. The spiritual and reverent
connection to the mountain (volcano) reinforces Tlingit peoples’ respect for nature and the active
role the environment plays in influencing location. Perhaps Tlingit reverence is similar to the respect

---

152 Sourced from Hope III (1982: 32-33) as translated from Russian by Sergei Kan.
of the environment within East Asian geomantic location principles, which regard natural energy flows within the physical landscape that must be respected (Yoon 1982, 1992, 2006). Both appear to seek to enhance harmony between human activities and nature, and both do not appear to unilaterally decide where to locate without consideration of the environment. This discussion allows for a deeper understanding of Tlingit culture by examining behaviours reflecting geomentality that celebrates a different heritage explanation.

4.3 Rules for Living

This section focuses upon rules for living described in myths and folklore that highlight notions of acceptable behaviours, valued character traits and the consequences of not abiding by the rules. In the Judeo-Christian faith, The Ten Commandments are set out in Exodus 20:2-17 (abridged):

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. 2. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image...and keep my commandments. 3. Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain. 4. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. 5. Honour thy father and thy mother. 6. Thou shalt not kill. 7. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 8. Thou shalt not steal. 9. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. 10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house.

The first four commandments underline the supremacy of the Creator, his authority, and the relationship that he has with humanity. The remaining six commandments relate to relationships between humans (such as honouring parents), character traits like honesty (do not steal) and the sanctity of personal ownership (what belongs to another should not be coveted). None of these commandments relate to how humans should interact with nature. Consequences of disobeying the commandments are set out in Revelation 22:14:

Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.

In summary, to get to heaven and attain immortality amongst God, the laws must be abided. Humanity’s former ‘fall from grace’ reiterates the consequences of failing to adhere to God’s rules. Some religions humorously refer to the fear or obligation created within this framework (e.g., Catholic guilt).

In the Tlingit mentality, Veniaminov tells of Yéil’s (Raven) actions and words as a guide for how to live:
Yéil’s words and deeds are the only dogmas of the people’s faith and rules for their life. They say, “Just as Yéil lived and acted, so do we,” (in Hope III 1982:25).

In traditional Tlingit beliefs, there is retribution or consequence for not adhering to the ‘rules that govern living,’ similar in the Māori concept of utu. Raven’s lessons are depicted in various Tlingit myths as opposed to a list of ten commandments. For example, in the story of The Fog Woman, depicting the creation of salmon and fog, it conveys how men should treat their wives with kindness and respect. Raven, who marries the daughter of Tlingit chief, Fog over the Salmon, does not take care of his daughter so the chief tells Raven:

You promised to take care of my daughter and to give her respect. You did not keep your word and so she is lost to you. You cannot have her back (in Smelcer 1993:32).

A Woman Who Turned into an Owl is another myth carrying consequences for being selfish (Smelcer 1993; Girado-Beck 1989, 1991; Harris 1985). In this story, putting hot fish entrails into the mother in law’s hand, (or fish guts in some versions), rather than sharing the good parts of the fish, has consequence for the selfish one who becomes an owl (Harris 1985:27). Tlingit creation myths also discussed the accepted ways to kill animals needed for food like “the salmon must always be killed by striking it on the head with a club,” (Hope III 1982:86). Improper killing meant species would not reincarnate after death. In geomancy, Yoon (2006:72) discusses how “human bones can concentrate vital energy,” and need good soil for preservation during burials since “descendants are theoretically influenced by the vital energy,” (p 86). For this reason preferred burial sites in Korea are upon hills with soil (and better energy flows), than rocky mountain areas.

Finally, in the traditional Russian context, rules to live by are illustrated with Father Frost, and two daughters, one whose step-mother wants to get rid of her and is cast away to the forest to die. In the forest she meets Father Frost who, “leapt and danced and at the girl glanced,” and she was kind to him so he did not freeze her as he intended, rather married her. Meanwhile he did freeze her sister when she was unkind to him (Afanasiev 1998:31-33). Abiding by society’s valued traits therefore leads to benefit, while retribution reigns for non-observers (in this case by freezing). In the Russian and Tlingit examples, the rules to live by are set out in stories and show the interconnectedness of living creatures by involving nature in the rule setting and consequences process. These aspects
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153 Utu is the concept of revenge, or satisfaction; also payment (http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/document?wid=387&page=1, accessed 17.11.2008).
differ from the Judeo-Christian commandments, which introduce a duality similar to the “White” and “Other” ways of seeing race described in Chapter 3.

The Judeo-Christian duality structures societal understanding in a binary right/wrong manner similarly found in the Māori creation myth. Through “actions of the gods, all living things were given their opposites,” (Barlow 1991:55) which sets in motion opposing forces in life (e.g., pleasure/pain, good/bad). This contrasts the Tlingit ‘balance’ concept which is less adversarial. In geomancy, to benefit from nature requires that “humanity chooses an auspicious environment and uses it appropriately,” (Yoon 2006:155). Yin-Yang concepts and the Five Elements Theory underpin specific principles for auspicious site decision-making that involve “mountains, water and cosmic directions,” (Yoon 2006:10). Neither science nor art, various aspects are considered as geomancy does not provide a binary answer. In decision-making such subtlety is critical.154

The next part of this section briefly looks at folklore and how it is important to convey values to live by (Yoon 1975, 1979, 1986). Commannger (1950:6-7) writes of the American imagination being “receptive to large plans and heroic speculations” largely due to geographic and historic challenges. Grand scale places like the Great Lakes, Mississippi River, Niagara Falls, and Texas reinforced quantitative aspects etched into the American mind. Challenges were accentuated in the West due to the wilderness and harshness of the territory that demanded domination over nature, the obstacle to be overcome (de Frietas 1999:67). In America legends of Johnny Apple Seed, Davy Crocket and others emphasise human dominance over nature as well as reflect American attitudes toward nature and societal values (Yolen 1986; Cavendish 1982; Boorstin 1965; Harris 1982). Conquering nature would require qualities of strength and persistence. There is a difference in how to dominate nature reflected in Johnny Appleseed and Mountain Mary who tell of stories of the positive connections to the agricultural heartland in New England and Pennsylvania respectively. Meanwhile, hunters and frontiersmen like David (Davy) Crockett (late 1700s) showed domination over nature and the need for physical strength to overcome nature.

154 Illustrating two different perceptions from the same stimulus (e.g., the popular Gestalt psychology figure and ground picture depicting both a wine goblet and two faces), Johnson (1996:43) shows that being correct is the easy step in identifying and managing unsolvable problems. His book, Polarity Management, has merit in land conflicts as distinguishing conflicts from problems to solve. To manage polarities (conflicts), Johnson advocates a need to “affirm diversity.” Seeing the other person’s view allows an easier shift between perceptions, thus increasing the likelihood of reaching a mutual course of action (p 50). If Johnson’s proposition is applied to approaches within the rules for living depicted above, starting from a binary position would make managing conflicts impossible.
Humour reflected geographic quantitative exaggerations, but also social distinctions where nature “was forever putting men in their place,” (Commanger 1950:25). Crockett for example, masters the forces of nature when he saves the earth on the coldest day in history, after climbing a mountain to see what the trouble was (Boorstin 1965):

“The airth had actually friz fast on her axes, and couldn’t turn round; the sun had got jammed between two cakes o’ ice under the wheels, an’ that he had been shinin’ an’ workin’ to get loose till he friz fast in his cold sweat.” Crockett rescued all creation by squeezing bear-grease on the earth’s axis and over the sun’s face. He whistled ‘Push along, keep movin’! The earth gave a grunt and began moving. ‘The sun walked up beautiful, salutin’ me with such a wind o’ gratitude that it made me sneeze,’” (p 332).

The hardiness and aggressive behaviour of those moving west was understood and acceptable. In his own words, the missionary Sheldon Jackson defended his significant push to assimilate the Alaska Natives by setting up 22 churches, covering 29,000 miles between 1869 and 1879: “God blesses aggressiveness. We need to cultivate an aggressive spirit,” (Carlton 1999:13). Other legends encourage hard work and discourage frivolity. Coal-Oil Johnny for example became destitute after foolish spending (e.g., teaching frivolity has its consequences), and George Knox of Maine (d 1892) received supernatural powers after selling his soul to the Devil for twenty dollars. Lastly, “naughty children were told: I’ll send George Knox to get you,” (Cavendish 1982:334) linking bad behaviour to the devil and consequences.

In traditional Russian folklore, greed and anger are not desirable traits, emphasising what ‘not to do’ similar to the earlier noted Tlingit myths (e.g., do not be stingy). In Death of a Miser, Yolen (1986:466) tells when a greedy man swallows his gold coin fortune rather than sharing at the time of death, leads to a summoning of the devil who says, “The money is yours, but the bag is mine,” and takes the miser’s body with him. Being miserly and selfish are undesirable traits in the Russian mindset that relies on the ‘collective focus,’ in its people. Another undesirable trait is anger. In Words of Wisdom, the main character nearly chops off the heads of his twin sons when he thinks his wife has been unfaithful to him, but just before he does so, he remembers wisdom told to him, “Never let your anger get the better of you,” (Afanasiev 1998:123-125). Humility, forgiveness and moral strength, are other desirable traits that appear in folklore:

The enemy has surrendered…Shew mercy to him. Be kind to the prisoners. A soldier is not a bandit…Our enemies are as we are. Overcome the foe with magnanimity. Freedom from national pride and mercy to the defeated have made the Russians sensitive to the influence of the other inhabitants of their land,” (Zernov 1945:177).

The more male virtues of freedom and valour are contained within folklore or legends focused on more historical events as examined shortly. These folklore examples are rich in illustrating the values held important to different cultures, how the environment is perceived (friend or foe) and how behaviours have consequences. Folklore is important to complement earlier creation myths and more formalised rules from religious texts (e.g., Ten Commandments) providing insights to deep rooted cosmological and spatial beliefs.

4.4 Death and Afterlife

*Genesis* Chapter 3 tells how man will “return to the dust out of which he had been taken,” after eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil after God commanded (in Genesis 2:16):

> Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

Mortality of humans began only after eating from the tree of knowledge. Prior to that, God gave man choice to live eternally (i.e., by eating from the adjacent ‘tree of life’) (Frazer 1985:75-80, in Dundes ed.). After *The Fall*, God removes the option of the tree of life (immortality) sending:

> an angelic squadron, with flaming swords, to guard the approach to the tree of life that none henceforth may eat of its magic fruit and live forever (Genesis 3:22-24).

Could the modern emphasis upon *knowledge* and the significance of the *mind* over all else (i.e., nature and life force in all things) contribute to the present state of society’s *unconsciousness* as Tolle (1999) suggests? Is the other *tree of life* in Genesis representative of the less linear aspect of creation/evolution that views death more holistically (reincarnation) within a cyclic view of life? Perhaps a less human-centric model describing a different relationship between humans and all other living creatures (e.g., including low lying creatures like snakes, lizards, beetles) might view the environment differently were it not eternally damned from the prior fall of man. Two trees may reflect two perspectives in decision-making.

In the Judeo-Christian faith, upon death of a human, each soul is *judged* as to whether they go to heaven (if they lived according to God’s rules) or hell (if not) or purgatory (depending on denomination). Thereafter the soul is reunited with a person’s physical body after judgement day. In
the Māori traditional belief, the spirit was joined to the physical body at birth through the mauri (life-giving essence) that gives “warmth and energy to the body” to grow and develop, returning to dwell with the gods after life. The Māori belief system then resembles the Judeo-Christian religion regarding the presence of an afterlife; however, the place where the Māori soul dwells is with other gods, without their physical body.

The physical separation of heaven and earth differs from the traditional Tlingit and Russian beliefs where communications between living things and cosmic levels is continuous (Eliade 1986:120). For the Tlingit, living and afterlife places are transcendable. The connection between the apparent or visible living world and the mystic or other afterlife is discussed through the use of material objects as outlined in the creation myths. Raven for example, uses the hair from a woman to bring boys back to life by tickling their nose. David Kanosh emphasised beliefs about hair in traditional Tlingit society:

> The hair is regarded as something with power – which is why some of our Elders never let a stranger cut their hair – my grandmother only let her daughters cut her hair. Once cut off – you would burn the hair – you wouldn’t like it to linger. A number of elders don’t like to have their hair cut157 (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

In other examples, Spirit and his ‘shadow’ are turned to stone by Raven and now are ‘in possession of one Chilkat ixht’ [shaman];’ and Petrel called ‘to his spirits’ to hold Raven in the smoke hole. Jones (1914:237) tells that, “[p]eople in earlier times grasped at shadows cast by the sun, and would ask, after blowing on their hands, “let me have luck.”

Due to their belief in reincarnation Tlingit are not afraid of death (Salisbury 1962). Kamenskii notes, the worlds “are so closely connected that movement [between them] seems simple and natural,” (trans by Sergei Kan in Hope III 1982:63). A Tlingit myth of the story of the dead told to the Krause brothers on May 13th 1882 (1993[1881/1882]) highlights a “happy arrival of the soul,” that falls asleep, then:

---

156 When a person dies their physical remains are interred in the bosom of Mother Earth, but their spirit lives on…no longer subject to death, but dwells forever in the presence of the gods. In contrast to Christian theology, there appears no evidence....of the idea of a resurrection...but Māori do believe the spirit is immortal (Barlow 1991:152).
157 After 5 years of working in a hospital as a CNA, [one of the elders David Kanosh cared for] pulled out talismans on a necklace – carvings of bone shaped like deer or raven or eagle and sea otter and a couple of human carvings as well – and seashells as well – he said I want to give this to you for protection – and he clipped off his own hair and tied it to the amulet and handed it to me (David Kanosh, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).
When he wakes up the next morning, he yawns and with it makes the now quiet ghost on the opposite bank aware of him. They bring the soul across the lake in their canoes. The soul is not allowed to sit near the fire at first, but only after his body is cremated. On the other hand, if the soul has no friends among the dead he would not be taken across. That is why so many souls can be found on the shore waiting in vain for the crossing…They receive only as much food and drink as is donated by their friends on earth. That is why no Tlingit neglects to remember his dead friends during his meal and calling their names, throws a little food in to the fire (p 177).

The other world is seen as a “beautiful island surrounded by green water so great in its expanse, that no spirit could find its way across alone,” (Krause 1993[1881/1882]:211). The reliance on the living (for food, ongoing remembrance, to ensure no neglect) emphasises the interconnectedness between the living and afterlife phases of life. The creation myths reinforce this connection across space where Raven flies to the sky from earth through the ‘smoke hole.’ Roseman’s (1998) study in Malaysia discussed the cincem (shaman) within the Temiar culture channelling songs from the dead and moving between this and the other (after) world by entering a trance-like state using a drum beat. The link between worlds is captured in an example from British Columbia. The Nlaka’pamux people have a cosmological map of the world illustrating their local attachment to their “intimately known worlds” and a separate but connected “land of the ghosts and dancing souls,” (Harris 1997:9). The map shows the Fraser and Thomson rivers, village area, as well as a route for souls to get to the land of the ghosts through underground pathways depicted to run west toward the sunset, then along the river, and finally across a wooden log where the souls cross.

Kan (1989) provides a comprehensive analysis of the Tlingit mortuary practices (including the memorial potlatch) based on indigenous traditions and beliefs, including the role of death within the Tlingit social order. The cyclical notion of time and space interconnecting life and living to death is captured by “the body of the new-born child [being] no less sacred than the corpse,” (Kan 1989:108). Despite many cultural influences and political attempts to extinguish it, the survival of memorial potlatch and practices are a testimony of the ability of the Tlingit culture to syncretise indigenous elements with modern Christian rites. Kan (1989) refers to an elderly chief speaking at a potlatch in 1980:

If we did not perform the potlatch, we would have lost our Tlingit culture [kusteeyi, also ‘way of life’] a long time ago (p 301-302).

The survival of the Māori tangi similarly retains that culture’s ancestral heritage syncretising traditional and Judeo-Christian beliefs (Yoon 1980, 1986; Marie 1999).
The importance of the care of those in the afterlife by those still in the apparent or land of the living persisted post-transfer, as expressed by Jones (1914):

[The Tlingit] believed firmly (and do yet) in the immortality of man. For this reason they put food in the fire, and food and clothing in the tomb of the dead; placed food and clothing on the house top for those killed in war (whose spirits are supposed to live in the air), and canoes beside the dead houses of the deceased shamans (p 234).

During field research in July 2000, in the Russian Orthodox cemetery, there were four gravesites where kitchenware (e.g., pots) or household articles (e.g., plates and cups) were observed upon the gravesite. Death, funerals and orderly disposal of the dead are also important in the Russian folklore and linked to ancestry. In Father Frost, after the step-mother orders her step-daughter to die in the forest, she prepared a funeral feast in her memory and baked a plateful of pancakes. She tells her husband to bring back his daughter “to be buried here,” (Afanasiev 1998:31).

The Tlingit fear of future suffering from cold could explain their prior choice of cremation for disposal of the dead (Salisbury 1962). The Westcoast natural wet and cold climate may have influenced the cremation choice as it translated into their preference for warm and dry, removing all the water in bones to leave behind only dry and hard bones. In early burial days, “bones were not infrequently dug up and burned,” (Salisbury 1962:214). Other practices give insights to social structures: defining roles of each moiety, adhering to grieving behaviours, or the period of time (approximately a year) between the deceased’s family holding a memorial potlatch. If the deceased was a shaman, traditionally the bones were placed into a dead house, often across the water on an island since shaman bones were powerful and needed to be kept far from the living so as not to interfere with their activities.

4.5 Nationhood

To understand a nation requires consideration of land they inhabit, the history they have experienced and their religion. This section makes initial comments on nationhood for American, Russian and Tlingit cultures. The contemporary spiritual landscape is set within the American political framework, thus the discussion for this section begins with the United States of America.
4.5.1 AMERICAN

The importance of the Judeo-Christian cosmology is reflected in the ‘Charters of Freedom,’ the founding documents of the American nation (e.g., Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights). All reinforce the role of God in creating the United States and protecting the rights of the individual (e.g., the unalienable rights, all men created equal, pursuit of life, liberty and happiness). The American national anthem, which reflects the political ideology both to the nation’s citizenry and to other nations, emphasises God as Creator, “Praise the Pow'r that hath made and preserv'd us a nation.” The national motto also originated from the anthem, ‘in God is our trust,’ is now simply, ‘in God we trust.’ With few traditions, no national holidays, and even the 4th of July date having indefinite origins, Commanger (1950) shows how education, patriotic legends and maxims began to define significant aspects of the nation:

“As for me, give me liberty or give me death,” “We hold these truths to be self-evident...life liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” “I shall never surrender nor retreat,” “Government of the people, by the people,” (pp 38-39).

References that reinforce ties to God, and the reliance on divine providence,¹⁵⁸ illustrate the American thinking at the time, and their strong connection to God. These aspects reflect the earlier noted aspects of hard-work, acrimony toward the harsh environment, and a spirit to succeed in the land of opportunity.

Next to God, the role of the individual is clearly emphasised. The Bill of Rights puts the importance on the individual’s protection, rather than maintaining the role of government. Government is portrayed to serve its people (not vice versa as in monarchy based nations) and interestingly, clarifies why the word ‘nation’ only makes its debut in the Constitution.¹⁵⁹ If the government fails to protect its people, it will be replaced. The importance of the individual is enforced within the Constitution (14 May 1787), which emphasises the ‘people’ notion of the state as well as the intent for establishing the government – for the people – and to secure ‘liberty.’ It stresses the, “immunities of individual citizens thus avoiding the…tyranny by the central government,” and protection against the violation of civil rights as had occurred under British rule, with the first

¹⁵⁸ Providence: the foreseeing care and guidance of God or nature over the creatures of the Earth (Webster’s Dictionary).

Americans believed in a universe governed by laws which were immutable and unassailable but which left room, somehow, for the play of free will (Commanger 1950:28).

The passion for freedom sanctioned by God appears in the role of Providence where “God helps those that help themselves.” Self-reliance, being industrious, and being fair (equal) exemplify good Puritan values. “The American preferred heroism to be personal,” (Commanger 1950:32).

Protecting the individual and anti-establishment themes appear in America’s Robin Hood equivalent of Jesse James (1847-1882), a product of the Civil War of the 1860s:

Jesse James was one of his names
Another it was Howard
He robbed the rich of every stitch
You bet he was no coward

Jesse James is a hero against the establishment, banks, and “tyrannical government.” An outlaw, his character was recognised among the commoners, “among poor whites and southern Negros, deprived social groups who, naturally enough, found the idea psychologically satisfying,” though scholars find no evidence of stolen money being given to the poor (Cavendish 1982:330-1). Another famous outlaw, Billy the Kid (1859-81) was also motivated by the injustices to poor farmers from corrupt government politicians. America as the ‘land of opportunity’ is there for the “commoner.” Those that fight for individual rights are recognised for their contributions to nation building. For example, Lincoln, as architect and hero of the Civil War and champion of African American rights, has been described as “the most legendary American president,” (Cavendish 1982:333). General Custer (1839-76) is also recognised for his contribution to building the nation. The use of naming will be discussed in Chapter 5 where those individual nation-builders are highly regarded and commemorated.

Freedom for the individual is also emphasised in the national anthem words: ‘in the land of the free and the home of the brave,’ that are repeated in each of the four stanzas. These values are important to the American attitude and are personified in the American flag through the national anthem, *The Star Spangled Banner*. The flag is embraced as a key ‘symbol’ of what it means to be American (e.g., it is the flag that remains on Castle Hill in Sitka to show American ownership), and has special procedures for disposal (e.g., at *Sitka National Cemetery* there is a special designated area). Under
the social construction of the Tlingit people, the American reverence of the flag as a symbol of the American culture might have been compared to the reverence of clan ensigns by the Tlingit people.

In combination with the link to God, Boorstin (1965) comments on America’s unique national characteristic of ‘vagueness’:

A great resource of America was vagueness. American uncertainties, products of ignorance and progress, were producers of optimism and energy. Although few acknowledged it, in the era between the Revolution and the Civil War this vagueness was a source of American strength (p 219).

Does America’s vagueness make it an imagined community? Agnew (in Duncan et al. 2004:223) argues against the notion of Anderson’s (1983) Imagined Communities, stating that politics make nations ‘real’ by: identifying a common enemy (e.g., Britain saw the Native population as savages and heathens); through material aspects (e.g., defining territory, accessibility to religion (persecution) or religious freedom via legislation); and physical images in landscape (e.g., monuments), which serve as ‘concrete reminders’ of a collective identity. Cosmological and spatial beliefs reflected above show links to material aspects. They provide a better understanding of cultural attitudes through geom mentality to interpret land value and material expressions like monuments (e.g., what is commemorated, by whom and where). Politics can result in cultures being eliminated, or a step further from the imagined community. LaDuke (2005) notes indigenous people can be stripped of language and land and removed from references in television and films, to pose an alternate problem to the imagined, that of the vanished culture.

The imaginary community concept is supported by Boorstin (1965) who speaks of Americans being “united by a common vagueness and common effervescence,” (p219); a nation “growing while it discovered itself,” (p223). He credits the mystique as the driving force to seek the next one (p229). Hon Charles Sumner’s speech on the Cession of Alaska refers to Alaska as “without form and without light; without activity and without progress,” (Shiels 1967:32). He expresses only land (no inhabitants) where, like the darkness before creation, American rule can enlighten. The emptiness presents the opportunity for America to spread its ideals and move into the ‘new’ territory, but conceptually, it created a ‘gap’ in the map of America:

…a gap in our possessions on the Pacific Coast will always be an eye-sore to the nation, whose sense of symmetry will be offended by the ragged look of the maps. The national imagination shall always require that our coastline shall be continuous (in Shiels 1967:134-5).
The value placed upon the ‘written map’ and how ‘gaps’ or blank spaces are viewed in a negative way to the young country is echoed by Boelhower (1986) who discusses the power of cartography to shape sentiment of American nationhood and ethno genesis to create a notion of oneness across many (E Pluribus Unum).

4.5.2 RUSSIAN

Moving to the Russian mentality, Zernov (1945) positions it, not European nor Asian, but a bridge between the two. This bridge aptly describes the Russian culture fitting between Tlingit and American mentalities. Ashby (1988) emphasises the evolution from paganism to Orthodoxy placing the founding of the Russian Orthodox Church as the ‘baptism of Rus’ in the year 988 at Kiev, under Vladimir I:

[A]t that time, Russia was a pagan country, dominated by a Scandinavian-type pantheon and Slavic pantheism…before this conversion, [Vladimir I’s emissaries were tempted by all the world’s religions then advised the Tsar] when we stood in the temple of St Sophia, we didn’t know where we were: in heaven or on earth…we can never forget the beauty and glory we saw at the service; there in truth God has his dwelling with men. We cannot abide in heathenism any longer. And if we are to change our pagan religion, we shall accept instead of it, only the Greek Orthodox Religion (p.12).

Fedotov (1946:3) suggests the peasants retained many aspects of their pagan beliefs alongside Christian beliefs and that each nation adapts, but retains its original beliefs in, “the subconscious of the national soul.” The blending of Russian and Tlingit cultures is illustrated by a local NPS historian who notes:

strategic corners of the [Bishop’s] house, NPS restorers found hidden sprigs of Devil's Club…To protect the house and the priests (in Swagel 2007:35).

Tlingit elder, David Kanosh discusses the significance of Devil’s club in Tlingit society:

Much of Tlingit society may have forgotten – many of our elders…Devil’s Club – a very spiny plant – if you’ve gone into Totem Park you’d see it – it is still used today, still used today by our people…there are various recipes for using it – my grandfather and grandmother on my mother’s side were both ixht’ – and so were the grandparents on my father’s side – my mother hangs on to some of the beliefs but she doesn’t talk about it much – they were punished for talking about such things – she doesn’t like to talk about these things – [Devil’s Club] was used to ward off bad spirits. It is a very spiny stalk – it hurts when you touch it – sometimes you would cut a piece of the stock and pin it above the doorway because it would keep away the bad spirits. But it was also a healing plant - over at SEARCH hospital – the Devil’s Club is part of the banner/emblem of the Native hospital. It cures various ailments (e.g., dandruff, rids lice) and it you shave off a couple of layers and dry it out – you can make tea with it – it comes from the ginseng family – we used it to cure diabetes, cancer…there are so many plants in the every environment – somehow you can find out some of the legends of the
healing plants in every area... that's why the Tlingit will not build a house in a place where there is Devil’s Club – because it is sacred (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

Devil’s Club is a potent local medicinal herb still in use today as confirmed by Tlingit elder Big John (pers comms, Sitka, 08 July 2000).

The Russian nationalism and traditional pagan attitudes are reflected together in the unofficial Russian national anthem between 1791 and 1833 (when the Russians occupied Sitka): Гром победы, раздавайся! (transliteration: Grom pobedy, razdavaysya!), which translates to English as: ‘Let the thunder of victory sound.’ It also has many geographic place references (e.g., Danube, other countries) and emphasises nature (e.g., ‘thunder’ of victory, fast waters). There is no reference to God (or a creator); however, there is a reference to ‘our tender mother,’ that reflects Russian folklore and the strong ties to Mother Earth. Nature is also personified with the Russians having ‘the river in their hands.’ The connection between all living things is indicative of the universalistic view of the Russian culture.

Russian epic legends represent the past of their ancestors, where peasants, tied to the land, enjoyed stories representing freedom and a Russian past “when brave men and free defended their own honour and that of their country,” (Cavendish 1982:290). The main centres of Kiev and Novgorod are the scene for most bylina. In the Kiev bylina cycle, the Prince is always called Vladimir (after Vladimir I who was canonised for his conversion of the country to Christianity in the tenth century), and Vladimir Monomakh, famed for his military exploits and clever diplomacy in the twelfth century. The Novgorodian legends often reflect more class struggles. For example, Vasenka, the son of a wealthy citizen gets retribution for violent and mean behaviour toward others which includes:

Vasenka began to go out on the streets
To play no mean jokes on the people.
If he grabs your hand, it comes off,
If he grabs your foot, it comes off,
If he slaps you on the back,
You’ll walk for ever bent forward (Cavendish 1982:290).

Historical songs, most composed in the 16th-19th centuries, are around events and rulers (e.g., Peter the Great). In Peter and the Dragoon, Peter is seen as the simple friend of the common folk, whose offer of challenge to anyone to wrestle him is taken up by a 15 year old dragoon:

The young dragoon overturned him with his left hand,
The young dragoon caught him up with his right hand,
He did not let the Tsar touch the damp earth.
Peter rewards the dragoon’s skill and respect for his sovereign, but, true to his peasant background, the dragoon declares: I do not want villages or estates, Or a chest of pure gold, Permit me to drink, without charge, Wine in the taverns of the Crown (Cavendish 1982:291).

In contrast to American folk heroes who are noble, brave and strong, Vladimir can be weak, passive, cowardly and frequently unjust, suffer from his pride, status consciousness, and during the legend often learns a lesson about respect, humility and retribution for his human failings (Cavendish 1982:291). He appears to have mischievous qualities similar to Raven myths of the Tlingit, and the ‘cycle’ of stories about Vladimir resembles the adventures of ‘Telling Lies’ Raven. There appears a greater balance in character within the Russian and Tlingit mentality, recognising even heroes like Raven have mischievous as well as supportive sides. The preference for more defined American ‘characteristics’ could be a result of a goal to ‘define’ what it is to be American by distinguishing it from other cultures, thus needing to clearly articulate traits like success, bravery, independence.

Set in Sitka, a song composed by Baranov (in 1799), Chief Manager of the Russian American Company (RAC) reveals Russian views toward his homeland and the Tlingit people (Appendix 5 contains full text). First, the acknowledgement of the need to ‘learn the simple rules of nature and follow its laws’, represents a continued mutual respect for nature as depicted in the folktales. Second, God is noted to help the Russians to support their quest linking a spiritual connection to their purpose and reason for being there while simultaneously illustrating the Judeo-Christian influence to hybridise the traditional pagan culture. Third, trade and profit motives are affirmed in honour of the Tsar reinforcing the collective nation rationale to expand the country. The ‘fatherland’ reference (changed from motherland) aligns with the male monarchy and further represents the hybridisation of culture away from the significance of mother earth toward patriarchal beliefs (more aligned to Judeo-Christian beliefs). ‘Brotherly friendship’ uniting them, also emphasises the ‘collective’ notion of all Russians being part of the same universe and are proceeding ‘together’. Fourth, referring to the Tlingit as ‘friends’ (after being ‘savage people of barbarous natures’) and how they are ‘mighty people’ and ‘brave,’ reinforces the prominence of honour and valour valued among Russians like General Suvorov above.

The brotherhood element requires further comment within the eternal notion of kinship-community, what is called in Russian, rod. In Russia, an individual is only part of the whole (rod), the deepest
root of Russian collectivism. Similar to the Tlingit ancestry, rod is, “full of vitality and vigour, more important than family, and carries with it similar functionality to the Celtic clan,” (Zernov 1945:16). Russian-Tlingit offspring, Creole, were afforded similar treatment to the Russian citizenry. They were educated, looked after and lived with the Russians. Social ties are based on blood relationships as described above with the emphasis on rod. Black (2004:xv) describes the Creoles as:

the social class deliberately created in order to have a bicultural stratum, member of which would be loyal to their native land, Alaska, and to the Russian cultural heritage brought to Alaska by an ancestor or ancestress.

The experience with Creole appears similar to the experience in French Canadian provinces with Métis (a separate cultural group of Native and French). This different colonial/settlement experience led to the creation of a new “small indigenous society,” neither Native nor European, that developed strong leadership and, different to the Creole, the Métis remained in Canada and had a “profound impact” on the country’s development (Harris and Warkentin 1974:248). Cultural connections better explain these ties than merely economic and political assumptions. Given the understanding of the importance of the collective and ancestry/heritage to the Russian culture, it would reason that a closer tie would be formed with progeny. Finally, the ‘collective’ sentiments and universalistic beliefs inherent in the Russian ge mentality could have influenced the speed at which Russian people adopted communism.

4.5.3 TLINGIT

Contemporary ‘Tlingit nation’ attitudes toward the land continue to convey traditional beliefs and values referencing: the national anthem, flag of the Tlingit and Haida Central Council and modern poetry. The Tlingit national anthem was composed by Joe Wright, and Austin Hammond gave the song to the people in grand camp in 1989, “so that they could perform the song during the 1990 Celebration,” (http://cooday8.tripod.com/anthems.htm, accessed 10.07.2007). The intent of the song, like Tlingit myths, keeps Tlingit people connected with their past and keeps their heritage alive. As with other national anthems, it is sung at special traditional gatherings, such as the potlatch, along with the story of how it originated. On the website, Sandrenia Katasse writes the story behind the Anthem, as retold by Robert Willard Jr. (Raven/Beaver Clan Elder) from Angoon who donated the song to the website in 1996. For many years the anthem was kept in secret as the ritual of passing
the story on to the new generations as part of Tlingit oral tradition was forbidden by the government.

The story behind the Anthem origin follows:

AanteeYéili (Joe Wright) and his friend were out on a boat. They saw another boat drifting towards them. They found a family on the boat, and everyone had been killed. They brought the boat back to the authorities in Haines Alaska. The authorities questioned them, but all AanteeYéili and his brother could only say in English was yes, so they were sent to Alcatraz Island in California. Many years later, when AanteeYéili returned home, he found a great loss of culture had occurred. People no longer remembered the old traditions and culture. AanteeYéili wrote the Tlingit National Anthem to assure that our voices will always be heard on our grandfather's land, (http://cooday8.tripod.com/anthems.htm, accessed 10.07.2007).

The words of the Tlingit National Anthem follow with the full English translation as recorded:

**Tlingit National Anthem** (as retold by Robert Willard Jr (Raven/Beaver clan elder))

YAAW, EIYAAW, EIYAWW, EI--YAAW
HOO.EIYAAW, EIYAAW EI--YAAW
HOO.EIYAAW, EIYAAW EI-YAAW
HOO.EIYAAW, EIYAAW EIYAAW
EIYAAW, EIYAAW, EIYAAW
AAYAAW, YAAW HANEE, AAYAAW
CH'A AADEI YEI OONA TEE
GA-ZAWE HAAA TLEELKW HAS
AANEE----YAAW, EIYAAW
AAKAADEI HAA SAGAX
DDO.AXCH-A
HOO.EI--YAAW, EIYAAW, EIYAAW
EIYAAW, EIYAAW, EIYAAW
AAYAAW, YAAW HANEE, AAYAAW
CH'UYEI! CH'UYEI! Repeat, Repeat
DAA X'ER GAAS CHAAYANASK'A EETOOWOO
AXAAT HAS, AAYAAW, EIYAAW
EEYÉILEE KAX AGEE DAA GAAX'--YAA
HOO.EI----YAAW, EIYAAW, EIYAAW
EIYAAW, EIYAAW, EIYAAW,
AAYAAW, YAAW HENEE AAYAAW
CH'UYEI! CH'UYEI! REPEAT, REPEAT

*Full English Translation:*

So that it may never be forgotten
Our voices will be heard on
Our Grandfather's land.

Keep this promise our Fathers'
Sisters as you'll pray for your Raven.

The Tlingit anthem is unlike the American anthem devoted to the *Star Spangled Banner* flag with no mention of battles, bravery of its people, nor the glory of its leaders. The Tlingit anthem instead emphasises heritage/ancestry (shagóon), tradition and links to place, reiterating the cultural difference in the construct of nationhood. The blending of the Tlingit cultural attitudes in the anthem
brings some of the traditional concepts into a contemporary setting without losing the links to the past (e.g., adapting how Raven’s role is acknowledged today (prayer), but retaining Raven’s key creator role). The anthem retains the notion of the collective, or Tlingit communal aspects, working together in political tribal communities contributing to the welfare of the group. The song reference to ‘our voices’ also emphasises Tlingit oral traditions. The notion of heritage and ancestry is conveyed through the past that will ‘never be forgotten’ linking to heritage and the land (our grandfather’s land) and the future promises by the fathers’ sisters, reinforcing the matrilineal structure of the Tlingit society. Finally, the notion of ‘promise’ captures reciprocity principles underpinning the Tlingit potlatch/gifting system (Godbout 1998) creating a ‘spiritual bond between giver and recipient’ (Langdon in Hope and Thornton eds. 2000:123).

Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994) reflect on ownership and reciprocity as the two main features that characterise Tlingit culture and oral tradition:

> Songs, stories, artistic designs, personal names, land and other elements of Tlingit life are considered either real or incorporeal (spiritual or intangible) property of a particular clan…at.óow…that refers partly to the ‘real estate’ and partly to rights to use emblems, songs, names and spirits…the visual art and oral literature follow and reinforce the patterns of social structure. The two moieties, Eagle and Raven, balance each other (p13).

The nature of Tlingit ownership (at.óow) concludes the discussion of the anthem:

> Haa at.oowu haa kusteeyix sitee.
> Our at.óow are our life
> [Our at.óow are our culture]
> (Emma Marks, interviewee in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:16)

The word at.óow means, literally, “an owned or purchased thing or object,” (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:15), where both aspects of object and ownership are important. Jacobs (in Hope III and Thornton 2000:34) stresses the material and symbolic dimensions. An object requires to be “brought out,” in memory of a deceased relative at a proper ceremonial opportunity, and is given a name before it is at.óow in its own right. This connection to ancestors is also important as

---

160 There is similarity in tribal unity to Māori (kotahitanga) as “fundamental to our ancestors,” (Barlow 1991:57).
161 It is Māori custom to provide some koha or donation/gift (formerly mats, baskets, or food but now often is money) as a contribution to their hosts (Barlow 1991:49).
162 For a fuller appreciation of these terms see Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1987, 1990 and 1994).
163 For example, a geographic feature like a mountain or historic site, a personal name or artistic design. They can also be spirits.
164 An object is owned by his or her descendants through purchase, as with the law where a person pays for a life with a life, perhaps their own, or with an object of great value. Ownership is restricted to one clan and passed down through the clan to the next steward (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:16-17).
Tlingit honour their immediate ancestors as well as more generally, the members of their clan who have gone before, and those unborn who, “wait ahead of us,” (shuka) (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:19). These aspects are recognised in material and non-material objects and through honouring Tlingit heritage in naming after ancestors.

Objects used during Tlingit dances, like masks, are at.óow. Two examples of at.óow represent the Russian-Tlingit conflict; an “iron Russian blacksmith’s hammerhead and a distinctive brass ceremonial hat,” both repatriated to Sitka clans under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 2003 and 2004 respectively (Griffin 2007:1). These objects are currently under the guardianship of the National Park Service in Sitka at the clan’s request. They are brought out with other at.óow in important ceremonies. They are reminders of Tlingit history of the 1804 Battle and subsequent peacemaking (Griffin 2007:1).

The following flag of the Tlingit and Haida Central Council (Figure 14) was found on the Tlingit national anthem website (http://cooday8.tripod.com/anthems.htm) and is included to illustrate the connection between the traditional and modern Tlingit attitudes. This emphasises the future applicability of geomentality as an explanatory framework related to ‘lasting’ cultural attitudes to nature, and thus a strong proxy to understand cross-cultural relations.

Figure 14: Tlingit and Haida Central Council Flag

![Figure 14: Tlingit and Haida Central Council Flag](http://cooday8.tripod.com/anthems.htm), accessed 21.03.2009.

---

165 Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994:693) note over time how at.óow has been under pressure, citing ANB members selling pieces to museums and collectors, but “we learned that we couldn’t live without them.” The cyclical notion of time and reincarnation and connection between the living and ancestral world is encapsulated in the concept of at.óow.
The flag depicts the state of Alaska (the central blue figure) as surrounded by artwork representing the two moieties of Eagle and Raven. The blue colour represents the water connecting the Tlingit and Haida people throughout the wide Northwest Coast lands. The nations are represented in traditional style using red, white and black. The flag connects the Tlingit heritage with ties to place and nature. Place is contained within the explicit illustration of Alaska as a physical landmass between the two nations. The connection to nature is illustrated through the moieties’ emblems of Raven and Eagle, living creatures that connect the identity of the Tlingit people to nature and the environment and represent the balance in moieties within the Tlingit social structure. Of a random sample of 24 national flags (representing one country for each letter of the alphabet), referenced using the on-line World Flag Database (http://www.flags.net/fullindex.htm, accessed 29.03.2009), only two countries, Bermuda and Kenya (8%) had flags similar to the Tlingit in their depiction of a ‘scene’ through a crest (e.g., Bermuda shows an animal and ship/water scene). All other flags represented (91.7%) had solid coloured lines with 8 of these (or 33% overall) depicting a star or stars. The American flag was amongst these.

Tlingit attitudes are contrasted with comments from President Woodrow Wilson regarding the American flag (1917):

This flag, which we honour and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us — speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it (in Van Buren 2007:81).

Wilson’s comment has a heritage element, though he emphasises individual choice possibly disconnecting a link between past and future generations different to the ongoing connections found in Tlingit and Russian cultures. Freedom of individual thoughts and actions is emphasised rather than maintaining historic promises as conveyed in the Tlingit anthem.

The genesis of the Tlingit and American ‘nation’ constructs appear distant. The Tlingit, grounded in place, ancestry, heritage and cyclical notions of time and space contrasted with the American nation based on ideals, an expanse of wilderness yet to be ‘conquered’ and a focus on linear time and individual liberties. Recognising this difference one can expect constructions of place naming to replicate these notions of nationhood, or it could assist to honour different cultural beliefs. Allowing
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166 Flags with a star or stars included: Algeria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Honduras, Morocco, Turkey, USA, and Vietnam.
difference to persist unrecognised only serves to deepen and prolong past cross-cultural conflict and negative sentiments between groups to continue.

A final observation, based on a poem by Andrew Hope (in Hope III 1982:98), titled, *Spirit of Brotherhood* reflects a contemporary Tlingit perspective on recent history that reflects attitude and observations made through the eyes of one of the Tlingit people today:

They sing Onward Christian Soldiers
Down at the ANB Hall
Every year in convention
The kids don’t like that song
They don’t like the missionary history
We shove that in the closet nowadays

The church had little to do with
ANB adopting this battle song
William Paul, Sr. introduced it
after he heard it at Lodge 163 of A.F. and A.M.
Portland, Oregon
The Masonic Lodge influence

The song bothers me
That’s no secret
But
My people went in to the church to survive
I don’t know what the pioneer days were like
Up here in gold rush Alaska

I listen to the Black church and think about the
music of the Black spirit
the gospel of Sam Cooke and the Soul Stirrers
Otis Redding and the others
That spirit catches you
When you walk in to the meeting and feel like family
You’ll know what I’m saying

Three things that are striking in this poem connect to the traditional Tlingit geom mentality. *First*, the dislike of the mission history and desire to remove (hide) it from the present indicates an on-going sentiment toward the past centuries of occupation and colonisation of the mind. There is an awareness of the impact from missionary activity and a desire to progress beyond its ramifications by returning to the Tlingit heritage (i.e., shove into the closet that part of history that does not align with the Tlingit way of living). The *second* is the acknowledgement of active choice by the Tlingit people to go ‘in to the church to survive,’ which supports previous discussions regarding the cultural adaptations taken by the Tlingit to ensure survival. Tlingit actively made external changes to burial practices, but retained their attitudes toward death and afterlife. *Third*, the discussion of ‘Black
spirit,’ spirit in the music and the notion of spirit catching you and feeling like family, conjures up the ‘spirit of brotherhood’ that Hope is writing about – the link to the Tlingit heritage that is part of the Tlingit spirit and that lives on in the connection across the Tlingit society connecting past through future generations.

4.6 Summary

This chapter has made an original contribution by adding to Sitka’s local and regional knowledge through the discussion of Tlingit, Russian and American geomentalities providing another means to enhance cross-cultural understanding through Sitka’s spiritual landscape. The formation of the American and Russian geomentalities represents an original contribution alongside a new cultural geographic perspective on existing Tlingit notions of place (Thornton 2008). It has provided a framework for understanding cultural influences that will be used to explain geospatial patterns in subsequent chapters, and shown how the use of cosmological study objects like creation myths can be used to effectively reveal cultural geomentalities.

Applying a consistent lens across the Tlingit, Russian and American cultures provided cosmological and spatial insights into the structure of the universe, attitudes toward the environment and the relationship between humanity and nature. During this process, similarities and differences between cultures were highlighted. For example, the Tlingit cultural values revealed through geom mentality included: priority for heritage (shagóon) and the associated strong ties to ancestral lands; a mutual regard for the natural environment (without a human dominated hierarchy); and a strong sense of guardianship over the environment. Traditional Russian geom mentality valued Mother Earth and a reliance and co-existence with the natural environment and seasons, reflecting the vastness of their geography. The sense of collective (versus individual focus) and ancestry (heritage) was also dominant with a longer term connection to the past and the sense of place. The American geom mentality was discussed within the Judeo-Christian context, shown to be reflected in the nation’s founding documents and national flag and anthem. The Judeo-Christian influences upon the American geom mentality emphasised attitudes toward nature that: prioritised human use of the land over other living creatures; reflected how the Fall of Man ‘cursed the earth’; emphasised the notion of the individual; and noticeably integrated the role of the Judeo-Christian faith and the creator
(God) within the rules for living and prioritised values (hard-work). Some of these geomentality aspects were translated to explain geographic behaviour in settlement explanations, Tlingit house, concepts of death, and nationhood. Further application of these geomentalities will explain geographic behaviours in Chapter 5 and 6 that explore people and place naming and the spatial aspects of Sitka’s spiritual landscape.

The discussion of geomentalities has traversed past and present views. It illustrated how the notions of attitudes toward nature, the origin/creation mythology, and structure of the Tlingit, traditional Russian and Judeo-Christian/American universe and society persist over time, with a core remaining in tact. These expressions of cultural geomentalities and how they contrast each other illustrate how each culture group has a fundamentally different starting point regarding human-environment relations. As this has been an investigation of the invisible spiritual landscape of the mind, concepts of time and space and differences in how these are expressed provide an important distinction for future cross-cultural consideration. The notion that the environment and all creatures are sacred for example, contrasts a preferential treatment of the needs of humanity over other living things. Where similarities in geomentality exist, a different inter-cultural relationship is observed.

To conclude this chapter, consider a return to the places of origin. The Nass River is where Raven releases the stars, moon and sun, and is the residence of Petrel. The Nass represents a parallel but very different notion to the Garden of Eden. You can visit the Nass River today. Prior to modern maps that “represent a static picture of the earth at a given moment in time,” the medieval mappamundi represented multiple information layers that “transcended in a vision of a multi-dimensional reality,” (Scafi in Cosgrove 1999:64). It contained geographic elements, but also Bible scenes, myths and reference to the Garden of Eden. In the 15th century “acceptable religious mystery” communicated in an abstract timeless dimension, became a “geographical and a rational problem,” changing how humans conceived their world (Scafi in Cosgrove 1999:65). It is no wonder then, after centuries of dividing up the world into measurable space with marked coordinates
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167 For example, in Genesis 2.8-10, it was east to Eden where God planted the “Earthly Paradise” known as home to man, the tree of life, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and the source of water for the garden parted into four heads (e.g., Tigris, Euphrates, Ganges and Nile rivers).

168 “The medieval attitude to the wholeness of human knowledge did not distinguish between cosmographical, philosophical, theological, mythological, historical or geographical knowledge…[T]he shift from medieval to modern thinking, from a holistic to a fragmented view of reality, from a mapping which sought to penetrate the mystery of the whole universe beyond human boundaries to a mapping…contained strictly within the frameworks of analytical thought and Euclidean geometry, and from cosmography to geography,” (Scafi in Cosgrove 1999:70).
and a secular geography focus, that colonists encountering cultural beliefs with a fluid time-space continuum, or unmapped spaces were deemed inferior.

What began as heaven on earth, was dismissed when Paradise was not “found” in our “ordinary experience of the physical world,” (Scafi in Cosgrove 1999:67). Around the same period, writings of John Lock [1690]

Held that God’s gift of land to Adam and his posterity acquired value only as labour was expended on it, and that labor justified individual property rights…People who marked the land lightly and lived within the rhythms of nature were obviously unprogressive and backward, (in Harris 2004:171).

This sentiment captures divergent cultural thinking between traditional and European minds. The dominance of nature, the development of individual property rights, the need to physically map the observable lands common to Western contemporary views, began with origins common with other cultures. Perhaps going forward in linear time, intercultural relationships must return to areas of commonality or beliefs held across cultures in the past to facilitate greater understanding and clarity around true points of difference and how these can be shown to evolve.

Can we recreate a pathway that brings the invisible geomentality back into consciousness where spiritual and spatial beliefs can coexist in human terms? Chapter 5 and 6 illustrate the impacts from disengaging with such beliefs and suggest ways to learn from differing viewpoints.

CHAPTER 5: THE POWER OF NAMING - POLITICS AND MULTICULTURAL INFLUENCES IN PEOPLE AND PLACE NAMES

Your name tells you your history...who you are and how you are related to people - Elder Lydia George (cited in Thornton 2008:56).

Chapter 3 provided an introduction to culture group relations and the development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape. Environmental attitudes of these groups were revealed through geomentality in Chapter 4. This chapter moves the exploration to the tangible contemporary landscape to focus upon naming. Some might consider naming innocuous with a functional simplicity of assigning a word or phrase to represent a person, place or thing. Naming however, is like a Trojan horse concealing deeper political motives and a version of history by those in power that is normalised through simple inscriptions upon maps and street signs. Deeper meanings can be “unquestioned,” aspects of landscape as they are “so tangible, so natural, so familiar,” (Duncan and Duncan 1988:123). Simple street names, for example, can “mask structures of power and legitimacy that underlie their construction and use,” (Winchester et al. 2003:74). The social and historic impact of such unconsciousness, as with the Trojan horse, results in naturalising particular ideologies, emphasising what is deemed important and marginalising (through its absence), what is less regarded. For this study then, names represent social constructions carrying significant meaning through their designation (process of naming) and use (power and influence). They are relevant to Sitka’s spiritual landscape to provide another layer to enhance understanding of culture-land and intercultural relationships reflected in the visible landscape. A thorough reading adds to the comprehensive approach to studying Sitka’s contemporary setting to highlight issues of cross-cultural diversity.

Past research has established the utility and versatility of studying place names. This rich data source offers insights to colonisation, social constructions of race and nation, and power in relationships at the same location. For Sitka, this cultural geographic approach complements previous work: Orth¹⁷⁰ (1967) and Schorr (1991) on Alaskan place name origins; anthropological investigations of Tlingit place names by Thornton (1997a, 1997b, 2008); recordings by Dauenhauer
and Dauenhauer eds. (1994); the Sitka Tribal Organisation, Tlingit Readers (*Traditional Tlingit Country Map* 2003); Stewart’s (2008[1958]) historical account of naming in the USA, and local historic chronologies by DeArmond (1993, 1995) that offer some name origins. Further afield, Yoon (1980, 1986, 1994a) and Herman’s (1999) works preserve and comment on indigenous naming in New Zealand and Hawai’i respectively. Modern applications and practical planning aspects are covered by Anderson (1988), and Kong and Tong (2003). And finally, research into the power and politics of street names is growing (Alderman 2003; Azaryahu 1996, 1997; Faraco and Murphy 1997; Herman 1999; Rose-Redwood 2008; Yeoh 1992, 1996) despite being “marginalized within the field of political geography,” (Rose-Redwood 2008:875). Street naming studies tend to focus upon political aspects from a hegemonic perspective with few studies taking a cross-cultural and/or indigenous view. Budnick and Wise’s (1989) exploration of indigenous Hawai’ian street names provides useful comparison in this regard. Many of the past Alaskan works are origin or dictionary type collections, with few linking names to geographic thought (Thornton 1997a, 2008) or making cross-cultural comparisons regarding origin, history, hegemony and geom mentality (Yoon 1980, 1986, 1994a).

Tlingit cultural naming discussions refer to the most recent place naming work by Tom Thornton (2008), the only researcher to extensively discuss Tlingit place naming and relate it to attitudes to the environment (1997a, 1997b, 2000 ed., 2008). As in Chapter 4, his research is useful in this study to facilitating Tlingit geom mentality understanding around ‘cosmological’ constructs (e.g., the role of Raven in naming, sacred clan histories that contextualise mental maps of specific places, or how naming reflects Tlingit cultural relationships to the land). Thornton’s (2008) analysis of naming in Glacier Bay National Park reflects his anthropological background to relate similar naming characteristics across Tlingit and English names (e.g., “the use of the body and kinship as metaphors,” (p70)), and to emphasise language and syntax relationships in names to Tlingit concepts of place. Part of his mandate concerns the ‘loss’ of traditional names, citing “as much as 50% of Tlingit toponymic knowledge may be lost already,” (Thornton 2008:72). His research makes reference to Sitka, but differs in scope and scale to this research. For example, he focuses upon Tlingit place names from a culture group perspective across the whole geographic area. This study focuses upon the “spiritual landscape” in Sitka including smaller scale features like street names and historic place designations while also considering Tlingit, Russian and American cross-cultural
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170 Orth is recognized as the definitive source for exploring Alaskan place origins.
influences upon maps (e.g., considering different culture group sources) and how and why Sitka’s ‘named contemporary landscape’ identity reflects different cultural influences. Patterns are explained within the comprehensive approach relating socio-political, historic, social construction and geomentality rationale. Original findings relate to the cross-cultural influence analysis of topographic place names including a first of its kind streetscape analysis for Sitka.

This chapter is organised to builds on previous approaches with an aim to: illustrate geomentality reflected in the tangible landscape thus linking attitudes to geographic behaviour; explore power relationships and politics reflected in the landscape over time; and consider the modern spiritual landscape, and heritage designations (a form of naming) to see how the contemporary landscape reflects diverse cultural influences. The scope of this chapter accommodates the range of sacredness discussed in Chapter 4 where the Tlingit geomentality considers all the landscape as sacred to the site-specific nature of the Judeo-Christian (American) geomentality. The investigation is structured into three sections: people, places and process. The first section is at Sitka territory-level examining 20 Tlingit tribe and 45 Clan House names and personal naming aspects to see how these reflect geomentality. The second section examines Sitka Territory place names to reveal historic cultural origins, the intent of naming, how this relates to worldview (e.g., commemorating people, nature, or relating to places), and links hegemony with features naming. The topographic examination includes 147 natural or built feature place names, including rivers, mountains and settlements and a Sitka-wide analysis of all of its 160 contemporary street names. No previous comprehensive research exists on Sitka street names. To aid in the historic and spatial analysis, Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape is divided into ‘zones’ as illustrated in Map 3 (see rationale in section 2.2.4). To remind readers, Zone 1: is the original (1800s) settlement area; Zone 2: the commercial business district (CBD); Zone 3: Outer town zone; Zone 4: Suburbs; and Zone 5: Japonski Island. Section three focuses upon the naming process, highlighting contemporary sacred place naming and implications relating the heritage designation process (e.g., what places are ‘recognised’ as ‘heritage sites’ and why). Naming insights discussed in this chapter provide consideration for future processes and practices to improve how cultural diversity is regarded and reflected in local and national settings.

171 Yoon (1980, 1991) discusses British influences on major city naming in New Zealand (Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch) while smaller centres carry indigenous names.
5.1 People Names

Attitudes toward the environment were revealed in Chapter 4 in geomentalities for traditional Tlingit, Russian and American cultures. Geomentalities represent a culture’s spiritual and spatial beliefs, thus can be expected to be reflected in cultural naming attitudes and naming behaviours. A reasonable hypothesis based on revealed geomentalities, would be that Tlingit naming highlights a deep connection to nature and place, and shagóon (heritage and identity); Russian naming reflects traditional mentality and depicts a nature connection; and American geom mentality emphasises a connection to the creator God, the Charters of Freedom (democracy and independence) and the important role of the individual. Linking geospatial behaviours to cultural geomentalities strengthens the use of geom mentality as an explanatory framework and leads to a deeper reading of the spiritual landscape tied to intangible beliefs. Associating the tangible and invisible landscape achieves the study objective for a deeper understanding of culture-land relationships as displayed in a holistic reading of the spiritual landscape.

This section analyses Tlingit Tribe and Clan House names to consider how geom mentality is reflected in naming. Data is based on the Tlingit Readers (2003) Traditional Tlingit Country Map (Map 1) that includes 20 Tlingit tribe names (Table 7) and 45 Tlingit Clan House names\textsuperscript{172} (Table 8) translated into English\textsuperscript{173} and a complete set of Tlingit names for the study location and surrounding territory. Names are categorised as: Nature names relating to the environment including flora, fauna, water or seasons; Location names indicating a cardinal direction like north, or containing an adverb like ‘near,’ ‘at’ or ‘across’; People names referring to individuals, human references like ‘nobility,’ or to human-made objects, like ‘fort,’ or ‘box.’ Names that do not fit into these categories are classified other. Categories are broad to enable a consistent application across subsequent naming analyses (e.g., topographic place and street naming). A more sophisticated Tlingit naming analysis emphasising ethnographic and biological links is found in Thornton’s (2008) recent work. He develops categories of hydrographic (water) and terrestrial names and explores naming according to: auditory, olfactory, and gustation senses; biological references (e.g., species of fish and wildlife, plants, minerals); and naming densities (e.g., according to frequency of food supply, settlement).

\textsuperscript{172} The Carcross/Tagish clans were added in July 2003, however they are not included in analysis of clan house names as the Tlingit translation into English was absent.

\textsuperscript{173} A possible fourth category was identified to relate to ‘historic reference or a part of history,’ however, none of the names on the map fit that category.
While useful for comparison, this study emphasises the cross-cultural diversity within the spiritual landscape.

### Table 7: Tlingit Tribe Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tlingit Tribe Name</th>
<th>English Tribe Translation</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Controller Bay area</td>
<td>Galyax Kwáan: Yakataga</td>
<td>Salmon Stream Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yakutat area</td>
<td>Laxaadiyik Kwáan</td>
<td>Near the Ice People</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dry Bay</td>
<td>Gunaxoo Kwáan</td>
<td>Among the Athabascans174 Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KluKwáan</td>
<td>Jilkat Kwáan</td>
<td>Chilkat175 Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Haines</td>
<td>Jilkoot Kwáan</td>
<td>Chilkoot176 Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hoonah</td>
<td>Xunaa Kwáan a.k.a. Káawu</td>
<td>Tribe or People from the Direction of the Northwind</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taku</td>
<td>Taakú Kwáan</td>
<td>Geese Flood Upriver Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teslin</td>
<td>Deisleen Kwáan</td>
<td>Big Sinew Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Atlin</td>
<td>Aa Tein Kwáan</td>
<td>Big Lake Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Auke Bay</td>
<td>Aak'w Kwáan</td>
<td>Small Lake Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sumdum</td>
<td>Sawdaan Kwáan</td>
<td>Dungeness Crab Town Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Angoon</td>
<td>Xutsnowú Kwáan</td>
<td>Brown Bear Fort; aka Burnt Wood Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sitka (Sheey At’ika aka Sheet’ka Kwáan)</td>
<td>Sheey At’ká (a.k.a. Sheet’ká) Kwáan</td>
<td>Outside Edge of a Branch Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Kake</td>
<td>Keex' Kwáan</td>
<td>The Opening of the Day (Dawn) Tribe aka The Town that Never Sleeps</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kuui Island</td>
<td>Kooyu Kwáan</td>
<td>Stomach Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Prince of Wales</td>
<td>Ta'k'k'aan Kwáan</td>
<td>Coast Town Tribe</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Klawock</td>
<td>Hinya Kwáan</td>
<td>Tribe from Across the Water</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Wrangell</td>
<td>Shtax'héen Kwáan</td>
<td>Bitter Water Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ketchikan</td>
<td>Taant’a Kwáan</td>
<td>Sea Lion Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cape Fox</td>
<td>Sanyaa Kwáan</td>
<td>Secure in Retreat, Like a Fox In Its Den / South East Tribe</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 8: Sheey At’iká or Sheet’ká Kwáan Clan House Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan House Name</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raven Moiety (Kiks.ádi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atuwaxiiji Hít</td>
<td>Strong House</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagaan Hít</td>
<td>Sun House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaxatjaa Hít</td>
<td>Jumping Herring House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noowtu Hít</td>
<td>Inside The Fort House</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noow Daganyaa Hít</td>
<td>Outside The Fort House</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S’é Hít</td>
<td>Clay House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

174 From Cree athapaskaaw, “there is scattered grass,” (http://thefreedictionary.com/athabascan, accessed 01.02.2008)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan House Name</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shdéen Hít</td>
<td>Steel House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tináa Hít</td>
<td>Copper Shield House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X'aká Hít</td>
<td>Point House</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watineidí, Koosk'eidí, Xaas Hít</td>
<td>Cow House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watineidí Koosk'eidí Daginaa Hít</td>
<td>Out In The Ocean Salmon Box House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuta Hít</td>
<td>Sleep House</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'ook Hít Tlein</td>
<td>Big Coho House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'ook Hít Yádi</td>
<td>Small Coho House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shgat.aayí Hít</td>
<td>House Named For Creek Near Yakutat</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taan Hít</td>
<td>Sea Lion House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinaa Hít</td>
<td>House At The Lower End Of Town</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinaa Hít 2</td>
<td>House At The Lower End Of Town (2)</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xích'i Hít</td>
<td>Frog House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yáay Hít</td>
<td>Whale House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeintaan, Danakoo Hít</td>
<td>(Sea Pigeon”) Danakoo House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X'at'ka.aayí, Kayaashka Hít</td>
<td>Platform House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'ook Hít</td>
<td>Coho House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan House Name</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aanyádi Hít</td>
<td>Nobility House</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eech Hít</td>
<td>Reef House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi'áak' Hít</td>
<td>Eagle House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi'áak' Kúdi Hít</td>
<td>Eagle's Nest House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi'ee Hít</td>
<td>Murrelet House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cháat' Hít</td>
<td>Halibut House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Déix X'awool Hít</td>
<td>House with Two Doors</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayéis' Hít</td>
<td>Iron House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooch Hít</td>
<td>Wolf House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutxayanahá Hít</td>
<td>Star House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heenka Hít</td>
<td>House on the Water</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X'oorts Hít</td>
<td>Brown Bear House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaawagaani Hít</td>
<td>Burned House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuháada Hít</td>
<td>Fish-Chasing Stick House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kookhiittaan, Tóos' Hít</td>
<td>Shark House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kóok Hít</td>
<td>Box House</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutis' Hít</td>
<td>Looking Out to Sea House</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'laadein Hít</td>
<td>Standing Sideways House</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chookaneidí, Xaat Hít</td>
<td>Iceberg House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aan Eegayaak Hít</td>
<td>Iceberg On The Beach House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooshkeetaan, Noow Hít</td>
<td>Fort House</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xáx'ahittaan, X'ax'a Hít</td>
<td>Cliff House</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Sheey At'iká or Sheet'ká Kwáan* is the ‘Tribe’ of the study site area. A first comment on Tlingit naming is that the reference to ‘Tribe’ is a European construct imposed within the Tlingit social structure. A brief overview of terminology is useful context for the naming analysis discussion. The

---

balance inherent in the Tlingit social structure is illustrated in Figure 15, which overviews relevant terminology based on definitions in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994:13).

Figure 15: Overview of Tlingit Social Structure Terminology

Confusion by the terms, ‘tribe,’ ‘nation,’ and ‘clan,’ are discussed in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994:12-13), with meanings varying according to the speaker and context. They note the Latin derivation of the term ‘tribe’ and its origins in government use, as with the legal definition of Native organisations established under the Indian Reorganization Act. The introduction of the term ‘tribe’ through legislation is an example of a social construction by the government to artificially compartmentalise groups of Native People, assuming an absence of existing Tlingit social structures as described in Chapter 3. The Tlingit people have adapted to the “tribe” construction (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994) particularly as much of the access to government programmes and funding is through formal tribal associations, organisations and affiliations. This adaptation is similar in other indigenous cultures, such as Māori in New Zealand, where Durie (1998) discusses:

a new type of Māori identity…based on tribal affiliation…actively promoted by the State (in Marie 1999:99).
The adaptation shows indigenous culture resilience, and in some cases can heighten allegiance to a particular ancestral location (Kallen 1996:88 in Marie 1999), though legislation is also identified as an instrument of geographic displacement (Harris 2004). This section illustrates the importance of naming in the Tlingit culture, thus underlining how political power, like legislative change, greatly affects the deepest aspects of culture.

The simple categorisation of the 65 Tlingit Tribe and Clan House names is based on English translations of Tlingit names set out in Tables 7 and 8. The Tlingit geomantality and connection to the environment is clearly supported with Nature names dominating 72% of all names, 17% of names referring to Location, and 11% of names referring to People. It was difficult to categorise some names as location and nature categories blended as with: The House on the Water, or The Looking Out to Sea House. Further, the names in the Tlingit “People” category did not relate to European people names (e.g., individuals). The former emphasise human qualities or behaviours (e.g., strong, sleep, nobility), and if one considers the strong connection to nature in the Tlingit geomantality (e.g., house strengthening ceremony), the distinctions merge further. Tlingit naming is simplified however, if one looks beyond the English translation to the Tlingit origin for each name, which would mean all names reflect Nature. Thornton (2008) describes events that occurred at particular locations to contextualise name origins. Names that would be classed People (e.g., Box House or Fort House), when contextualised, reflect the Tlingit connection of people and place. So why not change Table 7 and 8 to reflect this? This is a study that seeks to enhance cross-cultural understanding. By reflecting how the ‘other’ (researcher) looks at the Tlingit naming from a non-Tlingit perspective, provides insight to how another non-Tlingit might respond. Such misunderstanding across cultures can be better managed if divergent interpretations are surfaced.

To test the functionality of connecting a ‘name’ to the physical place it refers, a matching exercise with names and the Traditional Tlingit Country Map (2003) was undertaken. Tribe names should be related to specific places/locations based on physical geography. It was relatively easy to approximate the following Tribe locations using English translations: Near the Ice, People from the Direction of the Northwind, and Big Lake Tribe. Remaining Tribes were located based on natural features (e.g., Tribe Across the Water, Coast Town Tribe, or Small Lake Tribe), or a food/hunting source (e.g., Sea Lion Tribe, Geese Flood Upriver Tribe, Dungeness Crab Town Tribe). Despite the utility and result from the geographic name matching exercise, it is noteworthy that English
translations have limits. For example, the richness of oral culture and multiple meanings are constricted when translated. For example, the Keex' Kwáan, contains two different but related English translations: The Opening of the Day (Dawn) Tribe, and The Town that Never Sleeps. The variation could relate to the different seasons. During summer the sun barely sets in the north, indicating a town that never sleeps; however, during the winter, the daylight hours are limited (emphasising dawn only) or might simply reflect a different English translation. In all cases, the established link between Tlingit tribe naming, nature and location was reinforced.

Several other observations in Tlingit naming appear to relate the Tlingit geomentality. The first is the continuous present tense depicted in naming (e.g., Fish-Chasing Stick House, or Iceberg On The Beach House). Naming is not retrospective and commemorative or historic to support a linear view of time. This naming aspect reinforces the Tlingit mentality of continuous time and a sense of ongoing responsibilities regarding acting with the environment. The second aspect is that none of the names in Tribe and Clan Houses are repeated. Duplications are not found in Tlingit naming within nearby locales (e.g., within the same bay) where Thornton (2008) identifies an additional distinguishing feature would be added (e.g., ‘Big’ Sockeye Creek). In this way it could be considered nature also has a role in the naming process. Thornton (2008:111) notes how noisy clams drown out Raven’s voice to show how nature plays an active role in the naming process preventing Raven from redundantly creating two Nass Rivers “purely out of want, longing or nostalgia.”

Thornton (2008) describes this interconnectedness of people and nature as ‘geographic ensemblage’ where people:

place elements of the geography on their bodies in order to mutually inscribe their character on the land and the land on their character. Through ensemblage, not only does space become ‘a society of named places,’ as Levi-Strauss (1966) observed, but members of society also become landscapes of named places (p 100).

The Western Judeo-Christian geomentality that regards people as separate and superior to nature explains why European names can repeat in different locations (e.g., Mt Edgecumbe in Sitka, Britain, and New Zealand).
5.1.1 SHEEY AT'IKÁ CLAN HOUSE NAMES

One difficulty of the legal construction of ‘Tribe,’ is that in the Tlingit social structure, “[v]irtually all legal and political authority was vested in the clan,” (Thornton 2008:47). Focusing upon Sheey At’iká (Sitka), there are similar numbers of clan houses for each moiety in the Sheet’ká Kwáan: 23 houses in the Raven Moiety (Kiks.ádi) and 22 houses in the Eagle/Wolf Moiety (Kaagwaantaan). This equal division supports the balance in society where the responsibilities of opposite moieties are clearly set and required to maintain the economic and social stability as discussed in Chapter 3. Tlingit elder, David Kanosh spoke of this balance in a contemporary context:

My mother is of the...Beaver clan – I am likewise of the Raven Beaver clan. She married someone of the Eagle clan – in this way balance is maintained. A Raven never married a Raven. This was a taboo that was punishable by banishment or death. Today society can’t really prevent that. We still encourage the younger ones to marry in the traditional path, to keep balance in Tlingit society (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

Looking at the clan names, the Kaagwaantaan moiety has a greater proportion of People names and less Location names than the Kiks.ádi moiety (if applying the simple English translation). One explanation is that the Kiks.ádi clan came to the area first and perhaps have more topographic location references. George Lewis notes:

The Kiks.ádi clan was the first to come here, of those who are now in Sitka. Originally, there were people here called the Neix.ádi, who claimed the whole area from Sitka to Cape Ommaney. The Kiks.ádi is really a branch of that group. They claimed up to Surge Bay, from Sitka. They carved a mark into a rock on a cliff in Surge Bay to mark their ownership. After the Neix.ádi people died off, the Kiks.ádi claimed the area to the south too. This happened long before the Russians came to Alaska (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:140).

The story of the founding of the Kiks.ádi clan crest (frog) and the physical location of origin are sacred. The story from Swanton (1908) follows:

the Kiks.ádi had been wandering northward for several years, never certain as to where to establish a village. One day, when they were off Sitka Sound in a dense fog, a frog appeared and circled about the canoes for some time, then started towards the land. The canoes followed and were led by the frog into Sitka harbour, where the Kiks.ádi were overjoyed to find a pleasant village site. The frog was then taken as the crest of the Kiks.ádi clan (p 64).

The story illustrates the cooperative balance between humans and nature in settlement decisions. The connection to place is noted by Thornton (2008):

One cannot speak of the Kiks.ádi without implicitly invoking their ties to Kiks Bay (near the Nass River), the distant place for which they are named (p 53).
Emmons (1916) captured this sentiment in the following: “a name once given (to a clan house) survive(s) the mere structure.\textsuperscript{178} His phrase refers to the Tlingit house, while shown to be sacred in Chapter 4, is merely symbolic of the clan structure, but not \textit{materially} required to retain the deeper meaning of belonging to the clan. The link to clan and place continues even if the Tlingit person is far from their ancestral land as illustrated in personal naming.

\section*{5.1.2 PERSONAL NAMING & INTRODUCTIONS}

The importance of naming and personal ‘identity’ ensures balance and structure within the Tlingit society. Thornton (1997b, 2008) and de Laguna (1960) discuss the heritage-identity link provided by the moiety structure where the clan’s matrilineal lineage was key to recognise individual identity. Similar iwi and hapū affiliations link heritage and identity for indigenous Māori in New Zealand (Yoon 1986). Naming and how one receives their name at birth reflect the social structure. Thornton (2008) discusses the importance of naming for the Tlingit:

Without a Tlingit name, social identity is drastically weakened – short of breath\textsuperscript{179} – and the individual may be considered adrift, lost, without a spirit, and without a place (p 56).

Veniaminov notes that a Tlingit can have two names:

…the first given immediately after birth and always by the mother or by maternal relatives. The baby always receives the name of some deceased relative known for his bravery, or success, or something else (in Hope III 1982:16-17).

The second name is given at a potlatch (thus the expense meant some Tlingit only had one name). Legalised marriages threatened inheritance and other tribal customs including the role of matrilineal relatives attending to funeral arrangements (e.g., providing the coffin, pall bearers, criers (Kamenskii 1985:137)). Patrilineal inheritance jeopardised the balance in Tlingit society by transferring property to another clan and moiety. Thornton (in Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:xix) discusses the Tlingit English naming strategy, which effectively adapts the Tlingit cultural and matrilineal social structure within the White ways, showing further adaptations for survival (i.e., individual names reflected place inheritance alongside first names like \textit{Dry Bay} George and \textit{Sheep Creek} Mary without an emphasis upon patrilineal based surnames).

\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Traditional Tlingit Country Map} (Tlingit Readers 2003:1).

\textsuperscript{179} See Chapter 4 for discussion on breath of life.
Personal names are used in introductions, which are linked to place as illustrated in Andrew Hope’s introduction referring to:

his birthplace Sitka, his father’s clan, “the Kiks.ádi of the Raven moiety,” his mother’s birthplace Wrangell (Stax’heen), meaning “the manner in which a person grits his teeth after drinking water from the glacial lakes,” descendent of X’aan Hít, Red Clay house, of the Sik’nax. Ádi meaning “Grindstone people,” clan of the Wolf moiety and finally by his Tlingit name, X’ustanch, “Killer Whales Coming Down in a Wave, Going to War” (Hope III & Thornton eds. 2000:23).

The modern day introduction reinforces his heritage and identity (shagóon). His social place amongst other clans is set out along with place connections representing his heritage. His personal name is stated last, suggesting a greater importance to the heritage context. George Lewis similarly introduced himself half a century ago, starting with his birth date and place, then his mother’s clan and then father’s:

I was born in Sitka on March 15, 1873, and am a Native of Sitka. My mother’s clan is Kiks.ádi, and I am now the recognized leader of that group. My father was a Chookaneidi. Both my parents were Natives of Sitka (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:140).

Herb Hope recently began his discussion of the Kiks.ádi Survival March of 1804 with a greeting that acknowledged the shaman Stoonookw, Yéil as creator, his Kiks.ádi clan link, the Sheet’ká Kwáan place link, his house link X’aaká Hít and his father’s Kaagwaantaan association (Hope and Thornton eds. 2000:49).

The continuous nature of Tlingit naming is illustrated by David Kanosh regarding the heritage of his name:

My clan comes from Admiralty Island – but it’s also known as “Kootznoowoo,” meaning “Fortress of the Bear” – there are lots of bears on that island…You acknowledge you are from that clan – you were able to tell who you were just through the name – the genealogy of who you were…When a person dies, that name may not be held for another couple of generations…out of respect, and then when there will still be someone alive who remembers who that was – for example the clan leader…when I stood up and said my name – he stood up and said that is my uncle’s name – so in a sense – I am his uncle returned…and I would take on duties as to stand by him when he would speak…When you pay respects to the one who takes on that name – you are paying respects to the ancestors before you. This tries to keep the balance with the living – and let the dead stay in the land of the living (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

David Kanosh is connected to his place of birth and his ancestry through his name that reinforces the importance of place and heritage as a context for individual identity in the Tlingit culture.
Other indigenous cultures similarly have strong connections to place in their sense of identity and introductions. These practices are elaborated here to illustrate how some countries breathe new life into traditional identities (introductions) which may be relative to changing practices in nations where such practices are not the norm. In the traditional Hawai’ian culture for example:

No genealogical chart was possible without the mention of personal geography…no family could have any standing in the community unless it had a place…no history could have been made…without…a place (Herman 1999:84).

Māori proverbs (whakataukī) that identify a person’s whakapapa (or genealogy links) are known as pēpeha. Some Māori iwi or hapu use pēpeha that “reflect the thoughts, values and advice of past generations,” in formal speeches on marae like the Tlingit examples (http://www.korero.Māori.nz, accessed 09.04.2009). In introducing oneself, the speaker recognises ‘those who came to this land, those who have departed, and those present creating the customs (tikanga)’ (http://www.Māori.org.nz/tikanga, accessed 09.04.2009). In New Zealand, the more standardised Māori pēpeha is used frequently, including by European cultures in some contexts (revised accordingly). The Tlingit variance of introductions in comparison could be because the examples used are random from academic texts rather than formal ceremonies (like a potlatch). It could also be due to the stronger preservation of the Māori language supported in New Zealand as a bicultural country (i.e., the formality of preserving the Tlingit language is at an earlier stage). As a non-Tlingit, non-Māori observer, the support within government to promote an indigenous culture makes a significant difference to all cultures of a place. In New Zealand, bilingual training is common in government departments. Through the kura kaupapa Māori immersion education system, more children are growing up learning their indigenous language and culture. Given the rich meaning behind the Tlingit naming, wider application of the Tlingit language would serve to extend understanding of Tlingit geom mentality and broaden cultural diversity.

---

180 Examining 25 pēpeha from around New Zealand, Yoon (1986:53) associates the three parts of the pēpeha structure to natural and cultural identity: first, the sacred mountain historically concealed the bones of their ancestors (natural identity); second, the association to a significant body of water/river within the homeland territory (natural identity); and third, the tribe or chief link at the level the individual most identifies (e.g., hapu or family unit (whanau) (cultural identity).

181 Yoon (1986:55) cites a pēpeha within the Judeo-Christian context useful for illustrative purposes: “Zion is the mountain, Jordan is the river, Jesus Christ is the man.”
5.1.3 SUMMARY

Tlingit people naming has revealed characteristics that clearly reflect their geomentality, maintain balance in their social structure, emphasise a connection to nature, and reflect specific places or locales. Nonetheless, fundamental Tlingit naming has adapted to co-exist within Western frameworks like the construction of ‘tribe’ social categories. Individual, clan, and tribe naming reflect nature and the environment. Personal names, like *Killer Whales Coming Down in a Wave*, and *Going to War*, like clan names articulate a continuous time and are based in the present rather than commemorative and based in linear time. The application of these Tlingit naming characteristics also applies to others. Rather than create an ‘us’ and ‘them’ mentality with the arrival of White settlers, the Tlingit named the White people *Gus’k’ikwáan*. This term has been interpreted within a context by Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. (1994) as:

“People From Under the Clouds,” because their ships sailed from under the clouds and we believed their land was out there (p324).

Rather than create a duality in their naming of others, Tlingit contextualise people names within place notions, representing their ‘geographic ensemblage’ (Thornton 2008) in their way of conceptualising people and places. Such a stark difference to European naming, raises a caution around literal translations resulting from such fundamentally different naming foundations. This difference in approach is articulated in Nyman and Leer (1993) where the Taku River Tlingit Clan expresses naming as representing:

components of an integrated folklife system…[where] narratives show an intimate connection between people and the land…[and] place names document events that shaped not only the lives and culture of the people, but the land itself. The place names…contrast the arbitrariness of the European names given to the same places by the newcomers. “Dorothy Peak” and “Point Bishop” that could be applied to any place (cited in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:30).

Changes to Tlingit naming approaches reveal similar experiences to other indigenous people in New Zealand and North America. In these places new tribal constructs within Western frameworks require adaptation. Better understanding of the fundamental reasoning behind Tlingit naming aids cross-cultural understanding, rather than comparing visible markers alone. Esoteric or origin explorations of names do not sufficiently express the rationale and deeper meaning of the Tlingit culture naming system. Further contrasts with Western and European approaches are next explored with an analysis of Sitka Territory’s topographic place names.
5.2 Topographic Place Names

This analysis of topographic place names includes 147 Sitka Territory names and 160 Sitka street names. The ‘Sitka Territory,’ is based on boundaries in the *Tlingit Traditional Use and Ownership Map* (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998[1946]) with place names collected from it, the *Russian America or Alaska Territory* map by Lewis and Cadin (1867), and *Nautical Charts* from the US National Office of Coast Survey (1995/2006). Street names were gathered from the *Sitka City Walking Tour Map* (Caputo 2008[1998]) and the *Greater Sitka Chamber of Commerce Map* (1991). Appendices 7 and 8 set out the data sets for topographic place and street names, respectively. Name origin is recorded in the “commentary” section of the data tables and any ‘sacred place’ location information is also recorded (e.g., religious name or location of sacred place like the Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) cemetery being located on Indian River Road). Considering previous naming categorisation by Yoon (1986, 1994b) and Thornton (2008), for this study, map names were categorised according to: *Name Type* using *nature, location, people* or ‘*other*’ groups following the rationale applied to the Tlingit Tribe and Clan House analysis above; *Type of Feature* as land, water or built categories; and *Scale* feature ranking size into *small, medium* and *large* groups. Small classification is applied to rocks or streams. Medium is applied to rivers, inlets, and small islands. Large applies to lakes, mountains, large islands, and main settlement areas.

Finally, to capture *Cultural Influence* for the naming analysis, several principles were applied to determine allocations to ‘culture’ categories of: *Tlingit, Russian, American,* and *Other.* First, transliterated or translated names were categorised to represent pronunciation by their original culture (e.g., Russian names that appear in English are categorised as ‘Russian’ like *Kupreanof Island*). Next, in the absence of historic data for a place’s origin, the name is categorised according to how it ‘sounds’ to the researcher (e.g., *Ilin Bay* sounds Russian, *A Street* sounds American). Where a name appears in English and does not have historic data to support a British origin, it is categorised as American (e.g., *Hogan Island, Herbert Graves Island, Portlock Harbour*). The date and cultural context of a source map is considered as part of the naming context (e.g., *Slocum Arm* and *Klag Bay* are classed as *Tlingit* names as they only appear on the *Traditional Tlingit Use Map* and have no other culturally distinguishable features). Cultural influence categories were used as culture tags (e.g., ‘R’ for Russian) on the Goldschmidt and Haas (1998) base map. *Map 4: Cultural*
Influences on Sitka Territory Place Names provides a visual perspective of the cultural influences according to location, scale and feature type. This method was effective in revealing spatial patterns in Yoon’s (1980, 1994) analyses of place names in New Zealand. A variation of this approach is used for street names where a number tag using the development ‘zones’ described earlier (1-5) is captured in the data set and then plotted on Map 5: Cultural Influences on Sitka Streetscape. Where a street is located over more than one zone, categorisation is based on the ‘zone’ where the majority of the street is located. Interview responses and field research notes supplement information collection where applicable.

To provide an introduction to the data, Figure 16 illustrates all 307 topographic names according to name type and divides names by place and street for comparison. People names account for approximately half of all names (55%); however, this grows to 69% when considering only street names, a contrast to the earlier Tlingit naming discussion featuring Nature names. Type of feature also shows a variance with more Nature names for natural features (36%) than for streets (11%).

**Figure 16: Topographic Features by Naming Type**

![Bar chart showing distribution of names by category and type](chart.png)

Data set:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Physical Features</th>
<th>Streetscape</th>
<th>All Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 4: Cultural Influences on Sitka Territory Place Names

[Diagram showing cultural influences on Sitka Territory place names]

Name Origin
- A: American (1840s)
- B: British (1850s)
- F: Finnish (1900s)
- P: Portuguese (1890s)
- R: Russian (1870s)
- T: Tlingit (1900s)

Source: Field Research (Alexander 2000)

[Legend for territorial boundaries, clan territories, hunting, fishing, and other place names]

Property / Courtesy of Sitka National Heritage Institute, All Rights Reserved
Source from Goldschmidt and Haas, 1998
Breaking down the 147 physical features in Sitka’s landscape into feature type (Figure 17), most are Water (55%), followed by Land (35%) and Built features (only 10% as there are few settled areas within Sitka Territory). Nature names dominate the Water features (50%), and People names dominating Built (60%) and Land features (58%). Location names account more for water (16%) and land (15%) features, though overall it is not as important a naming category as compared with its position in Tlingit Tribe and Clan House naming. For each type of physical feature (built, land, water), the range in scale (size of features) is set out in Figure 18. Of all these features, few are Large scale, thus the naming of such features may be considered more important if size is taken to indicate ‘power.’ Yoon (1980) considers ‘significance’ and size in his investigation of New Zealand place names where indigenous names are found to be more abundant; however European names dominate larger centres.

![Figure 17: Type of Topographic Feature by Naming Category](image)

Data table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the key topographic features in this overview provide a frame for considering cultural influences in place naming in the next section. Trends reveal a dominance of People naming types overall, with Nature names represented more in natural features, particularly Water, and few Large scale topographic features (of these more land and built than water). The next section explains the cultural influences of naming these features and considers the implications of such naming.

5.2.1 CULTURAL INFLUENCES

To introduce the cultural influence data, all place names listed on all maps (including duplications of ‘places’ where different maps refer to the same place albeit with a different name), yielded 350 names to categorise (see Figure 17). The majority of these names were American (51%) with Russian names representing 23%, Tlingit names comprising 19% and Other names adding 7%. Figure 19 provides a closer look at the map sources used in this analysis to illustrate the varied cultural emphasis of each.
Figure 19: Cultures Represented by Map Source

Data set:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Source</th>
<th>Tlingit</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haa Aani (1998[1946])</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Charts (1867)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Nautical Charts (1995/2008)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka Zoning (2000)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka Walking (1998/2007)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It could be expected that the source culture is over-represented in the proportion of place names for that culture’s map. Indeed, the map with the most Tlingit place names (46%) is the *Haa Aani* map (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998[1946]). Yet this map still has fewer than half Tlingit names since larger features reflect early European exploration (e.g., *Mt Edgecumbe* rather than the Tlingit volcano woman name *Shee*). Similarly, the *Russian America 1867* map reflects more ‘Other’ culture names (44%) than Russian names (38%). In both cases cartographers may have added well-accepted European navigational naming, including non-Russian names to the Russian origin map during Lewis and Cadin’s translation. There are no American names on the Russian map likely since it is of international scale and much of the landmark naming was completed by European explorers prior to America becoming a nation. Interestingly, the orientation of the Russian map is eastward toward Europe and Asia rather than remaining focused on North America or the coastline as is the case for the Tlingit map. Not surprisingly, local city CSPD Zoning and *Sitka Walking Tour* maps are dominated with American names (67% and 71%, respectively). In contrast to the above, when
‘significant’ (medium and large features) are considered in the Sitka Territory, most are Russian (37%) or Tlingit (33%) with American names representing 17% and Other 13%. An analysis of observations follows for land, water and built features considering cultural influences for each.

5.2.1.1 Land Features

The dominance of the Russian culture on the major land features is striking with all seven of the largest islands in the area bearing Russian names. This observation contrasts Stewart’s (2008[1958]) comment on the unimportance of Russian naming:

On the whole, however, the most remarkable thing about the Russian names in Alaska in their unimportance. First, the British named the larger features. Second, the Russians adopted many native names. Third, the Americans translated many names into English. In the end, the important Russian names came to be those commemorating individuals, such as the Pribilof Islands, for the pilot who discovered them in 1786 (p 397).

In addition to reflecting a Western geomentality regarding topographic hegemony, Stewart’s scale of investigation is too broad to effectively discuss significance of Russian naming in this former headquarters of North America. Even his chapter on Alaska added in 1958 does not provide sufficient attention to Russian naming influences in Sitka territory. In descending size, the largest islands in the territory include: Chichagof, Baranov, Kruzof, Yakobi, and Kupreanof. In the medium size category, Russian cultural influences are also present with Catherine Island and Japonski Island. All Russian names are People names and have been transliterated into English spellings. The need to recognise ‘the discoverer’ of a place, by naming the place after them, was a practice during exploration. The timing of naming as with first ‘discovery’ and periods of European exploration was important to show dominance over land in line with Judeo-Christian geomentality, with ownership illustrated in the written cartographic form. From a European perspective, the naming process acted to reinforce power as well as provide functional navigation aids showing no regard for ownership identified through oral traditions (Roseman 1998). Dominating the landscape through naming of features and plotting territories on maps for example, reflects the importance of asserting human domination over the environment. It is also an important nation-building tool that was not historically practiced by oral indigenous cultures. As such, the absence of indigenous names upon written maps led to a race by nations to claim ‘uncharted’ territory. Boelhower (1986) discusses the power in the use of blank space for the ‘yet to be explored’ frontier west:
the very process of extending the master word, “United States of America,” across the land automatically creates a political continuum, a place of consent (p 116).

Words on a map across the “unclaimed” territory set in motion the process for dominating it. For this reason Black (2004:92) is critical of Cook who gave English names to coastal features “he knew full well were claimed by the Russians.” But such is the power in naming. So why did America not overwrite the Russian names at 1867?

Major land masses continue to bear the Russian names as when America acquired Alaska, it was so concerned with avoiding British influences (Jackson and Penrose 1993) that it would have supported the stability provided by the Russian occupation and influence of their new acquisition. Further, the distance and relative obscurity of the acquisition at the time (e.g., Seward’s Folly and Johnson’s Icebox) were unlikely to generate attention. It would be reasonable to expect an American cartographer developing a map of the Sitka area to translate the Russian name into English in line with the American ‘transfer’ of the area from Russian to American control. Senator Charles Sumner’s speech on the cession conveys:

...as these extensive possessions...pass from the imperial government of Russia, they will naturally receive a new name (in Stewart 2008[1958]:398-399).

Making place names ‘American’ (e.g., English as opposed to Russian language) would have sufficed to acknowledge the new ‘landowners.’ Translations led to multiple spellings of names in different map versions. Chichagof Island was listed as “Tchitchagoff Island” in the Lewis (1867) map of the area based on Russian charts. Baranov Island has often been spelled as Baranof, and Baranov. American interest in the area did not really take hold until the threat of war some 70 years post transfer. Even then, the relative importance of the place (e.g., a population of several thousand at the time of WW2) was minor in relation to the lower 48 states. Finally, feature names must have relevance to their users at one level and require wider acknowledgement at international scales (e.g., functional navigation points established over time became well-recognised internationally). For this reason, the timing of place naming also explains why navigation landmarks appear on recent maps irrespective of cultural origin.

---

182 Mt Edgecumbe was named by Cook in 1778. Lt Saricheve of the Imperial Russian Navy published two other names for the same feature in 1826: Svataya Lazarya (Saint Lazarus), after Chirikov’s naming in 1741, and Trubitsina in the 1790s by Baranof of the Russian American Company (Orth 1967; Cook’s Log 1986).
There are patterns of cultural naming in the Sitka territory at a macro-level. The most dominant culture represented in the ‘other’ category was British (54%) and Finnish (23%). British naming is prevalent to identify distinguishing ‘boundaries’ of the investigation area. For Sitka Territory these boundaries include: Icy Strait\(^\text{183}\) to the northeast; Cross Sound directly north (located just to the north of the map in Map 4, though it is not labelled); Chatham Strait, which forms the eastern boundary; and Cape Ommaney, which borders the south (all but Icy Strait are British names). The Portuguese naming of the Pacific Ocean by the explorer Magellan forms the western boundary to the Sitka Territory. These names represent the British and Portugal nations as part of the North American ‘discovery’ period beginning in the 15\(^{th}\) century. The patterns that influenced Cook’s naming process as identified by Stewart (2008[1958]:390-392) can be more widely applied to the European naming process regarding: commemoration of people, descriptions of places, incidents (e.g., Mount Fairweather was named after bad weather cleared and Cook was then able to see its peak), and the calendar (e.g., naming Cross Sound on Holy Cross day). As significant landmarks for navigation,\(^\text{184}\) the persistence of these names is not surprising. The importance of Britain as a power during the 1700s would have influenced the persistence of the British naming on key landmarks and features in distant lands. As prolific cartographers, the British and Portuguese influences are also visible throughout early maps of North America (Whitfield 1998). Still, the conflict between American and British nations in the 1700s would influence the preference of Americans to retain any other non-British naming where possible. The Western view of land is commodified and viewed as a territory rather than seen as part of a comprehensive system, thus underlining the diverging worldviews of the indigenous peoples and colonists (Herman 1999:80). An example of this is the repetitive naming used by the British in contrast to the Tlingit naming.

The Russian naming with links to nation (e.g., Catherine), religion (e.g., Saint Michaelovska) and homeland (e.g., Novo Archangel’sk) reflect aspects important to their Russian culture that are better explained through geomentality than the role of the explorer and his observation skills (Cosgrove 1999). Some spiritual references in naming align to the Judeo-Christian geomentality and reverence

---

\(^{183}\) Names can be viewed as living organisms that alter and change over time. The naming of Icy Strait is an example. Since 1778, it has been called by the Russians, Pr[oliv] Ledyanov, meaning Icy Strait. The Spanish explorers called it Entrada de la Cruz, meaning entry of the cross, and Puerto de la Cruz, meaning port of the cross. These names originally included the area that is now called Icy Strait (Originally published in Cook’s Log, page 460, volume 9, number 3 (1986) at http://www.captaincooksociety.com/ccsu4138.htm, accessed 3.3.2007.

\(^{184}\) It was expected that Location names would have factored higher overall, given the functional requirements of navigation across Sitka Territory, however, this category ranked low for both physical features and streetscape (15%).
of the cross represented in British and Russian topographic place names of Cross Sound, Cape Cross, Krestof Island and Port Krestof (as “Krestof” means cross in Russian); and former Russian naming for Cape and Mt Edgecumbe after Saint Lazarius (in Russian “Svataya Lazarya”).

An oddity that remained in the post-Russian landscape is the name of Japonski Island, particularly interesting in an American landscape during and following WW2. The Russian “Yaponsky Island” was translated to Japan Island in the Lewis & Cadin (1867) map and currently transliterates the original Russian. Initially named by the Russian Captain Resanof, it was designated as the place “to keep captive Japanese whom he expected to capture through his expedition against the lower Kuril Islands in 1806,” (Andrews 1922:93). Joe Ashby recalled a story of the naming of Japonski Island:

> When the Russians first came to the area, there was a Japanese boat that came in…There were six to eight men on this junk – the Russians rescued them and put them over there on the island [Japonski] where the airstrip is. The Tlingit had fish houses over there. They had little cabins there to smoke fish and tend to gardens – so the Russians put the Japanese over there. They [the Japanese] were really good gardeners. The Japanese stayed for two to three years – the Russians kept them because they could grow really good vegetables...When a ship came years later, the Japanese left (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

The Russians had a magnetic observatory there. Post-transfer the President created a Navy reserve (1890) with a wharf completed in 1900, a coal bunker added in 1904 and a Navy wireless station set up in 1907 (DeArmond 1991). It was the site of the US naval base during WW2 with bunkers and gun sites and home to thousands of military personnel. Today Japonski Island is home to the Sitka airport, University of Alaska Southeast, a high school, and the SEARC health facility (Alanen 2009).

It is peculiar that the name persists given both the origin of the name (Russians holding captive Japanese) and following America being at war with Japan (i.e., WW2 might have signalled a change of name). The warmer economic relationship with Japan discussed in Chapter 3 however, translated to $70m invested in the Sitka mill by 1959, as Keating (1971) explains in the early seventies:

> In the Alaska-Japan relationship you have the classic case of complementary societies. The Japanese manufacture about as well as anybody in the world. But they have very little raw materials to work with. Alaska has few factories, but raw materials...in abundance...Conscious of the growing Japanese presence in their area, Sitkans installed an airport welcome sign printed in Japanese (p 198-200).

The persistence of naming then is appropriate in such mutually beneficial economic circumstances.

---

185 Named in 1778 by Captain Cook after discovery on Holy Cross Day, though it was formerly named Icy Straight by the Russians (Cook’s Log, page 460, volume 9, number 3 (1986) at http://www.captaincooksoct2.com/ccsu4138.htm,
Another observation in Russian naming is the use of *Nature* names. Russian naming primarily reflects people names, though some nature naming can be explained with traditional Russian geomentality. Observations on Russian naming posited by Stewart (2008[1958]) reinforce geomentality with the naming of smaller features (in contrast to the British naming of larger features (p396); and the Russian use of “simple descriptive” names including adjectives like:


While Russian *Nature* names reflect environmental factors important to navigation (e.g., *Icy Strait* and *Peril Strait*) other *Nature* names reflect a deeper connection to the environment. The ‘bear,’ (*medvyzhda* in Russian) is used to name several features in the Sitkan landscape including: *Reka Medvyzhda* (Bear River), *Medved Lake* (Bear Lake), and Bear Mountain (American translation into English). While Medvednikov was a Russian American Company (RAC) employee (Grinev 2005:111), it is more likely that this Russian naming reflected the environment as *Reka Medvyzhya* was named in 1809 by Russian navigator Ivan Vasiliev. Medvejie Lake and the Medvejie Lake valley are nestled between Bear Mountain and Cupola Peak where the transliteration of the Russian ‘bear’ is retained in the American context. The bear is an important symbol in Russian culture, and the prevalence of bears in the area influenced the Tlingit cosmology (see Thornton’s (1992) discussion of subsistence use of the brown bear).

The different scales of the Russian use of *Medvyzhda* contradicts a hierarchical naming framework where one would expect the larger mountain feature to represent an individual (with human dominance) and a smaller feature could reflect a nature name. This approach would resemble the Western phallic order of place naming reported by Yoon in New Zealand place names (1980, 1994). Certainly the Western consideration of use and occupation (smaller scale features) contrast with ownership and territory where *large* denotes *importance* in the Western mindset. In contrast, Stewart (2008[1958]) cites Alfred H Brooks who once complained:

The Alaskan Indian has no fixed geographic nomenclature for the larger geographic features. A river will have half a dozen names, depending on the direction from which it is approached (p 407).

---

Tebenkof showed *Reka Medvyzhda* on a 1850 map where he also put a sawmill. When the Coast and Geodetic Survey redrew the map, they renamed it Sawmill Creek (according to DeArmond 1995:202-203).

---

accessed 3.3.2007.
An examination of smaller features naming elucidates this distinction.

Tlingit naming focuses on points and smaller scales (Emmons and de Laguna 1999; Thornton 1997a, 1997b, 2008) and the Native people in the area would not have named the larger land masses in the same way Europeans did (to lay claim or dominate the land) and it would be incorrect to assume, as did Waterman (1922) in Herman (1999:80), that naming larger places means “cultural progress.” In the Land features category, small islands, rocks and capes are included. Most of the land features are small (71%), with the remaining features split between medium (15%) and large. American influences dominate most of the small islands (62%), with Russian influences upon 22% of small features, and Tlingit and other (mostly British) dividing the influences upon the last of the small features equally. Of the eight medium size features, Russian names influence four (50%) and American names influence three places. Koui Island is influenced by Tlingit naming. Six of the eight medium sized names are after people, with one based on location and one nature.

Tlingit naming affects mostly smaller features because that is the scale that is relevant to the clan (e.g., sustenance, survival, hunting grounds, use and occupation). This relationship to smaller features influences Tlingit naming. Kake Elder Fred Friday (1946) in an interview reported in Goldschmidt and Haas (1998) captures this:

> If I told you all the names of all the places that I know it would fill many pages. These areas were used so much that we were familiar with every little place (p177).

This practice is also illustrated by the ‘hundreds of thousands, or a million’ indigenous names from the Hawai’ian Islands:

> Hawai’ians named taro patches, rocks and trees that represented deities and ancestors, sites of houses and heiau [places of worship], canoe landings, fishing stations in the sea, resting places in the forest, and the tiniest spots where miraculous or interesting events are believed to have taken place (Herman 1999:83).

Considering a Western mindset toward naming the smaller features, Cosgrove (1999:127) discusses the challenge of such features to Captain Cook, who left gaps in Alaskan charts with their “infinity of inlets” compared to New Zealand and Australian charts with coastlines that had “long sweeps.” Gaps appear as “an offence against logic,” (Carter in Cosgrove 1999:127). They were viewed negatively even in Fra Mauro’s 1459 *mappamundi*, where “what existed beyond” the habitable earth, was negatively viewed as not suitable for human life, as “unknown,” and the dwelling place of “monsters,” (Cosgrove 2008:105). Smaller features level of naming would have avoided gaps as
these were important to name for clan ownership and to record in oral history. For example, small points such as gardens, smokehouses and cabins were identified through interviews as part of the Goldschmidt and Haas (1998) report that led to development of the Tlingit map used in this place name analysis.

Tobias (2000) cautions around the difference between use and occupancy where “use,” such as the harvesting of traditional resources could generate a lot of artificial overlap in mapping, while “occupancy” locations:

are about which people have knowledge of ecology, legends and indigenous place names and where they have built habitations and buried their dead as more likely more respectful of the Nation’s true territorial limits and would generate less overlap (p 3).

Land use and occupancy mapping that captures the geography of oral tradition, map cultural and resource geography is encouraged (Thornton 2000, Tobias 2000). Revealing Tlingit geomentality clearly establishes the significance of place alongside a subsistence lifestyle. Yet “laws protect only ‘customary and traditional uses’ of resources, not places,” (Thornton 2008:xii). Law makers consider hunting and fishing as forms of production rather than recognise ties to heritage at specific places (homelands) as evidenced in Tlingit geomentality and people naming. Water features are examined next.

5.2.1.2 Water Features

Sitka’s west coast topography features numerous inlets, islands, and bays making Water features the most abundant category of place names (55%). These features include streams, rivers, bays, straits and the Pacific Ocean. With respect to the large water features, there are three: the Pacific Ocean, Stakine River and Chatham Strait. The first of these is Portuguese origin, the next Tlingit origin and the last British origin. Small features accounted for 64% of all water names, with medium sized features representing 32% of all water names and large water features at approximately 4%. Small feature cultural names are divided among American (45%), Tlingit (37%), Russian (16%) and British (2%) influences. Medium sized feature names are dominated by Tlingit influences (46%), then Russian (35%), American (11.5%) and British (7.5%). This is the first category where Tlingit cultural influences dominate feature names.
One would expect ‘people’ naming to strongly influence settlement (built features) and land features following the earlier comments on the Judeo-Christian view of nature and the human desire to ‘shape’ the environment. By comparison, water is less ‘shape able’ and the inherent nature of this physical feature tends to be named functionally (e.g., Icy Strait). From a human dominance perspective, functional naming of water also increases the change of humans ‘managing or conquering’ the water, as when sailing ships navigate Peril Strait. Indigenous naming has similar functional characteristics (e.g., Fish Bay, Deep Bay), however is focused upon production and locations with no negative aspects in nature names like Peril. There is a practical functional imperative to naming this stretch of water as opposed to lesser functional consequences of naming a city street.

Colonising countries did not acknowledge the detailed topographic understanding of the Tlingit people (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998) and overwrote indigenous place names to legitimise their colonial power. This topographic obliteration demonstrates how early ‘contact’ and subsequent ‘conquest’ of European cultures over indigenous inhabitants materialises through place naming (Herman 1999). Perpetuating such naming in modern day raises important socio-political questions as to why certain places persist with racial and colonial connotations. Indian River presents a case in point.

What is now referred to as Indian River, is called Kaasda Héen by the Tlingit and was labelled Ryeka Koloshenka (or Kolosh Ryeka) in 1826 by the colonising Russians (meaning river of the Kolosh, the name given to the Tlingit by the Russians), before being translated in 1883 to English (Andrews 1922:98 and http://www.answers.com/topic, accessed 14.02.2008). It is considered a Russian name for this study, though the name does not represent a direct English translation from the Russian Cyrillic language as with other names (e.g., Japonski Island). It is a hybrid name since it incorrectly translated Russia’s reference to the Native Tlingit, Kolosh as meaning the generic ‘Indian.’ It would be a ‘type 2’ name according to King (1976:73) as its original naming context was lost. Khlebnikov (1994 [1861]:181) had referred differently to ‘Kolosh’ and to ‘Aleut’ acknowledging distinctions between Native people (nations) by the Russians. This hybrid name therefore does not relate to part of Sitka’s past nor commemorate an individual. The Tlingit naming context of Kaasda Héen contrasts the present generic ‘Indian River’ as it:
The Tlingit name of *Kaasa Héen* is not used on current maps, though recent efforts by the Sitka Tribal Organisation (Robert Sam), and researchers like Andy Hope III (pers comms, 02 October 2007) and Tom Thornton (1997b, 2008), continue efforts to record and preserve Tlingit place names. Perhaps it would be prudent to reconsider an accurate naming of this important place given the current naming has little meaningful context.

5.2.1.3 *Built Features Including Settlement Areas*

Built features include ports, harbours and settlement areas. Most of the built features are small (87%) and most reflect settlement and American influence (69%). By way of comparison, Yoon’s (1980) study of 107 settlement place names in New Zealand found almost all names to be of Māori and European origin reflecting the country’s recent settlement history. Looking at Sitka, there is a strong pattern of Russian naming in and around the Sitka Sound and Sitka town area where the Russians dominated settlement from the late 1700s. In *Map 4: Cultural Influences on Sitka Territory Place Names*, these influences are seen in the collection of Russian names in the central (middle) of the Sitka territory. American names show a minor influence on the physical features in the landscape and dominate specific *Built* features like *Portlock Harbour* and small features like *Emmons Island, Paterson Bay* and *Moser Bay*. The collection of small islands and waterways in the lower third of the Sitka territory (*Map 4*) is dominated by Tlingit naming. The one medium sized *Built* feature (Port Frederick) was also of American origin and the one large sized feature, *Sitka*, is a hybridised name of Tlingit origin with several changes over the years.

A closer look at the naming of *Sitka* reveals its Tlingit origin and another ‘type 2’ name according to King (1976) where the context and intent has been lost. For example, a number of interviewees (H Arnoldt, Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 2 July 2000; D Farrell, Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000; Groundskeeper, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000) knew Sitka was a *Tlingit* name, but none knew the context within the culture, links to location and place or expressed geomentality. A variety of origins...
for “Sitka,” are outlined in Appendix 6. One interpretation is outlined in Dangel (2003:98) referring to the Tlingit Shee At’ika:

I know Baranov Island is called Shee. The same word as ‘limb’ or a knot on a tree. Shee. So Baranov Island was named Shee. The people coming from the villages for herring spawn, they would say “Shee dekwaat dekuut eteek. I’ll paddle to the outside of Baranov Island. That’s what that meant. So the name stuck to Sitka, Shee Atiká. That means outside of Baranov Island, the ocean side of Baranov Island. (Mark Jacobs Jr. 2003, Dakl’awidi).

Shit’ka or Sitkha signifies “place on the seaside of the island” called Shig by the Kolosh (Khlebnikov 1994:29).

The Russian naming of Sitka as Novo Archangel’sk was described in Chapter 3 as originally named by Baranov after a northern Russian city. On the Russian Map (1867) only New Archangel is listed for the Sitka settlement area. Post transfer in 1867, the Americans largely ‘took over’ the existing Russian settlement of Novo Archangel’sk. The Americans named Novo Arkhangel’sk, Sitka in 1867, according to Orth (1971) from the Tlingit Indian name for “by the sea.” Stewart (2008[1958]:396) attributes the name to replace “Fort Archangel Gabriel” [Old Sitka] who failed the Russians in the Battle of 1802 thus justifying a shift to this “more military colleague.” No references were found to substantiate Stewart’s reference to Fort Archangel Gabriel. Shortly after transfer, William S Dodge, Customs Agent, had complained to headquarters that the official seal of the Customs Service used the name ‘New Archangel’ instead of Sitka (DeArmond 1995). The American choice of Tlingit naming influence may have been one of need rather than conscious regard for the indigenous people given the earlier racial perceptions outlined in Chapter 3. The need to find a ‘different’ name to the Russian settlement factored into the speed of re-naming. The Native name would have provided a suitable and readily available option. In line with Yoon’s (1980, 1994) findings regarding the hierarchy of place names in New Zealand, indigenous Māori naming is preserved in lower order centres and several provincial towns (e.g., Taranaki, Whangarei, Wanganui). Sitka, while being an important colonial place, would not qualify as a ‘major’ centre, and thus unlikely to exhibit a European name, like the major centres Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch in New Zealand. In European naming style, the use of Sitka as a name in the landscape is repeated in three other features: Sitka Sound, Sitka Channel, Sitka Rocks; and again out of its original Tlingit context (Herman 1999).
In summary, the hierarchy of physical feature naming illustrates a dominance of British and Russian influences at the major landmarks scale. This shifts to a Tlingit focus for smaller features and the main centre of Sitka, though it is questionable how familiar users are of Sitka’s true naming origin context and intent (Herman 1999). The palimpsest of names is evident in particular homelands locations, and shows the dominance of some international powers over others (e.g., British naming), due in part to the prolific production of navigation maps and exploration expertise during the early days of west coast discovery. Repetition of names in some areas illustrates the importance of different cultural aspects and the pattern of naming types continues to illustrate a reliance of ‘people’ naming by Western minds. The Russian tendency was to import Russian names for places in the Sitka landscape (e.g., Catherine, Arkangel’sk) reinforcing links to homeland but also politically expanding their nation’s territory. Finally, the greater emphasis upon nature and location is found with the Tlingit naming. Geomentality provided a deeper level of understanding of reasons for naming by culture group, particularly around explaining why a culture chooses individual, nature or location types of name. Links to power, politics and religion were also discussed as reflected in Sitka’s topographic naming. A detailed analysis of Sitka’s streetscape (the first of its kind) will now be provided.

5.2.2 SITKA STREET NAMES

In the same way the previous Sitka Territory place name analysis revealed cultural influences and geomentalities through naming categories, the following streetscape analysis examines the complete set of Sitka’s street names (to July 2000) to enhance cross-cultural understanding through these important toponyms.

Street names can naturalise a hegemonic version of history, often designed to consolidate political regimes. Such histories celebrate official constructions of the past as definitive and ignore, indeed actively deny, other versions (Winchester et al. 2003:74).

Boelhower (1986) discusses how with the stroke of the cartographic pen, a map is able to “translate continental chaos into institutional order,” (p118). Street name maps provide a canvass to display the desired image of cultural history. A closer look at Sitka’s streetscape by applying naming categories outlined above, illustrates functional rationale and past colonial and political influences (Alderman 2003; Azaryahu 1996, 1997; Faraco & Murphy 1997; Herman 1999; Kong and Yeoh
The important role of local government in the street naming process is also discussed in the context of socio-political implications found in Sitka’s spatial naming patterns.

The dominant cultural influence upon Sitka’s streetscape is American naming representing 70% of all names. Russian names represent 19%, Tlingit 7% and Finnish 4%. Street names are functional markers that predominantly influence local residents. There are no international influences to contend with for major landmarks or island features needed for navigation or nation-to-nation negotiations as with the topographic place name analysis. In this way, street naming is a more ‘current’ reflection of social and political preference and importance. Looking at the mix of naming type, the People category dominates in each culture group as illustrated in Figure 20.

Figure 20: Streetscape Names by Culture and Type

![Figure 20: Streetscape Names by Culture and Type](image)

Given that all streets were named by Americans post transfer, it is not surprising that the People category dominates the streetscape as the ‘individual’ features in the American geom mentality. Where other culture groups are represented, American naming would similarly seek to commemorate other ‘individuals.’ Speed and need are emphasised by Boorstin (1965:299) when discussing the naming of the American nation as a, “gigantic, tantalising, and complicated task…largely accomplished during the first half of the 19th century.” Boorstin’s Judeo-Christian bias is noted with references to “Christianising” the land with names.
The street naming task in Sitka at transfer was minimal compared to national requirements. There was only one ‘road’ in Sitka in 1867 (Stephens, correspondent in Sitka, 09 October 1867, in Shiels 1967:150). The first Sitka municipal government passed a streets and city limits resolution on 3 December 1867 designating the street names: **Lincoln, American, Club, Lake, Bishop, Hospital and Alaska** (DeArmond 1995:189) with those bolded names eventually used in the town streetscape. The absence of naming at the time of transfer gave the American government a clean canvass to create a version of Sitkan history. Azaryahu’s (1996:325) contends that the “spatial organisation of street names,” has no relationship as “historical figures and events coexist simultaneously.” To test this, culture naming influences are examined according to spatial zone (e.g., original settlement area (zone 1) as illustrated in Figure 21 (see also Map 5).

**Figure 21: Street Names by Zone Location**

![Street Names by Zone Location](image)

Data tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 0</th>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 2</th>
<th>Zone 3</th>
<th>Zone 4</th>
<th>Zone 5</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 0</th>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 2</th>
<th>Zone 3</th>
<th>Zone 4</th>
<th>Zone 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 5: Sitka’s Contemporary Spiritual Landscape
Cultural Influences on Sitka Street and Place Names

Name Origin
- American
- Finnish
- Russian
- Tlingit

Town zone
1 - Original Settlement Area
2 - CBD
3 - Outer Town
4 - Sitka Suburbs
5 - Japonski Island

References:
1. Sitka, Alaska: Road System and Downtown Walking Tour, map by Alan Cargill (1994), Sitka Sound
3. Field Research (Alexander 2005)
American culture influences dominate in each of the geographic development zones. The lowest proportion of American names (46%) is in zone 1, where cultural influences are shared among the Russian (27%), Tlingit (15%) and Finnish (11%) names. Settler culture influences in a town are typically features of post-colonial cities (Azeryahu 1996, King 1976, Kong and Tong 2000); however, as street naming did not commence until the early 1900s under American rule, these cultural influences were chosen to represent Sitka’s heritage.

Looking at Finnish street names, all reflect people: *Etolin, Oja, Finn Alley, Furuhelm, Kainulainen* and *Toivo Circle*. *Furuhelm* and *Etolin* were Finnish-origin Russian American Company governors. *Etolin, Oja* and *Finn Alley* are located in a cluster within zone 1. Finn Alley is described as:

> a short one-way street named after several Finnish fishermen who built their homes along the alley (Sitka Historical Society 1977).

This context for naming authenticates an important Finnish settlement area. The Finnish residential ‘congregation’ is replicated in the culture group’s separate Lutheran Church, the separate Lutheran Cemetery, and separate schooling (see Chapter 3) perhaps enabling residents to preserve their heritage (Badcock 2002). The location of remaining Finnish names in suburban locations suggests American naming continues to value the Finnish “heritage” and commemoration of individuals, resulting in growing the sense of American ‘past.’

Russian influences are most dominant in zone 1 (27%), and zone 5 (27%). It is not surprising that Russian names like, *Baranov, Monastery,*187 and *New Archangel* are found in the old ‘Russian town’ geographic area. As “non-British,” Russians were America’s friend during the transfer. The Russian heritage represents part of Alaska’s history expressed in American terms (e.g., acknowledging civic contributions through naming). The use of Russian names in outer zone areas (15% in zone 2, 22.5% in zone 3, and 11% in zone 4) means ongoing conscious effort to acknowledge past Russian influence (e.g., *Kashevaroff, Kostrometino, Shilikof, Chirikov, Davidoff, Vitskari, Gavan, Verstovia*).

---

187 Monastery Street gives American (English) naming for the monastery located there during Russian settlement, though DeArmond (1995:189) believes this street was to be named Bishop Street.
A surprising proportion of Russian naming (27%) is found on Japonski Island. Used primarily as a military and hospital base, and later a school, this zone has a mix of functional references and historic names that reflect Sitka’s past heritage. Given that Japonski was developed by the Americans during WW2, it is not surprising that street names reflect the government functions like *Admiralty, Marshall, Seward, Airport* and *Lifesaver*. However, with *Galena Avenue, Kruzof and Lazaria* streets, there is a conscious effort to commemorate the city’s Russian heritage, notably repeating two Russian topographic place names. From a nation-building perspective, a country’s policies can support the recognition of a multi-cultural population base, like municipal naming policies in Singapore that actively promote multilingual and multiracial naming (Tan 2008, Yeoh 1996). In a young country like America, it could be expected that a multi-cultural diverse heritage similarly be reflected in its naming. Strangely however, there are no Tlingit street names on Japonski Island. This absence is concerning as street names:

introduce an authorized version of history into ordinary settings of everyday life…[that] concretize hegemonic structures of power and authority (Azaryahu 1996:312).

A closer look at Tlingit street naming is necessary.

### 5.2.2.1 Tlingit Street Names

The lack of Tlingit names, as compared to the Russian and Finnish names in the streetscape is dramatic. It would be reasonable to expect a greater proportion of Tlingit names as part of the landscape, particularly at a smaller settlement scale in line with the above naming analysis; however, the Tlingit geom mentality is not to name *streets*:

From a Native viewpoint, we had no need for roads and sidewalks since we located near the water. That’s why waterfront is so valuable to Natives, especially for fishing. Now waterfront is valued for its scenic or commercial value. We used it for survival (G Truit, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

According to Thornton, Tlingit elders interviewed by Goldschmidt and Haas (1998[1946]:xvii), showed a “typical theme in the testimony for a witness to describe a locale, the path to get there and the activity which took place there.” Still, the absence of Tlingit naming in today’s society, speaks loudly of the importance of Tlingit names (*People*) within the current landscape where those doing the naming (government powers and local residents). The *impact* of naming is invisible, but assists
in the construction of social maps, providing clues to social position and practice, activity and ambience (Kong and Yeoh 2003:128-9).

The absence of indigenous naming is typical in post-colonial settings. In Delhi, King (1976:247) notes in 1942 that approximately 60% of all named streets and places “were designated by non-indigenous nomenclature.” A closer look at what and where Tlingit naming is used will indicate relative importance of indigenous names in the landscape.

There are 12 Tlingit names out of the 160 street names in the Sitka landscape (with the development zone listed in brackets): Katlian (1), Kogwanton (1), Tlingit (1), Metlakatla (1), Nakwasina (3), Andrew P Hope Kaagusht’ei (3)*, Charlie Joseph Kaal. atk’ (3), Rudolph Walton Kawootk’ (3)*, Price (3) Jacob’s Circle (4)*, Benson (4), and Hope (4). None of the names reflect Nature or Location naming type categories exhibited in the prior Tlingit naming analysis. Katlian and Kogwanton Streets are used presently; however, in earlier times, these streets were referred to as “Front” and “Back” Street within the ‘Indian village’ (Photo 14). The use of ‘Front’ and ‘Back’ Streets in Sitka suggests a disregard for the inhabitants of these areas similar to the numerical nomenclature (e.g., First, Second Streets in state housing), providing “racial overtones that, sterility and lack of imagination, is for those less deserving,” (Kong and Yeoh 2003:119). Front and Back in the Sitka environment related to the front and back of Indian village rather than the waterfront orientation suggested by Winder (2006), which could legitimately be explained if Front Street appeared in the Russian side of town. The re-naming of Katlian and Kogwantaan provides a hybrid cultural naming approach by mixing the American naming preference for ‘People’ (e.g., commemorating Chief Katlian) without regard for the Tlingit moiety structure (e.g., Kiks.ádi and Kogwantaan). Another option could have been to name the streets by Tlingit moiety to recognise the balance, or to equally emphasise other Native leaders. While the Kiks.ádi clan chose Katlian as their war chief, “each house was an independent military unit,” and fought within their house (Herb Hope in Hope and Thornton eds. 2000:51). Finally, the spelling of Katlian and Kogwantaan varies with references by Herb Hope as K’a’lyaan, and Kaagwaantaan (in Hope and Thornton eds. 2000:51) suggesting that the names used are not only Anglicised, but also spelled incorrectly.

Katlian, Kogwanton, Tlingit and Metlakatla streets are located in original settlement boundaries within the “Indian village,” in an area now referred to as Katlian District. Figure 22 illustrates civic
designations of Katlian, Downtown, and Waterfront ‘districts’ superimposed\textsuperscript{188} on Blashke’s 1836 map matching ‘Russian town’ and ‘Indian village’ (Photo 13) to reinforce physical cultural division through government action (Anderson 1988).

The physical separation has a psychological dimension that perpetuates separateness according to King (1976:289) who calls it ‘categorisation.’ Referring to similar segregation in post-colonial Delhi, King 1976:283) identifies race as the distinguisher for a “world divided into compartments… inhabited by two different species.” Various studies (Meinig 1982, Schmidt 2005, King 1976) discuss segregation of European residential districts as satisfying a need of colonisers to create a:

culturally familiar and easily recognisable environment which was a formal and visible symbol providing psychological and emotional security in a world of uncertain events (King 1976:39).

\textsuperscript{188} The districts superimposed are indicative only since the coastal boundaries and layout in Blashke’s map do not have the same coastline and street system as present day Sitka.
Historic Russian references to the area included: *Indian Village, Native Village,*\(^{189}\) and *The Ranche* during later American settlement. This placement of names emphasises the ‘district’ segregation of the Native residents putting them into “a recognisable container,” that has persisted since Russian settlement (Kong and Yeoh 2003:118). Azaryahu (1996:313) cites other examples (in Paris and Berlin) where official street names were used “to control the residents of the city, especially the lower classes.” It appears that racism from colonisation has been retained, with seeming subtle differences like Russian ‘town’ and Indian ‘village’ carrying an air of more sophisticated ‘towns.’ The ‘Ranche,’ designation by Americans served to segregate the residences in a different way, with a label that was overtly inferior along with spatially and culturally separate. A parallel of the village can be drawn to Harris’s (2004) discussion of an Indian reservation:

A reserve had a name, an acreage, and a location. It could be looked up. It was situated in a bureaucracy (p 176).

The bureaucracy maintained American racial constructions. Attitudes toward Natives are captured with sentiments like needing more sanitary conditions that implied the existing dirty and inferior way of living needed change. The ‘numbering’ of houses noted by the Krause brothers in 1881 (1993[1881/1882]:112), and Andrews (1922:101), reinforces the racial difference and clashes with the Tlingit clan naming. Badcock (2002:196) offers a balance to the segregation interpretation of ‘district,’ viewing it as a method of preservation with ‘congregations’ and physical proximity of houses allowing residents to, “keep alive and pass on the language, cultural values and traditional customs.” The Finnish neighbourhood demonstrates this rationale. An alternate view is provided by a Tlingit elder, who does not live in the village: “not all Tlingit live in Indian village…the [Tlingit] locals prefer being with the Americans,” (Name withheld, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000). The remaining eight Tlingit streets are located in subdivision areas outside of town. Three are names of cul-de-sac streets: *Andrew P Hope Kaagusht’ei,* *Rudolph Walton Kawootk’* and *Jacob’s Circle.* Cul-de-sacs are the lowest level in the street hierarchy.

Challenge around *what to name* and *where* can lead to “intraracial contests,” like Alderman’s (2003) investigation regarding how and where to commemorate Martin Luther King Junior. Activists within the Black community had different perspectives giving a:

fuller appreciation of the historical consciousness and geographic agency of African Americans rather than seeing them as a single, monolithic group (Alderman 2003:163).

\(^{189}\) DeArmond (1993:86) referring to the first cadastral survey in 1941 by the US Land Office.
Similar divergence in views among Native groups was noted by Hayward (2003) in BC’s forestry land debates. The naturalisation of history and importance in the everyday landscape serves to reinforce power and ideology, albeit impacts may remain at a subconscious level.

Varying rationale aside, it is important to introduce Tlingit names in Sitkan places to reflect its multicultural heritage, despite perspectives on the inconspicuous nature or colonial ordered pattern that emerges. Might one commemorate the Nass River in naming (Photo 16)? From a local planning perspective there are some considerations regarding context and intent that could improve the use of Tlingit names. For example, the government decision to use Native naming could be part of what Herman (1999) terms anti-conquest:

> glorifying the Other at the time that the Other is denied real power...[or] the coloniser’s attempt to recapture the disappearing Other out of a nostalgia for the lost exotic (p 77).

This concept is similar to the romanticism and mystery afforded the “imaginary Indian” that Francis (1992) discusses regarding tourism in Canada. The practice of ‘returning’ to indigenous place names can exclude original intent and context important to reflect deeper meaning (i.e., demonstrated previously with accurately locating Tlingit clan house places within the landscape). For example, residential streets that use Tlingit ‘people’ names are disconnected from traditional Tlingit naming practices (e.g., individual compared to collective societal approaches).

A more powerful and contextualised way to reflect cultural diversity is through re-naming places with the original context and meaning, what Herman (1999) terms reconquest. The case of Indian River noted above would be an interesting consideration. Reconquest comes with resistance since it is different to anti-conquest, “where the colonised state is a blissful one and the natives are happy,” (Herman 1999:94). In reconquest, meaning is ascribed to the indigenous language and poses a threat to the governing authorities. A recent example in New Zealand illustrates the conflict of re-naming. Wanganui is a provincial town with 5.5% of the country’s population and 7.5% of New Zealand’s Māori (indigenous) population. Local iwi group Te Runanga o Tupoho made a request of the Geographic Board to add an ‘h’ to make the town name Whanganui, meaning “great harbour or

---

190 The naming of Raven Island on the Sitka Zoning Map (2000) provides an example of naming without regard for the deeper cultural association (e.g., the important role of raven in the Tlingit geometry and creation myth as discussed in Chapter 4).

191 The Manawatu-Wanganui Region population is 222,423 with 42,288 residents being of Māori descent. In size, the region has the 6th largest concentration of Māori people out of 16 regions across New Zealand (Census 2001, www.stats.govt.nz, 27.02.2009).
expanse of water,” since without the ‘h’ the word is meaningless (Dominion Post 27 February 2009, p A3). The Wanganui District Council voted 8-5 to resist the name change and later that week, a rock was hurled through a window in the Mayor’s home. What appears a minor change (adding an ‘h’) to the White mind (Anne with an ‘e’ versus Ann), is significant to local Māori given the place connection evident in their geomentality. The contextualised homeland reference links to heritage and meaning as illustrated with Tlingit geomentality making it more than a spelling debate, but rather one of semantics and identity. Tlingit naming in the local environment could also serve to adapt government processes as has occurred with Māori people in New Zealand. Adapting systems is a challenging road but can result in a “heightened allegiance to a particular ancestral location,” (Kallen 1996:88, in Marie 1999) with potential to strengthen Tlingit ties to heritage lands, visibly presenting how and where such ties reflect Tlingit cultural beliefs.

### 5.2.2.2 Establishing Post Colonial Remnants

From a historic perspective, Sitka’s actual street ‘system’ did not occur for some forty years after transfer since the first city government failed after six years and had not progressed street surveys (DeArmond 1995:189). As such it avoided the period of ‘functional’ street naming initially practiced in Europe (Azaryahu 1996:113), and America’s Philadelphia system of numbered streets, or plans based on compass directions, or the criss-crossing pattern of ‘streets’ with ‘avenues’ like in New York (Boorstin 1965:305). In Sitka, only two such names are found: 1st Avenue and A Street. This type of naming contrasts European naming and is criticised as providing “temporary names, [for] squatters, waiting till the rightful lords of the domain shall appear,” (Greenough in Boorstin 1965:305). Fortunately Sitka’s streetscape is more interesting to examine with its diverse context.

Next to the preponderance of People names, Sitka’s street naming has a prevalence of colonial references. When considering the timing of naming this seems strange as Americans had an opportunity to construct an exclusively American setting:

---

192 For a further understanding between Māori land and the Māori mind, see Yoon (1986, 1994).

193 It appears that the fire maps mainly used by insurance companies (published by the Sanborn Map Company of New York) varied from local usage (e.g., “1914 map shows Garrison Street al.though it was called Barracks Street in the local newspaper for at least 10 years, and in property conveyances for more than twenty,” (DeArmond 1995:189).
The act of naming streets is a way by which official agencies appropriate public space, possibly for political ends and because the contemporary norm is for the official naming of street to be carried out by the state’s agencies, the administrative procedure becomes an expression of state power (Winchester et al. 2003:74).

Evidence of Sitka’s post-colonial history is found in the cultural names noted above, and specifically streets like: Barracks, Cathedral Way, Princess, Monastery, and New Archangel, that show signs of an Imperial Russian past. Urban nomenclature in post-colonial Delhi shows a comparable experience with names featuring settler institutions: cemetery, church, club, court, hospital, school (King 1976:247).

It is interesting that with the American desire to reflect a history in the streetscape, that several existing colonial names were not retained. Historic sources refer to early Russian settlement. The Bishop’s Walk or Governor’s Walk illustrates an Imperial link. Similarly, Lady Cracroft’s 1870 journal refers to Indian River Trail, a road used for recreational walks, described as:

a very long walk...the only road in any direction, so it is the universal walk for the whole community (Cracof 1981:3-4),

Andrews (1922) cites this park trail as: Lover’s Lane. These names reflect local topography and history, yet do not remain on official records or maps used in this study. They are now memories at risk of being forgotten with other street re-naming practices (Rose-Redwood 2008). In addition, five street names identified in map sources used in this research are no longer in the visible landscape: Beardslee Way, Eagle Way, Race Street, Cathedral Way and Etolin Way. It is likely that Eagle and Race were omitted due to their conflict with the Eagle moiety and racial connotations. Etolin has been used elsewhere within the streetscape and Beardslee has been used in the physical features naming. Finally, during field research, no signage was observed for Maksoutoff Street, which appeared on the 1991 Chamber of Commerce map but was absent from the Caputo map 1998/2007.

A closer look at naming reveals that the emphasis is upon those involved in ‘nation-building.’ All of the people names with American influences recognise the contributions of individuals as, “founding

---

194 The only other reference to a ‘spiritual’ street name in Sitka’s landscape was Monastery Way, though this street does not appear on Caputo’s 1998 map and I did not come across it during field research in July 2000.

195 There is conflicting origin information for Cathedral Way which only appears on the 1991 map where it is illustrated as part of the ring road toward the back of the Russian Cathedral (i.e., referring to part of Seward Street in the 1998/2006 map). Sitka bylaws for street obstruction violations refer to it. DeArmond notes that Cathedral Way was called Kostrometinoff Street after their family, but explains the change resulting from a draftsman differently naming the map (1995:75). The Caputo map (1986/2008) does not list Cathedral Way and while Kostrometinoff is listed, it is not near Cathedral Way.
fathers,\(^{196}\) (e.g., General Jefferson Davis (Photo 12) was in charge of the town post transfer; Kelly was Superintendent of Sitka Industrial Training School in 1885; Seward negotiated the Alaskan purchase and has two streets named after him). Similar trends are found in the 1980s Ivory Coast, where: “Every colonial hero has his street,” (Azaryahu 1996:323) and in 1942 in Delhi, where King (1976) notes over half the street names:

were names of metropolitan sovereigns, military leaders, viceroyos, governors-general, and local administrators associated with the development of colonial rule (p 247).

While the late 19th century street naming focused upon “commemorating historical heroes and events,” by the 20\(^{th}\) century “commemorative street names with nation building became paramount,” (Azaryahu 1996:314).

In Sitka, former city councillors, mayors or governors, or those who established a school or mission were guaranteed recognition with a place in the city’s streetscape. For example, Hollywood and Mills were city councillors, and Tilson, Wortman, and Charteris were former mayors. Further residential subdivision in Sitka will enable the historic past to be created and with the national drive to recognise founding fathers (not necessarily sisters) the use of significant and powerful people in naming will continue to ‘manifest’ their power to “gain political capital,” (Winchester et al. 2003:75) and reinforce the political ideology around the role of the individual and contribution to civic responsibility. It follows that an absence of artists\(^{197}\) or musicians and a lack of nature references in Sitka’s naming ideology attaches lesser importance to these pursuits.\(^{198}\) Commerce and business interests however do appear in the hegemony of major streets.

Sitka’s main streets\(^{199}\) are Lincoln, Lake and Harbour, with Halibut Point Road and Sawmill Creek Boulevard being the main arterials leading into town from the ferry and old sawmill, respectively. This set of names blends functional location (i.e., near Swan Lake or along the Harbour) and political aspects (including the power of economic ties to lumber yards). French (1983) discusses street names influenced from trade quarters, and Winder (2006) discusses mercantile associations

---

\(^{196}\) Note no women’s names are obvious in the naming landscape.

\(^{197}\) Andrews and Eberhardt are two writers that may be commemorated in the present streetscape (see Appendix 7).

\(^{198}\) Streets in Tel Aviv for example, as the ‘first Hebrew city,’ became the ‘history of the People of Israel,’ with the city council approving almost 300 new street names of ‘writers, artists and political activists’(Azaryahu 1996:314).

\(^{199}\) Robust categorisation of arterials and collector streets as well as state highways are defined in Sitka’s city hierarchy of roads, despite the overall total distance of 12 miles. Zoning bylaws define a street as: “a permanently designated way, open to general public use, which affords the principal means of access to abutting property, such as an avenue, place, drive, boulevard, highway and any other similar public thoroughfare” (Ord 860695 para4 (part) 1986:261).
with water orientation a means of providing focus for commercial activity in early settlements like in Auckland, New Zealand. Arterials in Sitka were developed largely during WW2 with extensive growth in military and economic infrastructures. Commercial interests in Sitka are also reflected in other street names: Nelson Logging Road, Rand St (after Columbia Lumber Mill merchant), and Wolff Drive (Sitka Packing Company) reinforcing the power associated with commercial interests alongside political ideologies. While street naming is the domain of municipal planners, Tan (2008) looks at naming of condominiums in Singapore to reflect commercial over political power. Tan (2008) observes commercial power influences French and Spanish language names in condominiums (in addition to the four Singaporean official languages) suggesting power in commercial settings that differs from municipal political power. Such commercial dimensions are important considerations in the spiritual landscape as economic links relate to tourism and translate to competing values in contestable natural resource environments. Tan’s observation calls into question the rhetoric in policy statements and how these are reflected in practice. The power role of commercial interests in future naming settings should not be overlooked.

As Sitka’s main street, Lincoln plays an important role in Sitka’s landscape. At this smaller street naming scale, the act of ‘naming’ enabled America to lay ‘claim’ and provide an identity and context to this place. Lincoln Street is named to honour the 16th American president (1861-1865). The naming choice emphasises the strong connection to aspects of national significance, a feature of the American naming process that commemorates people, like explorers and early founders, and observes places where a significant national interest event occurred (Stewart 2008[1958]:439). There is high regard for Lincoln’s notions of civil rights, democracy and independence (as articulated earlier in comments on American geomentality). Lincoln Street physically divides around the Russian Orthodox Cathedral, which allows the importance of central place (Tuan 1977) to remain Russian, a central landmark acting as the heart of the town centre, but it lies surrounded by the main street in Sitka named by Americans. Using Lincoln, a ‘familiar’ American name, ‘reaffirms the American construct of nation’ (Winchester et al. 2003:74). East Berlin similarly featured democratic principles in its renaming process as core to its national identity in the 1990s (Azaryahu 1997). The importance of selecting Lincoln as Sitka’s focal point provides an American ideological context, or to use Francaviglia and Franklin’s (1996) main street reference, “both a place and a concept,” that connects Sitka’s colonial past, its commerce and its sense of identity.
To conclude this section, a possible 13 streets were considered for their religious or spiritual reference in naming. More than half are associated with the past Presbyterian influence in the early post-transfer period (i.e., Sheldon Jackson, Jeff Davis, Kelly, John Brady, College, Brady and Austin).\(^{200}\) Of the remaining six Russian streets, two names formerly in the CBD (zone 1) are no longer in use: Cathedral Way and Bishop’s Walk (which is currently named Etolin Street). Pierce (1973:26) claims Etolin street was circuitously named “for a woman...for the island...[then] for the Russian officer Etholen.” However, this has not been substantiated by any other sources, and only three other ‘female’ names are present in the landscape: Anna Drive, Nicole and Princess Way, suggesting the role of women did not and continues to play a minor role in the politics and planning of Sitka’s historic streetscape. Two of the ‘female’ names refer to Princess Maksoutoff commemorating the Russian/Finnish history of Sitka. The positions of power were historically held by males in Sitka’s colonial history, though more recently research by Maria Jarlsdotter Enckell (years) are revealing key roles played by Finnish and Russian women in Sitka’s history. Only three of the remaining streets have Russian religious influences: New Archangel (which is also the former Russian name of Sitka), Kashevaroff and Kostrometinoff, both Russian priests.

It will be interesting to see how the closure of Sheldon Jackson College in 2008 (as a major education employer) might impact street naming over time, particularly since the Presbyterian influence in the development of Sitka was so strong post American transfer and has persisted in the current landscape. Chapter 3 discussed some of the negative aspects of Presbyterian practices in separating Native children from their families. It may be that these practices are overwritten by changing street naming. Also, the trend of secularisation and the evolving ‘spirituality’ found in Sitka and Alaska (see Chapter 6) may also affect naming trends. Traditional denomination based and historic references will continue to contend with market and political ideologies that will materially affect Sitka’s landscape. This contestability becomes complicated in the tourist context where religious places have commercial impact as is discussed in the next section.

\(^{200}\) The naming of Price Street could be added here, after Frank Price, “a dedicated Christian man,” a graduate of Sheldon Jackson Training School and and Elder in the Sitka Presbyterian church (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:659-663). Price was born to a White father and Tlingit mother, active in politics, one of the founders of the ANB (1912) and an early leader in land claims efforts. This street was included as part of the Tlingit street name investigation.
5.2.3 SUMMARY

The comprehensive street inventory and initial analysis of data has revealed patterns in streetscape naming that represents Sitka’s imperial past. The active ‘construction’ of the past is interesting given the majority of street naming occurred relatively recently (within the past century). The spatial analysis revealed patterns of segregation and/or separation with a variety of explanations, particularly relevant where naming is incongruent with cultural norms and geomentalities. The data set remains a valuable resource with much potential for greater in-depth exploration into naming origin and historic place name changes. Together with the topographic and Tlingit tribe and clan house naming analysis, the naming of Sitka’s streetscape provides further insight into cultural influences and enhances the cross-cultural understanding of Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape. To conclude this exploration, the final section of this chapter explores sacred places naming.

5.3 Sacred Place Names

Four dominant characteristics emerge when exploring Sitka’s 37 sacred place names. First, all names demonstrate a sacred or spiritual dimension as defined in Chapter 2. Second, the majority of names are utilitarian, signifying the basic function or simple purpose. Third, the majority of names relate to denomination and/or culture group. Fourth, several names exemplify living organism naming with changes according to cultural influence and social change over time. A closer look at these characteristics follows for Sitka’s places of worship, cemeteries and homelands/historic places.

Sitka’s 24 Place Of Worship names (Appendix 11) were categorised according to denomination, establishment date, type of naming (Nature, Location, People and Other), and Judeo-Christian association (e.g., noting Saint names, Christian or Bible references). Several patterns exist. The

201 For example, Observatory Street was named after the magnetic observatory and seismological station that was built near the cemetery by the US Coast & Geodetic Survey. This street was formerly known as Cemetery Street, and before that Johnson Street, Union Street and Russian Cemetery Road (DeArmond 1995:67, 190). A historical analysis of these past names could illustrate cultural influences over time and/or provide evidence to support the siting of historic buildings or landscape features.

202 Stewart (2008[1958]:392) encourages place name associations within robust historic contexts referring to Cook’s naming of Cross Sound on Holy Cross day, cautioning any generalisations that might be drawn regarding Cook’s religiousity: “lest anyone should think a good Englishman had turned Catholic.” The 2008 edition illustrates a map with ‘Saint’ names similarly emphasising that not all have religious connotations (e.g., St Clare refers to a family name).
The first pattern is that naming for all places is utilitarian with all names reflecting function (i.e., including church, assembly, cathedral or hall within the name) and 67% containing reference to denomination. While not innovative, this naming is functional to differentiate Sitka’s numerous places of worship. Social constructs of denomination represent variations in beliefs (however diminutive) thus are important to convey what a worshipper might expect at that service. The second pattern was that over time, denomination has appeared to supersede cultural importance referring to places of worship since no cultural naming persists. Historic references to the Kolosh (Indian/Tlingit) Church or the Russian Church have ceased. Several interviewees and tourist references continue with colloquial cultural connotations (e.g., Russian Church), however, cultural associations are absent in official records, phone listings and on-site observations (H Arnoldt, Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 2 July 2000; D Farrell, Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000; J Ashby, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000; M Sarvella, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000; M Zabinko, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000). For example, the Russian Orthodox Cathedral was officially St Michael’s Cathedral and the Russian Bishop’s House Chapel was officially the Chapel of Annunciation. A third pattern is the four places that refer to ‘Sitka’ in the location naming category (e.g., St Peter’s ‘By-the-Sea’ following Orth’s (1971) translation of ‘Sitka’ to be ‘by the sea’). Sitka’s enclosed catchment area for worship attendees negates a need for elaborate location naming categories that may be beneficial in larger city explorations (e.g., Wellington South Baptist, Wellington Central Baptist, etc.). If comparative studies were undertaken, such distinctions may be useful to contrast Sitkan chapters from other places in Alaska or further afield. In Sitka, where multiple denominations exist, a distinction by establishment date appeared (e.g., ‘First’ Baptist or ‘First’ Presbyterian) suggesting a preference for longer established places and those that were ‘founding fathers’ in line with the civil responsibility drivers noted in street naming. The fourth pattern was the absence of any places displaying nature category naming. This is not surprising given religion as a mental constructs with the need for ‘places’ of worship contrasting traditional Tlingit geomancy where all of the environment is sacred (reducing the need for a specific ‘place to worship’ a specified ‘being’). The final and fifth pattern was the surprise that only nine of 24 worship place names (38%) referred to Saints, God or Christians. ‘Traditional’ denominations established in the late 1800s bear Saint Names: St Michael’s Orthodox, St Gregory’s Catholic, and St Peter’s By-the-Sea Episcopal. Saint names also appeared in Russian topographic naming (St Lazarius and St Michael the Arkhangel) connecting a familiarity of mother Russia in newly explored lands, common in colonial settings as discussed above. The conceptualisation of religions has evolved to be less ‘traditional’ as noted by
the birth of various denomination off-shoots to traditional approaches and discussed in changing
cemetery naming.

Examining Cemetery naming in Sitka is challenging as alternate names present in literature and interviews. This analysis gathers nine cemetery names\textsuperscript{203} from \textit{Sitka’s Zoning Map} (2000). The majority of sites\textsuperscript{204} are no longer used for new burials. Presently used cemeteries include: Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB), Sitka Memorial, National or Russian Orthodox (with limited space only). This \textit{choice} introduces the \textbf{first pattern} of cemetery naming, aptly captured by Boorstin’s (1965) reference to “the ultimate convenience,” with cemetery names representing a deceased’s \textit{denomination} and/or \textit{socio-political} association. For example, older, early established grounds offered three cemetery denominations with remaining names having local, city or national connections (e.g., those in the military would use the ‘National’ cemetery). Similar to place of worship names, the \textbf{second pattern} is the utilitarian aspect of cemetery naming with all names including “Cemetery,” avoiding any doubt over function. The lack of sophistication in naming is illustrated with ‘Old Sitka Cemetery,’ merely differentiating the old and current local burial grounds. Given the low population density of Sitka, it would not be expected that low incidence places would require elaborate naming. The \textbf{third pattern} is that the nature of cemetery naming over time has changed. While none of the cemetery names reflect \textit{nature or location}, the naming over time evolves to take on more social and aesthetic setting characteristics (Park 1994) (e.g., \textit{Sitka Memorial Park Cemetery}). This evolution matches changing cemetery forms as will be discussed in Chapter 6. The \textbf{fourth naming pattern} is how cultural attitudes are reflected in cemetery naming. The Russian nation and church links are maintained in the \textit{Russian Orthodox Cemetery} name. The American geomentality also persisted through municipal and national naming. For example, the \textit{Sitka National Cemetery}, was formerly known as, “The Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Cemetery,” and is presently referred to as the, “Government Cemetery,” and/or “Military Cemetery,” (DeArmond 1995:60) each maintaining the American sense of civic and/or national affiliation. Finally, the Tlingit culture influence is also represented, albeit with ambiguity during interviews with various naming mentioned: “ANB Cemetery,” (B Sam, Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000; J Ashby, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000; Groundskeeper, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000), and “the Indian Cemetery,” (H Arnoldt, Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 02 July 2000; B DeArmond, Interview, Sitka, 03

\textsuperscript{203} ANB, Sitka Memorial Park, National, Presbyterian, Russian Orthodox, Lutheran, Moose, Pioneer and Old City.

\textsuperscript{204} Pioneer, Moose, Old City, Lutheran and Presbyterian cemeteries are full.
July 2000). In the tourist guide, All about Sitka (2000:8), the cemetery is simply referred to as: “other burying grounds.” This cemetery’s name is confusing since ‘ANB,’ while important to Tlingit society and religion (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1998), is considered a political as well as social construct derived in part as a survival strategy post-colonisation. While not inherently problematic, the ANB Cemetery name appears to lack connection to nature or environment, unusual given the significance of ancestry and heritage exhibited in the Tlingit geomentality and insights regarding the importance of naming to identity discussed in the Tlingit naming analysis. An alternate explanation could be that burial grounds as a concept, introduced post-contact, vary sufficiently from traditional Tlingit constructs of death, that cemetery naming is less relevant since deeper meaning is preserved through alternate or traditional means (e.g., potlatch).

The final category of sacred place names is Homelands/historic sacred places, different from earlier names as they represent material expressions of nations as constructs symbolising heritage, occupation and power. When geographic displacement occurs, it is from such important homelands sites. Four homelands sites are examined here from Sitka’s spiritual landscape (see Map 3 and Appendix 8). The first is the current Old Sitka State Historic Site, originally a Tlingit summer village named, Gájaa Héen meaning “water coming from way up,” (NPS interpretation signs at Old Sitka, Field Research, July 2000). It was named as the first Russian post in the area as: Arkhangel’sk Mikhailovskaya after Saint Michael the Archangel. The second homelands site is the current area called ‘Katlian District,’ (discussed previously) and home to Sheet’ka Kwaan Naa Kahida Tribal Community House. The third site is Castle Hill, officially named a National Historical site designated as the “American Flag Raising Site” in 1966 to commemorate the transfer of Alaska from the Russians demonstrated 18 October 1867 by the lowering of the Russian flag and raising the American flag (an event that is recreated annually). Located within the original Tlingit village area, Noow Tlein was called various names during Russian settlement including Russian Castle (Krause (1979 [1885]), Russian Town, and Baranov’s Castle. The fourth and final site is Sitka National Historic Park, re-designated a National Historical Park in 1972. Other naming near the area included the Tlingit village of Shaaseiyi.Aan (now Jamestown Bay), Shis’k’l Noow (the Kiks.ádi

---

205 In 1890 President Benjamin Harrison established a 50 acre park at the mouth of Indian River. President Taft made it into Sitka National Monument in 1910. . . “The K’alyaan (Totem) Pole stands guard over the Shis’k’l Noow site to honor the Tlingit casualties. Ta Éetl, a memorial to the Russian sailors who died in the Battle, is located across the Indian River at site of the Russians’ landing. In September of 2004, in observance of the Battle’s bicentennial, descendants from both sides joined in a traditional Tlingit “Cry Ceremony” …to "put away" their two centuries of grief,” (Griffin 2007:1).
Fort site inside the Park on the Register in 1966), or more recently Totem Park (D Farrell, Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000; B DeArmond, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

There are several patterns in the homelands naming. The first is naming as an *expression of colonisation*. Replacing colonial influences through renaming of places is common. Naming displaces existing place references, as an “act of appropriation…an expression of power,” (Azaryahu 1996:312). The various names given to the four homelands sites over time indicate the changing names associated with those cultures in power. In Hawaii, Herman (1999:77) describes the process where indigenous names were overwritten soon after American annexation, “heightening the imperial [government] connection to this process.” Colonists wishing to make a place ‘like home’ reflected Baranov ’s selection of Arkhangel’sk Mikhailovskaya where attention was on significant Native places, and lower order naming able to retain an indigenous naming flavour as less important.

The second pattern in homelands naming is the expression of cultural influence or geomentality. The Tlingit naming is consistent with earlier topographic naming analysis references to *nature* names (e.g., *fort of the young saplings,* water coming from way up, by the sea). Russian naming contains Imperial links (e.g., *Castle Hill*) and European recycling of Archangel for Sitka as *New* Archangel, symbolising constancy, tenacity and renewed hope. The naming context is set within a linear time dimension that reflects the Russian geomentality, similar to Americans where ‘Old’ Sitka is distinguished from the present community indicating a linear pattern and concept of time. American attitudes are also captured in ‘historic’ references, and ‘national’ sites of significance. For example, Castle Hill is a remnant of Russian times and on the promontory used for generations by Tlingit. It now holds the name of the former Russian governor’s house where no structure exists, though on the National Historic Register it is named: “American Flag Raising Site,” which captures the American importance of the transfer of Alaska (event) and the importance of the flag to symbolise the nation.

The third pattern is the difference between ‘official’ and common naming references for these sites. For example, the most commonly referred to ‘names’ for these homelands sites differ from their ‘official’ names with: *Old Sitka, Castle Hill, Indian or Tlingit Village* and *Totem Park* being most

frequently used during interviews and in written materials. Yet surprisingly, the colonial remnants of the Russian heritage with the former Russian fort at Old Sitka persist as does the Imperial link to ‘Castle,’ and the racial connotations of ‘Indian Village.’ The difference between official and colloquial use of names and naming suggests a disconnect between the social understanding and political ideology displayed in official records. Mixed messaging does little to acknowledge Sitka’s rich cultural heritage and diversity. This aspect is linked to the fourth pattern regarding the reappearance of Tlingit naming. It appears that the palimpsest in the Tlingit geom mentality of original place naming may be returning ‘unofficially’ through interpretative sites as evidenced during field research where signage contained Tlingit naming and meaning alongside American naming. The naming of Sitka National Historic Park for example might change to ‘officially’ return to Native place naming and meaning. Official designations can greatly impact public perceptions and can influence external symbolism of a place as will be illustrated in the next section.

5.3.1 DESIGNATIONS

In this research, designations are considered a form of naming as physical adornments upon the land that like topographic names, imbue a place with cultural meaning, reflect power and link to intangible heritage constructs making them worthy subjects to explore in the spiritual landscape. In this section, sacred places in Sitka’s landscape receive an elevated status through a ‘designation’ making them representations not only of what is historically or culturally significant, but also in present settings, carries with it implications for the place’s ongoing management (protection and access) and potential revenue generation (e.g., tourism). Balancing heritage, tourist and current spiritual uses can be delicate with sacred places. This section considers how sacred places are designated, managed and reflect Sitka’s cultural heritage.

In America, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is the official list of government and privately-owned structures, sites, districts and resources deemed to have national significance and to be worthy of preservation. The Register was established in 1966 through the National Historic Preservation Act and is administered by the National Park Service (NPS). Registered property owners receive tax relief for preservation expenses. Establishment criteria broadly require that places are associated with significant events or people contributing to American history; or have
distinctive architecture (e.g., type, period, or method of construction); or have potential to yield historic information (e.g., archaeological significance), (See http://www.nps.gov for full criteria). Cemeteries and places under 50 years are not generally eligible. In Alaska, NRHP designated places reflect three categories: Russian heritage, roles in WW2 and stories of “ancient cultures,” (http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com, accessed 19.09.2008). In Sitka, as at April 2009, there are 22 NRHP sites including a variety of privately owned historic homes (e.g., Hanlon-Osbakken House, Mills House), and government buildings (e.g., City Hall, Japonski Naval Base, Alaska Pioneers Home, Sitka Community College Building (Indian Public School)). Nine of the NHRP sites are sacred places as defined in this study.

In Sitka, the 9 NHRP designations are for three homelands sites: Old Sitka, Castle Hill, Sitka National Historic Park; and six places of worship: The Bishop’s House, St Michael’s Cathedral, Sitka Lutheran Church, Sheldon Jackson College, and St Peter’s By-The-Sea Episcopal Church (and adjacent See House). Several of these places have additional designations. National Historic Landmark (NHL) designations are assigned by the US Secretary of the Interior for places possessing:

- exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States (http://www.nps.gov, accessed 19.09.2008).

NHL designations in Sitka include: The Bishop’s House, as one of four surviving examples of Russian Colonial Style architecture in the Western Hemisphere; St Michael’s Cathedral for providing primary evidence of Russian influence in North America; and Castle Hill as site of a national and historically significant event. A third level of national designation is the National Historic Site (NHS), which acknowledges the importance “of remembrance by people of an entire nation, if not beyond,” (http://www.nps.gov, accessed 19.09.2008). Old Sitka and Castle Hill sites are both owned and managed by the Alaska State government and hold NHS designations. Finally, the Sitka National Historic Park (NHP), under the aegis of the NPS and co-managed with the Southeast Alaska Indian Cultural Center, was set up in 1890 and is Alaska’s oldest federal public park. It was designated as a national monument in 1910, on 18 October 1972 it received NHP designation. The significance of the various levels of designation include increasing levels of

funding and protections as well as the ‘status’ that accompanies national sights of significance that promote a place’s tourism appeal. Further discussion of the heritage, management and tourism implications of designations follows.

“Historic” designations reveal what is deemed important to that country in the same way toponyms convey important socio-political aspects, ideology and heritage at a local and regional level. Several observations regarding designations are noted. First, there is an absence of designated Tlingit places among those ‘sacred places’ with designations. Second, the timing of designations reveals in 1966 when NRHP legislation was enacted, all places established in Sitka reflected its Russian past\(^{209}\) (e.g., Russian Bishop's House, Cathedral, Old Sitka, Castle Hill and the National Park). A third of the current designations were made relatively recently (within the past 25 years). Third, ownership of designated places is mixed (e.g., one third is privately owned churches with other places owned by federal, state or local governments). Fourth, the range of place functions is diverse with approximately half “religious,” a third “landscape/recreation or park” functions, one school (no longer used) and one health facility. Finally, one third of designated places are privately owned (Sitka Lutheran Church, St Michael's Cathedral and St Peter's By-the-Sea), all used for ‘religious’ functions. Designations of sites were coincidentally within five years of the 1967 transfer centennial contributing to establish ‘heritage’ and firmly anchor Sitka’s history within an American ‘designated’ context that recognises a Russian history, particularly as the buildings would have been dating and at risk of being lost to fire (as will be discussed in Chapter 6).\(^{210}\) The presence of religious sites is not surprising given the important role of the church in Sitka’s colonial past and early American history. Ownership is important since the government can exercise fewer controls over private owners in preserving and protecting historic sites. The converse is that publicly held places can be costly to maintain and restore and are subject to contestable public funding. However, if significant to the nation’s history, such places must be protected.

The ‘historic designations’ of these sites reinforce their importance as part of America’s history, despite these battles being fought prior to American settlement and involving Russian and Tlingit

\(^{208}\) An independent, non-profit Native organisation promoting cultural values of the Southeast Alaska Native cultures.

\(^{209}\) Other NHRP places were added after 1978 (e.g., SJ College in 1986, Sitka City Hall in 1997).

\(^{210}\) The other three sites designated in 1966, when the National Historic Places Register came into effect, honour the Russian past: St Michael's Cathedral, the Russian Bishop's House, and Castle Hill (where the changing from Russian to American flags during transfer took place). These post-colonial remnants feature visible Russian influences in the city’s centre, emphasising Russian, not Tlingit influences.
people. What is preserved can represent different messages about history. The “Williamsburg colonial history” or the “oppressive and dehumanizing aspects of slavery” are different aspects of the same point in history (Alanen and Melnick 2000:6-7). Birnbaum (1996) argues the importance of systematically documenting changes and processes in order to *preserve* landscapes of slavery for future generations since interpretations of history reveal how power relationships can capture, preserve and transform space, place meaning and perspectives over time (DeGraft-Hanson 2005).

Given the need for the new America to develop its history, and a desire for non-British connections, the Battle sites of 1802 (Old Sitka Site) and the Battle of 1804 (National Historic Park Site) are regarded as important to the nation’s identity. *Old Sitka* is a State owned and managed site and the Park is federally owned. Commemorating specific physical locations can serve as important national symbols as Jackson and Penrose (1993) discuss with the site of the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314. The Battle of 1804 is also remembered with a clearing at the site of the Tlingit fort and battlefield and two memorials, one for Russians (Photo 52) and one for Tlingit (Photo 62) casualties. Meanwhile, there is “very little to mark the Tlingit history physically in the park,” (Griffin 2007:1).

To mark the former Tlingit fort site the *Kiks.ádi* clan commissioned a traditional totem pole honouring *K‘alyaan*, leader of the Tlingit in the 1804 Battle raised in 1999. The absence of ‘designations’ for Tlingit sacred places is considered next.

### 5.3.1.1 ANB Hall

None of the four Tlingit homelands as defined in this study as ‘sacred places’ receive national designations despite their significance to the Tlingit culture. This suggests no Tlingit ‘sacred places’ are important to commemorate America’s heritage. A closer look at the only Tlingit place on the National Historic Register supports an assertion that the designations process favours an American geomentality. The Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) Hall (Photo 15) is located in the Tlingit homeland area (Katlian District). Two cultural perspectives toward the place are presented: as a building with a national historic designation; and according to function as explained in interviews during field research.

The importance of ANB Hall functions and location were talked about by a Tlingit elder:
The Alaska Native Brotherhood Hall is located in the area in which Tlingit people returned, approximately 20 years after the 1804 Battle of Indian River. It is an important place for native heritage preservation. The place used to be part of the Tlingit village that spanned from the ANB Hall to the waterfront to Swan Lake – taking into account the importance of water as the main transport. Now waterfront is more valued for its commercial use. Today it is not acknowledged that Natives used the waterfront as part of their culture… Functions at the Hall include social events (like a salmon bake) ceremonies and funerals (Name withheld, Interview 15, Sitka, 06 July 2000).

The land where the Hall is sited through to the adjacent Healing Centre, the Sitka Tribal Centre, and the Tribal Community Building/Tlingit Cultural Centre) was subject to land claims for some time as Gil Truit advised:

The land was given by the descendant of Chief Katlian to the government to build a school. In the 1920’s the government built a Bureau of Indian Affairs school, but when the school system no longer needed the school, the Tlingit wanted the land back for the ANB Hall. The Tlingit people had to fight to get the land back (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

The strong ties to the particular place reinforce the notion of the strong Tlingit connection to their ancestral homeland reinforced in the Tlingit geom mentality, as articulated by a Tlingit elder:

…religion, spirituality to the Tlingit is a way of life, not a building (Name withheld, Interview 15, Sitka, 06 July 2000).

Oberg (1979[1937]) incorrectly stated the ‘house’ has a name. Tlingit people are named (see Clan House naming 5.1 above) and while the building is considered sacred, the physical feature is not. What lies beyond the material, hidden in the meaning and functionality of place, is the heart of the cultural belief system.

In contrast, the NPS designation of the privately owned ANB Hall as a National Historic Building in 1972, notes its function as ‘social,’ and emphasises its significance differently:

The Tlingits founded the Alaska Native Brotherhood/Sisterhood Society in Sitka in 1912 to fight discrimination against Alaska's Natives and to obtain recognition of their rights and compensation for their lands. In 1914, the Society built a large frame building – the Alaska Native Brotherhood Hall - as a meeting hall and headquarters. It remains a symbol of the political power the group attained (cr.nps.gov/nr/research/nris.htm 03.03.2007).

The NPS designation recognises ANB Hall as a symbol of political power with a history of asserting rights, thus emphasising its similarity to American values:

As the history of the ANB illustrates, and the results of the collective action on behalf of Alaska Native rights and land claims bear out, it was those Alaska Natives who were educated, and who understood the Western system, who were ultimately able to effect change (Shales 1998:65).
Photo #14 - “Back Street” Indian Village 1938

Source: AMRC-b75-175-592 Photographer Ray B Dame, http://www.anchoragemuseum.org/aboutus_copyright.asp With permission

Photo #15 - Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka Camp No.1 (National Landmark)


Photo #16 – Nass River

Source: Alexander 2000
No attention to Tlingit cultural values or ties to homeland are stated in these references. There is a chasm of interpretation between the earlier discussion of the spiritual significance of the Tlingit ‘house’ and the historic designation rationale emphasising White political constructs and history of land struggles. Honouring founding members of the ANB with street names (e.g., Price and Simpson) is important to recognise recent history, but lacks a Tlingit cultural context with the ‘designation process’ failing to recognise the cultural significance of homelands or Tlingit geom mentality values.

To mark the Tlingit heritage, perhaps the Survival March pathway and significant sites could be considered for designation? Points and lines are components of the geography of sacred spaces (Tuan 2001[1977]). Distinctive site characteristics (e.g., historic events) are often associated with pilgrimages (Tanaka 1977). Whether the Survival March is designated or recognised more visibly within Sitka’s local heritage will have implications for the management and future protection of the lands involved. It is these places and times where public goods and sacred places interlock.

### 5.4 Summary

This chapter has presented the Trojan horse of naming in Sitka’s spiritual landscape. It has revealed through Tlingit people naming, Sitka’s streetscape and the designations of sacred places that names and naming are anything but innocuous. Some functional simplicity exists, like naming of natural features for navigational aids (Peril Strait), or to denote location (Lake Street), or a place of worship (First Presbyterian). Greater examination of naming type and spatial patterns however, reveal ideology-laden reflections of power. Cultural influences are reflected in naming preferences where politics goes some way to explain what is named and where, but cultural geomentalities serve to provide the deeper links to the subconscious drivers of this important geospatial behaviour.

Looking at period maps representing Tlingit, Russian and American sources revealed interesting cultural naming patterns. The hierarchy of physical features naming illustrated a dominance of British and Russian influences at the major landmarks scale, which shifted to a Tlingit influenced origin for smaller features. Cultural naming patterns illustrated a reliance on ‘people’ names in
European and American constructs, with Russians importing homeland references (Catherine, Arkhangel’sk). The “arbitrariness of the European names...that could be applied to any place,” (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer eds. 1994:30) contrasted with the nature emphasis in all forms of Tlingit naming, including personal identity. Tlingit naming does not commemorate people and focus on the past as much of the American and Russian naming, rather it reflects the present in clan names (The House on the Water) and in Tribe references associated with specific places (Small Lake Tribe). The Tlingit carry “mythopoetic traditions...grounding them in a material reality of the continuous present,” (Thornton 2008:100-101). Tlingit naming reflects their geometry to honour the uniqueness of nature, that also plays a role in the naming process (e.g., Raven nostalgia could not create two Nass Rivers as nature would not let him). The variety in naming patterns reflects the complexity of cultural influences upon Sitka’s landscape.

The original analysis of Sitka’s streetscape contributes to the local historic record and reveals patterns that represents Sitka’s imperial past including Russian and Finnish influences. The heritage constructs by early Americans failed to showcase the Tlingit history or roles of women. A spatial analysis of name location reveals patterns of separation by culture group. In the case of present day Katlian District, similar boundaries reinforce the segregation of colonial days with Indian Village and Russian Town. Where Tlingit naming is used in the streetscape, the applications are incongruent with Tlingit cultural norms and geometry. The American commemoration of founding fathers (mayors, councillors, navy personnel) dominated Sitka’s street names with a selection represented across culture groups.

Contemporary implications of naming were considered in a designation context where this form of toponym can be used to promote tourism. A caution was raised to balance religious and commercial needs of sacred places as tourist attractions, and a potential for using such designations to protect sacred places. With designations a similar absence of Tlingit places deemed to be ‘significant’ prompted a closer look at where Tlingit places are designated. Only one Tlingit place, ANB Hall, is on the National Historic Places Register, notably for its political and power association that reflects value in the American geometry. Future tourism potential linked to designations and a more accurate reflection of cultural diversity was discussed as a means of protecting the spiritual

211 In 1996, Herb Hope successfully tracked the coastal route around Baranov Island to reach Point Craven, the terminus point of the march, confirmed by archaeologists (Hope and Thornton eds. 2000:48-49).
landscape and enhancing the role of the indigenous population in the town’s visible material markers of history.

The familiarity of the named landscape reinforces power and legitimises ideologies that can remain unquestioned by the ordinary nature of these markers. However, if issues of equity and diversity are to be managed effectively, greater transparency of hidden messaging must be brought to the fore and cooperatively managed. Co-creating processes for designating, naming and managing or preserving history into the future requires change in the current system. Present designation frameworks and naming processes inherently ascribe value. Marginalising certain cultural heritages only serves to perpetuate cross-cultural misunderstanding and conflict. There is much opportunity through exploration of diverse perspectives, to create protections for land and culture that achieve preservation goals for sacred places and cultural landscapes. A proactive method to reflect cultural diversity in a city can be reasonably achieved through renaming that “has an immediate effect on daily life, on language, and on space (Azaryahu 1996:317). The big question about the observations in Sitka is whether Sitkans and Americans feel the landscape accurately reflects their cultural past, present and future. If not, meaningful action in a culturally appropriate context might provide a broader and balanced view of history that also poises the city well for tourism in the future.

This chapter has illustrated how invisible spiritual and spatial beliefs as part of cultural geomentalities, can influence the naming of people, streets and sacred places. Implications for intercultural relationships through a demonstrated inequitable distribution and disconnected cultural context for naming and designations in Sitka raises questions about how power is portrayed to create a version of history and influence everyday social perceptions. The next chapter continues the investigation of the tangible visible landscape through a spatial analysis of sacred places. This provides the final lens in the comprehensive approach to read Sitka’s spiritual landscape by examining places of worship and cemeteries in closer detail and by introducing some resident perceptions to these sacred places to enhance understanding between beliefs and the material landscape.

---

212 Azaryahu (1996) discusses the renaming 200 streets in West Berlin and 227 in East Berlin within six years (1945 and 1951) and renaming Zagreb’s Square of the Fighters against Fascism to the Square of Croatian Greats as actions with immediate impact.
CHAPTER 6: A SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF SITKA’S SPIRITUAL LANDSCAPE & SACRED PLACES

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a spatial analysis of Sitka’s sacred places to present the final dimension of this exploration into Sitka’s spiritual landscape. Original contributions are provided in content and approach by comprehensively including all Sitka’s contemporary sacred places together for the first time. As this research provides a starting point, sacred places details are included where available to consolidate available information for future use. The comprehensive approach explains visible geospatial patterns incorporating environmental, socio-political, economic and cultural geomentality lenses. This chapter is structured to first introduce the explanatory framework, quantum and distribution of sacred places. General spatial patterns are framed within zoning areas and resemble original Tlingit homelands, Russian settlement and American residential growth patterns. Next, places of worship and cemeteries are considered in closer detail including changes to form and function over time (see Chapter 3 for detailed homelands/historic places discussion). The role of government is considered throughout the chapter with implications for future sacred places management and tourism. Finally, resident perceptions of sacred places and the landscape are canvassed to enhance understanding between contemporary beliefs and the material landscape. This chapter adds a new dimension to the local and regional knowledge of Sitka Alaska.

The body of knowledge analysing specific places of worship is limited. Some relevant research is found in: Homan & Rowley’s (1979 in Park 1994) study on practical considerations such as topography, aspect and access and threshold populations; Tanaka’s (1981) study regarding the evolution of pilgrimage sites in Japan; and Shilhav’s (1983) study of religious considerations as for Jewish synagogues. Little research has been undertaken into specific location and planning factors. Park (1994) notes that factors influencing decisions on how and why to locate have changed over time and are worthy of study. While Yoon (1986; 1994b) discusses placement and proximity of Māori marae, church and cemetery complexes, he does so without considering the role of

---

213 Palimpsest evidence (e.g., middens at Castle Hill and Old Sitka sites) and national historic site designations for three of four sites (Old Sitka State Historic Site, the Sitka National Historic Park, and the American Flag Raising Site (Castle Hill) were discussed in Chapters 3 and 5 respectively. Only the Sheet’ka Kwáan Naa Kahida Tribal Community House (considered in this study to represent Katlian District) had no designation. Palimpsest is illustrated in the landscape map in Map 3 with corresponding data contained in Appendix 8.
government in shaping these clusters. Finally, post-colonial approaches (King 1976, Duncan 1990) tend to highlight political and power explanations, but are absent of social construction considerations applied by Kong (1990) and others. The comprehensive approach used for Sitka contributes to these less developed methods (Park 1994) and addresses Tuan’s (2001) criticism of the lack of focus in the area.

The geographic analysis of cemeteries draws on previous studies: at an ‘overall landscape’ level (Darden 1972, Howett 1977, Kong and Yeoh 2003, Park 1994, Yoon 1986, Zelinsky 1994); ‘site’ level (Jackson 1967-68; Price 1966 in Park 1994; Zelinsky 1976, 1994) and in the interplay of religion, politics and economics (Hardwick & Claus et al. 1971, Kong 2001, Kong and Yeoh 2003). Cemetery segregation as discussed in Park (1994) draws on studies in other locations including Pattison (1955) in Chicago; Price (1966) in southern Illinois; Francaviglia (1971) on Blacks in Oregon; and Christopher (1995) in South Africa. Landscapes of death are valuable to understand how cultural beliefs, in death and beliefs around death, interlink with attitudes to the environment (e.g., disposal of the dead by cremation, interment (ground burial), and inurnment (columbarium). These places represent “possibly the most sacred of human sentiments and values,” (Kong and Yeoh 2003:51). Beliefs are reflected in the physical environment through location, siting, configuration, layout, and naming, making such landscapes rich reading for cultural geographers whose interests are varied including:

- social constructedness of race, class, gender, nation and nature, the ideological underpinnings of landscapes, the contestation of space, the centrality of place, and the multiplicity of meanings (Kong 1999:2).

Landscapes of death are more lasting than churches214 since buildings are subject to natural hazards and require financial and social support to be sustained. Even when at-capacity, cemeteries still require government management and maintenance and can contain national monuments, contributing to their enduring quality. They make ideal topics for a comprehensive approach. Subject to government controls (e.g., public lands, zoning), their management reflects public attitude (e.g., preserving socio-cultural or national treasures) and social constructs, providing reflections for improving multi-cultural understanding.

214 Worship tends to be more of an internal experience for the living, though some links are external (e.g., ceremonial marches).
Applying the literature to spatial patterns in Sitka one expects to find a strong city centre with evidence of imperial architecture influences and cultural layering evidenced through palimpsest (DeGraft-Hanson 2005, French 1983, Schmidt 2005, Sidorov 2000, Sobti 2005). Church and cemetery layouts should resemble patterns found in other colonial experiences (Freeland 1963, Handlin 1985, Howarth 1985, Stacpoole 1976 and others) with recent denominations located in new residential zones and traditional denominations occupying established areas (featuring traditional architectural form). Cemeteries established in the 19th century would be denomination-based, with 20th century grounds more race-based and park-like (Boorstin 1965, Christopher 1995, Harris 1982), located where land is plentiful and scenic. Geomentality would explain invisible rationale of sacred places (Gilbert 1993; Yoon 1991, 1994a, 1994b), including how American symbols of patriotism house nationalist beliefs as evidenced throughout the material landscape (Boorstin 1965, Harris 1982). Economic location theory (Von Thünen 1966[1826], Christaller 1966, Weber 1963) would support: older places in expensive central locations; cemeteries relocating with pressure from higher rents and encroaching population growth; and the quantum of sacred places limited by sustainability thresholds (Lösch 1954 [1941]). Finally, environmental factors would also have influence on landscape development given Sitka’s remote location and limited buildable land area. These expectations are applied to Sitka commencing with general spatial patterns found in the spiritual landscape.

6.1 General Spatial Patterns & Explanatory Framework

This section provides an introduction to the spatial patterns in Sitka’s spiritual landscape discussing the number and distribution of places of worship and cemeteries (the distribution of homelands sacred places was discussed in Chapter 3). Patterns in the spiritual landscape incorporate information from: field research (2000) to document the contemporary landscape, historic maps (Blashke 1836 in Pierce 1986), models of Sitka at 1845 and 1867, transfer documents at 1867, and travel journal/diaries. Comments on function and form215 enhance sacred place assessments. Spatial patterns are discussed within spatial zones216 developed for this study (as illustrated in Map 6) and Sitka’s city zoning framework (elaborated next).

215 Several disciplines provide useful examples including in cultural geography (Yoon 1980, 1986; Tuan 1978; and others); in planning and architecture (Rapoport 1978, 2005); in sociology (Eliade 1986) and archaeology (Thornton 1997a, 1997b).
216 For easy reader recall, zones include: Zone 1 is the original (1800s) settlement area, Zone 2 is the commercial business district (CBD), Zone 3 is the Outer town zone, Zone 4 is Suburbs, and Zone 5 is Japonski Island.
6.1.1 ZONING AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Government intervenes in the *public interest* in various land use areas ranging from health and safety, to efficiency, equity, and resource preservation (Leung 1989:5-12). Governments translate the public interest through their different roles in policy, planning, regulating and/or owning depending on their political ideology (e.g., Communist Russia justifies substantial government intervention for the collective good, while American democracy seeks minimal interference to preserve individual rights and freedoms). The government exercises public interest decision-making in the spiritual landscape. Sacred places have ‘public good’ characteristics\(^{217}\) including: *joint supply*, since the cost to provide the good (e.g., historic public park or cemetery) is the same for one or many at no additional cost; *non-excludability*, as once provided, it is impossible to withhold from those who do not wish to pay for it; and *non-rejectability*, as once it is supplied, it must be equally consumed by all (e.g., rates/taxes that support sacred places). Applying public good theory to explain spatial patterns is useful as the amount, type and quantity of distribution varies by geographic location. Pinch (1985:7-9) explains how collective consumption has geographic perspectives relating to: the *jurisdictional partitioning* of good/services, since where one lives influences quantity and range of goods/services received; the *distance decay* or *tapering effect* from point-specific services (like cemeteries or parks) since travel cost/time impacts vary with distance; and finally, *positive or negative externalities* associated with proximity to, and the nature of, goods/services (e.g., individuals may value proximity to parks and avoid proximity to airports due to associated noise).

Government intervention in land management occurs at several levels. A system of land *ownership* is determined at the national or federal jurisdiction level where ownership structures are set out in legislation and includes any delegations of power to lower levels of government. *Regulation* of use, and land *management* policies and programmes often occur at local or regional levels. This study focuses on Sitka’s spiritual landscape and observes various levels of government action and responsibility relating to its sacred places. In Sitka, managing public goods occurs in a Western planning framework that responds to:

---

\(^{217}\) Public good characteristics are based on theory by Samuelson (1954, 1955) and Musgrave (1958) as cited in Pinch (1985:6-7).
the ambivalent attitudes held by man (sic) towards land. While land may be bought and sold like any other commodity, it is often perceived to have special qualities or attributes that require or justify government intervention (Mather 1986:65).

Mather’s ‘commodification of land’ reflects the Judeo-Christian geomentality applied in Western planning and regulatory contexts (e.g., zoning). This belief structure is important as it conflicts with the developing understanding of the Tlingit geomentality (and similar contrasts displayed in indigenous Hawai’ian and Māori cultures). It is also useful since he considers the need for common property, or what Pinch (1985) terms collective consumption. Does the government duty of care to manage land equitably in such ‘collective’ circumstances reflect a balance between divergent cultural attitudes toward the land?

In Sitka, the contemporary spiritual landscape is governed by local government planning regulations including zoning classifications that apply to churches, cemeteries and historic/homelands sites. The Sitka City Planning Department (CSPD) has responsibility to:

...regulate the use of land and improvements by districts in accordance with the comprehensive plan, the coastal management program and other applicable programs. These zoning regulations are designed to provide for orderly development, to lessen street congestion, to promote fire safety and public order, to protect the public health and general welfare, to prevent overcrowding and to stimulate systematic development of transportation, water, sewer, school, park and other public facilities (Ord 86-695 para 4, in CSPD Zoning Bylaws, 1986:252).

There are no unique land use classes for sacred places, nor recognition of spiritual land use or occupation as anticipated in the literature review (Chapter 2). Field research confirmed municipal signage at some ‘sacred sites’ but no policy or procedures regulate sign use (Wells Williams, Interview, Sitka, 06 July 2000). Different definitions of ‘sacred’ may explain why sacred places are not more formally structured within zoning categories, however, Alexander (1991) illustrated diverse interpretations of more straightforward ‘commercial zoning.’

Three zoning categories contain sacred places in Sitka: Public Lands, Residential, and Central Business Districts. Public Lands Districts (P) are intended to contain government-owned lands withdrawn from the public domain and utilised for a combination of public recreation, education or institutional uses. Should land be sold or returned to the public domain, the zoning classification imposed is that of adjacent property with the most restricted classification (Sitka Zoning Ordinance 1986:270-271). Residential Districts (R) have varying densities, utility services and lot sizes as
recorded through corresponding numerical suffixes. The Central Business District (CBD) is designed for concentrated retail, personal and business services to satisfy all residents in one central location. It aims to exclude residential and industrial uses that deter from cohesive business purposes (Sitka Zoning Ordinance 1986:275-276). In addition to these categories, Sitka’s Zoning Ordinance defines a church, and parsonages, but not ‘synagogue’ or ‘non-church’ places of worship. Standard houses unaltered for meeting purposes are excluded from the ‘church’ definition. Cemeteries, with obvious functions, are likewise not defined. Finally, no memorial or commemoration classifications are mentioned. Understanding the rationale for each zoning category is important when considering which sacred places are found in each zone and why (discussed shortly). The ad hoc nature of government classifications of sacred places highlights a need for greater consideration of how these places might be considered. Designations are one way of categorising and managing sacred places.

6.1.2 DESIGNATIONS AS PROTECTIONS

Designations serve as protections and to preserve sacred places. The most direct land intervention occurs when:


government is the owner, controller and user of land, and pursues objectives that private land users are unwilling or unable to pursue (Mather 1986:66).

The federal government has responsibility for two major sites, the National Historic Park (Battle of 1804) and the Bishop’s House. Both places require significant funding to maintain and the recent restoration of the Bishop’s House required an extensive budget and NPS expertise to manage as will be discussed. Interestingly, the Battle of 1802 site at Old Sitka is state owned and managed and appears less expensive to manage (e.g., it operates as a park/recreation area with no obvious expenses apart from interpretive display boards on-site and tourist brochures). One interpretation is

---

218 R1 is single-family and duplex; R1MH adds mobile homes; R1LD or R1LDMH is for lower densities as these areas have on-lot utilities or topography making increased density undesirable; and R2 is for multi-family use aimed at moderately high population densities (Sitka Zoning Ordinance 1986:271-275/1).

219 CSPD defines a church as “a building or structure generally open to the public and used as a place of gathering for the purpose of religious worship or related activities. The definition of a church shall be dependent upon IRS interpretation and that of the State Assessor’s Office,” (Ord 86-695 para 4 (part), 1986:256).

220 Parsonages are defined as places of residence of the pastor or minister of a church, owned by the church, not the pastor (Ord 86-695 para 4 (part), 1986:256).
that the Battle of 1802 was less important to the ‘nation’ than the Battle of 1804 which effectively marked the last altercation between European power and Tlingit people. The lower status battle could be managed at a lower order of government. On the cost to maintain side, the levels of protection and roles of government involvement are balanced with the site’s ‘significance.’

Protection of significant sites may sometimes require greater active government involvement.\(^\text{221}\) Miller (1999) discusses sacred sites to Native Americans that are under siege by development (logging, subdivisions, et cetera) doubting sufficient protection under current legislation (American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) 1978). He outlines the debate between Western and Native approaches regarding Mt Shasta in California where development interests promoting a ski resort competed with traditional Native use. Only specific ceremonial ‘sites’ on the mountain were initially protected, though after 20 years contention, eventually the whole mountain was designated as ‘sacred.’ Chapter 4 discussed different environmental attitudes and cultural definitions of ‘sacred.’

For one culture to ‘designate,’ according to their notions of ‘significant’ jeopardises the protection required to maintain cultural diversity. Concern over the protection of sacred places is echoed by LaDuke (2005) particularly when:

> Judeo-Christian sacred sites such as ‘the Holy Land’ are recognized [and] the existence of other holy lands has been denied (p 13-14).

The concept of ‘holy land’ cannot be exclusive in a multi-cultural and multi-spiritual society. In some cases, protecting sacred places for indigenous cultures is achieved through designating lands to government for management (or co-management); a type of cultural survival strategy for lands. In order to designate a place however, it must be identified and recognised. Ascribing value within different cosmological contexts proves a challenging task.

The preservation and protection of sacred sites is Robert Sam’s ‘lifetime project:’\(^\text{222}\)

> At the Sitka Tribal Association (STA)...I take care of all the sacred sites, all the cemeteries, all the ancient places. That’s what I do (Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000).

\(^\text{221}\) Leung (1989) identifies recreation and environmental enhancement or protection as two functions for Public Lands. Within Sitka’s Public Lands category, functions are wider including religion, schools (though no longer in use) and a health facility. This can be explained since the public interest is varied. The Public Lands category or NHRP designations act to collectively protect places at a level appropriate to the deemed importance of a place or building or site. As seen above with designations for privately owned places, government is intervening into ‘individual rights and freedoms’ to protect significant places.

Referring to the hundreds of named sacred places in the maps at the STA office, Robert informs:

These are all very sacred places. Recording the history of the names, the significance behind them is part of creating programmes to pass all the information about sacred sites and names down to the young people. Base maps have been assembled over the past 20 years relying on stories from elders...We are more interested in preserving our heritage and culture, and less interested in sharing it with the outside world (Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000).

Many places were natural sites (i.e., without distinguishable visible features). These connect locations that hold exceptional prominence, like where a clan heritage reflects a link to a particular animal or important migration aspect. A number of such invisible Tlingit places of power were identified pre-1794 including hot springs\textsuperscript{223} or where a shaman received his animal totem\textsuperscript{224} (Robert Sam, Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000). The history and origin of one power place in Sitka follows:

Over by the airport runway area is where a shaman used to live. There is a high rocky place – and whenever a big storm would come on up you’d find this ixht’ – or shaman in English – standing up on the rocks, crossing his arms and looking out over the storm. And shortly after he would do this, the storm would subside. They said that he would internalise the whole storm. If there was going to be a long voyage anywhere – quite often the Tlingit would visit him and ask him to calm the storms that would then come up. You may have noticed that our waters could be quite treacherous. With the small canoes, with none of the safety features that modern ships have – this is where they would often go. They would do this for many years – and then one day there was a large storm like no one has seen before – the Tlingit went out there to see if he was ok. When they got out there, he was dead. The rock that he always climbed up was all of a sudden flat. Now it is big enough for anyone to go and build a house on. I still see some Tlingit, not many, go out there – perhaps to fast and pray. Some say it obviously has...perhaps after his death...the place has great powers. But quite often, you really need to know what you are doing before you go ahead and do this (David Kanosh, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

Knowledge and access of such places is often limited to those that regard a place as sacred. To protect sacred places requires an overt linking between aspects of sacredness and place, a difficulty when Eurocentric rationale is applied to indigenous cosmological beliefs (LaDuke 2005).

This study focuses the material exploration of visible sacred places in the contemporary spiritual landscape excluding natural sacred places in the Tlingit culture that do not fall into the homelands, places of death or worship categorises developed for this research. Further, it is for the Sitka Tribe to determine how sacred knowledge is shared. Communicating detailed aspects of culture has risk;

\textsuperscript{223} Goddard hot springs site is noted, “as the Russians, never used these hot springs without first getting permission from the owner and bringing gifts of food, blankets or clothing. A man named Goddard took the place away from the Native people. Lewis’s older brother was at the place at the time, and Lewis states that the white man burned the smokehouses with all the Native goods in them,” (George Lewis #55, in Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:64-65).

\textsuperscript{224} The connection to an animal in the spirit world, and manifest on earth that will assist his healing work illustrates the link between the material and spiritual world.
Consedine and Consedine (2001) argue, referring to improper use of indigenous knowledge in New Zealand. In Sitka, reluctance to share stems from previous experience:

Thirty years ago our elders shared all this information about major ecological resources through this whole area with the state – they recorded it all for future use – to preserve it. Elders shared it all with them. Technology kept on. Survey records improved. When we asked the state for these records…to put them together for future generations…they said since the elders passed away the information wasn’t to be passed on (Robert Sam, Interview, Sitka, 2 July, 5 July 2000).

The Tribe had to fight for about two years to get back the information from the State. Balance is needed to manage risk of exposure with the importance of understanding sacred place information when making land decisions and preserving the Sheet’ka Kwáan spiritual heritage. The invisibility of such places and a loss of recorded context may preclude the place’s preservation and designation. Greater effort and focus is essential in planning contexts if we are to adequately link aspects of sacredness and place, and practically utilise such information in land management and designations.

One perspective to explore preservation of sacred places in contemporary settings is to view designations within the *gifting* process. Godbout and Caille’s (1998) discuss the notion not as a *binary relationship* between the market and the state, but rather a separate and distinct aspect to bureaucratic systems (power and authority) and exchange (money and market). Notions of *reciprocity* and *gift giving* emphasise the building of ongoing relationships. Gifting by indigenous people to government may be a way to remove lands from the market system to protect and preserve them, provided management is consistent with protection motives and intent. Applying this logic means sacred places become public goods. The gifting of Tongariro to the New Zealand government as a National Park (later designated as a World Heritage Site) defined the nature of the three way relationship between “the land, the Māori and the Pakeha (government),” as Sir Hepi Te Heuheu conveyed:

The gift says these sacred mountains are to be owned by no one and yet are for everyone. My Tuwharetoa people wish the gift to be remembered for all time. The mountains of the south wind have spoken to us for centuries. Now we wish them to speak to all who come in peace and in respect of their tapu. This land of Tongariro National Park is our mutual heritage (Potten 1987:8).

From a conservation perspective, Bruce Jefferies (Chief Ranger at Tongariro 1979-1986) echoed the sentiments noting a reciprocal and future-oriented ongoing relationship:

Our two cultures have come together and must continue to meet in a strong and creative relationship...to guarantee future protection of the land (Potten 1987:9).
Greater government intervention can be balanced with indigenous management or co-management of sites (e.g., Sitka National Historic Park, Gwaii Haanas National Park). In New Zealand co-management is often a condition within Treaty settlements (pers comms, Wellington, 15 January 2008) and provides a practical application for traditional knowledge in Western settings. Caution is needed to align environmental policy and practice to ensure natural resources are managed for protection and not commodified. This approach heightens the responsibility of government officials to execute decision-making that does not perpetuate the loss of sacred places. Designations are a good step in honouring the diversity of cultural places with spiritual significance and offering important environmental protections during ongoing management. This study method offers a practical framework to underpin future culture group discussions regarding these places and their management. The next section introduces Sitka’s sacred places discussing the number of places, distribution and denominations.

### 6.1.3 NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION

Sitka boasts 24 places of worship\(^{225}\) ranging from a cathedral through 16 churches to four meeting halls,\(^{226}\) and three chapels.\(^{227}\) There are also nine cemeteries and four homelands/historic\(^{228}\) sites. Map 6 illustrates the location of all contemporary sacred places. Most places are zoned *Residential* (57%) with 90% of these being churches and 10% being two cemeteries. All homelands sites and most cemeteries (78%) are in the *Public Lands* category and the *CBD* zone contains four historic churches (see Table 2 in Chapter 3 for list of zoning by site). Referring to the spatial zones, most of these sacred places (38%) are located in zone 1, within the original boundaries of the Russian settlement. A further 32% of places are adjacent in zone 2. A cluster of eight churches (22% of all

---

\(^{225}\) Appendix 11 contains the data table of Sitka’s Places of Worship at 11 July 2000, and all places of worship are identified in Map 8 containing a map of the contemporary landscape with study site reference numbers for individual locations.

\(^{226}\) These include: Victory Fellowship Hall, Unitarian Universalists Fellowship Hall, Salvation Army Meeting Hall and Jehovah Witnesses Kingdom Hall.

\(^{227}\) Chapels are housed within the Pioneers’ Home, Russian Bishop’s House, and Sheldon Jackson College. The Pioneers’ Home (for men) was completed in 1934 (according to information obtained on-site July 2000). Later, the former downtown Presbyterian Church (built in 1924 to replace the one built there in 1887/89 by SJ Jackson that was torn down in 1924), was turned into the, “Tower Apartments,” before being purchased and made into a women’s wing of the Home in 1949/1950. A more permanent arrangement was completed at the Home in 1956, and later the former women’s home facility burned down in 1965 (DeArmond 1993, Sitka Sentinel articles from Arnoldt collection, nd.).

\(^{228}\) The Homelands category includes historic sites and excludes memorials.
sacred places) are found in zone 3 around Watson's Point. The remaining three sites are in zone 4, distant from the town centre (Old Sitka and two churches beyond Jamestown Bay). No sacred places are located on Japonski Island (zone 5). An analysis examining this distribution summary follows.

It is reasonable that there are more places of worship (facilities for the living) than other sacred places; however, for a town of less than 10,000 people, it seemed unusual for there to be 24 places, plus six additional service\textsuperscript{229} listings in the Yellow Pages (2000). Approximately one church for every 360 Sitkan residents is 285\% higher than the 1:1026 ratio cited in Freeland’s (1963:146) work on church thresholds in Melbourne in the mid-1800s. Given the paucity of location and site selection research regarding churches (Park 1994), a proxy was used to compare Sitka’s relative position\textsuperscript{230} to similar sized towns in New Zealand (NZ). Greymouth, Stratford and Masterton were selected as towns to compare to Sitka as they have a similar remoteness or rural character, population, and history (early European settlement). These centres also cover a broad geographic reach in NZ. The comparison results and data are set out in Figure 23.

\textbf{Figure 23: Number of Churches and Cemeteries in Sitka Compared to Similar Sized NZ Towns}
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\caption{Number of Churches and Cemeteries in Sitka Compared to Similar Sized NZ Towns}
\end{figure}

Source: Field Research (11 July 2000) and New Zealand Yellow Pages (03.09.2007)

\textsuperscript{229} Additional services included: Baha’i, Christian Science, Eckankar, Jewish, Quaker and Lifeworld Ministries.

\textsuperscript{230} Churches and cemeteries were compared with historic sites/homelands sacred places excluded as these are less comparable with definitions subject to local interpretations and government policy.
In this simple comparison, Sitka has more than twice as many churches and over a third more cemeteries than the closest comparable NZ town. Sitka has 300% more spiritual sites than Greymouth or Stratford, the towns most similar in population. The NZ examples related more closely to Freeland’s (1963) estimated threshold of similar sized towns (i.e., a population of 10,000 would support ten churches). With cemeteries, Zelinsky’s (1994:35) American study discusses population thresholds to found and maintain a cemetery as being a ‘cadaver shed,’ where the top 10 states with highest numbers of cemeteries per area ranged in number from 9 to 59 places per 100 square miles. Sitka’s 9 cemeteries within the populated city limits would score among these top states. Some possible explanations for the difference follow by applying economic location theory and examining the mix of denominations.

Classical economic location theories are applied to explain the number, location and access to sacred places. Though aimed at private goods production and consumption (Pinch 1985:85), the distance-minimisation rationales (Von Thünen 1966[1826]; Christaller 1966 and Weber 1963), and Lösch’s (1954 [1941]) ‘range’ for a service should provide a method to explain sacred place distributions. Applying these theories to Sitka’s landscape, a number of assumptions can be made: First, one would expect to find a limited number of places overall (i.e., approximately ten places to service a population of 10,000). Second, it would be assumed that the spatial distribution for different denominations is standard, given threshold population requirements to support each ‘worship’ service. Third, a desire to minimise travel costs would drive behaviour for places with congregations located near suppliers for mutual access benefits. Fourth, is an expectation that places are located on or near major roads to facilitate consumer access to service. Finally, the cost to enter the market would affect the number of places (e.g., high entry costs would limit entry).

The previous comparison of Sitka’s number of sacred places to similarly sized New Zealand towns and Melbourne historic churches refutes assumption 1. Assumption 2 is more complex given the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Churches</th>
<th>Number of Cemeteries</th>
<th>Total Spiritual Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitka*</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greymouth</td>
<td>~10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>~ 8,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (3 are closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterton</td>
<td>~20,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sitka population as at July 2007
relationship between place of worship and denomination. Thresholds vary with denomination planting strategies (discussed further in the next section). In the late 1800s, for example places were initially supported through itinerant preachers or sharing buildings. Threshold arguments then, advocating a regular pattern of services or standard thresholds, appear to have limited application to explain denominations.

Assumption 3 relates to proximity of people to place with the distribution of Sitka’s 24 places of worship following the pattern of residential development. Most places of worship, including those established post 1970, extend into residential developments. This pattern supports a notion of local population supporting local services, and links building to availability of land. Leung’s (1989:110) siting principle for community facilities is relevant where two considerations are given: convenience to the users and economy of development. Experience in Sitka matches both as outlined in Chapter 3 where places of worship and cemetery growth trends match population increases in Sitka. Older established places in the CBD will persist as exceptions. They will remain in-situ as they are magnet locations for consumers, worshippers and tourists, with each willing to travel to reach them. Finally, the absence of places on Japonski Island supports the need for proximity of people and place. Historically Sitka’s population was mainland-based, commuting by ferry to Japonski for work (H Arnoldt, Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 2 July 2000; B DeArmond, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000). After the causeway was built, the variety of places established in Sitka negated need for additional services on the island. Nothing is preventing places establishing there, though the physical travel distance may be a psychological deterrent for non-Island residents.

Assumption 4 relates to access. In Sitka, distance overall is not a major factor with only 12 miles of paved road. Still, Halibut Point Road, Sawmill Creek Road and Lincoln Street are the major arterials, and collectively account for access to 63% of all places of worship. In contrast, only a third of Sitka’s cemeteries are located on a main road (Sawmill Creek Road) offering parking. According to Darden (1972), ease of access and remaining relatively secluded are characteristics for locating cemeteries. Most sites have residential street access without designated parking. Overall, parking and access were not factors affecting church attendance or cemetery access due to the limited extent of Sitka’s road network.
The final assumption relates to the cost of entry into the ‘spiritual market’ with the premise that low entry costs would facilitate entry. Considering this premise, little is required to establish a place of worship. Groups can begin in personal residences, like the Lutherans in Baranov’s Castle during Russian settlement, or the six services presently offered without fixed meeting addresses. An examination of external building materials and distinguishing features confirms the entry costs for most places equates to a simple ‘house structure,’ thus supporting a ‘low entry’ cost premise and a higher number of places overall. In summary, economic rationale do not adequately explain the quantum of sacred places in Sitka, nor denomination patterns and thresholds. The link regarding access to services cannot be substantiated in Sitka due to limited road network. Economic arguments do however support the link between proximity of population and services with growth in residential areas matching an increase in the number of sacred places.

Another consideration explaining the plethora of sacred places in Sitka compared to New Zealand is the wider country context. First, while similar sized places are compared, the population in the wider country contexts differ in scope and size (e.g., United States versus New Zealand). A larger population will support greater variation in religions as well as facilitating cross-state diffusion of ideas. Different cultural histories and influences upon geomentalities are another factor to consider. American geomentality stresses individuality and freedom of thought demonstrated by many new denomination varieties entering Sitka during and post-WW2 (see Chapter 3 and below). In New Zealand, the British colonial influence brought tighter religious diffusion (e.g., main denominations like Protestant and Catholic). Finally, New Zealand’s ethnic composition can explain some of the variance. The centres compared to Sitka regarding sacred places represent areas dominated by settler populations (e.g., British ethnicity). If comparing larger populated New Zealand centres, a greater ethnic variation correlates to greater diversity (e.g., the Asian population in the largest city Auckland comprises 13% compared to fewer than 4% Asian population in smaller centres and the South Island (www.stats.govt.nz, accessed 03.05.2009)). In addition to comparing ethnicities, a closer look at denominations further enhances the understanding of Sitka’s sacred places.

6.1.4 COMPARING DENOMINATIONS

Economic rationale did not substantiate Sitka’s case regarding denomination thresholds. Services differ by denomination with minor variations resulting in ‘new’ offerings, as seen with rapid growth
in Evangelical Protestant groups post-WW2. This section investigates how Sitka’s denominations, expressed as *places of worship*, compare to the worshippers across Alaska, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Using 2001 Census data from the Central Intelligence Agency, the Protestant faith (both Evangelical and Mainline combined) represented a majority of believers in the USA (51%), Australia (41%), and New Zealand (40%), which corresponds to Protestant places of worship in Sitka representing 62% of all places. In Alaska, data from the Association of Religion Data Archives (ARDA) also list the Evangelical Protestant category as the highest among adherents of organised religions. Two aspects stand out in the comparison. First, Sitka’s Orthodoxy places (10%) exceed other country-wide comparisons including Alaska, where Orthodoxy believers represent less than 5%. Second, Sitka has fewer Catholic places (5%) than the proportion of Catholic believers in the USA (24%), Australia (27%), New Zealand (13%), Canada (43%) and Alaska (13%). Explanations for these variations follow.

Only one Catholic place of worship in Sitka suggests a less important Catholic presence compared with the higher proportions of believers across the state and other countries. The Catholic Church was among the largest places of worship observed during field research. This observation suggests the number of ‘places’ do not directly relate to congregation size. The Catholic planting strategy better explains the variance. In the later 19th century, bishops advocated for large establishments with schools, rectory, hall, clergy, nuns, and so forth. A large population could be supported by one Roman Catholic Church. Protestant establishments by contrast, feature congregations sufficient to support one clergy and an organist. Catholics implement a strategy of one well-established church being more sustainable than several smaller places, as illustrated in Sitka.

The Catholic movement in Alaska is discussed by Balcom (1970) citing pioneer Reverend Althoff establishing the first church in Wrangell in 1879. Sitka’s first priest Reverend Carley arrived in 1877 and with Archbishop Seghers, made claim to a log building and adjacent lot (Burns’ saloon and

---

232 This category includes the following churches: Salvation Army, Seventh Day Adventist, Sitka Christian Centre, United Pentecostal, Trinity Baptist, Church of Christ, Church of the Nazarene, United Pentecostal, First Baptist, Sitka Assembly of God, based on information found on http://www.arda.com, accessed 12.04.2007) for the denominations/sects for the Evangelical Protestant category.
restaurant), “to be used for a church, school and parsonage in 1885,” (DeArmond,234 Arnoldt Collection, July 2000). Missionary accounts described Sitka’s Catholic Church in 1895 as, “a miserable little structure that was devoid of nearly everything,” (Balcom 1970:np). Initially St Gregory’s Parish held services infrequently with visiting priests from Juneau, Wrangel or Skagway. A second small church building was erected in 1922 on Baranov Street, possible through additional land claims and private donations to gradually increase the church lot area in line with the growing parish. A larger church was dedicated in 1973 (DeArmond 1993:197, 261) and while the old church was deconsecrated, it stands in reasonable condition (see Photo 17) but it has no national or state historic preservation status. With the current operation, the older church utility diminishes. Still, Dorrie Farrell, a Catholic and retired school teacher, believes the church heritage is worth protecting:

[The old Catholic Church] has been gutted except for windows…but the original alter rail and alter are stored in attic of the new church (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000).

According to Dorrie, the reason the old church has not been protected is because it takes a lot of people to apply for grants and to be involved in the process, like with St Andrews Church (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000).

St Gregory’s Church presently serves many functions as part of a full service235 Catholic enterprise (see Photos 18-20). The physical area of Sitka’s Catholic place of worship is directly relative to the size of parish, which has relatively and sustainably developed over time in line with the denomination’s planting strategy. In present day, a Tlingit elder (Name withheld, Interview 15, Sitka, 06 July 2000) explains why few Tlingit are Catholics, estimating approximately half of the Tlingit people as Russian Orthodox:

They [Russian Orthodox] were in first. The Catholics did not get a foothold as their concepts were similar to others so, so why change from Orthodox.

The Orthodoxy variation with Sitka’s higher proportion of places compared to proportion of followers is not surprising given its 200 year history as seat of Orthodoxy in Alaska. Several authors (Black 2004, Kan 1999, Oleksa 1992) discuss Orthodoxy’s spread during Russian occupation.

---

234 DeArmond’s, Around & About Alaska series, in the Sitka Daily Sentinel, provides more information on the church’s history sourced from historic Alaskan newspaper articles.

235 No evidence was found to support a history of a Catholic school operating in Sitka.
In a geographic context, religious diffusion (Park 1994) is common in colonial experiences where imperial influences spread religious values during colonisation impacting beliefs and place (e.g., Russia influencing Alaska as France influenced Canada). The spatial diffusion of religions is one of the more popular areas of geography and religion study as geographers have long been interested in the spatial diffusion of innovations and ideas (Park 1994). The introduction of Russian Orthodox and Lutheran Christianity to Sitka was due to ‘relocation diffusion,’ where the Russians and Finnish migrants and priests brought their beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviours to the area beginning in 1794. The church (and later Cathedral) in Sitka was the seat of the Russian Orthodoxy for Alaska. Once established, ‘expansion diffusion’ from these settlers, priests and new believers would ‘spread’ these religious ideas to others in Sitka through direct contact, also referred to as contagious diffusion (Park 1994:100). Orthodox missionaries of the 1860s, according to Kan (1999):

> convinced Church authorities that in order to spread Christianity beyond Sitka they had to continue to rely on the local aristocracy and separate their own missionary activities from those of the RAC (p168).

The expansion relied upon clergy learning the Tlingit language and instructing the Tlingit in religious sacraments. While Orthodoxy also has a planting strategy, Alaska’s adherents also exceed the USA national average.

Religious diffusion to mainland USA appears inhibited in part by Alaska’s non-contiguous physicality. Remoteness may also explain why Sitka retains a disproportionate quantum of places compared to similar sized cities. Its diversity illustrates a semi-permeable membrane allowing new ideas in, where they then remain. A perplexing concept given the majority of Alaskans (65%) do not affiliate with any religion as illustrated in Figure 24. Religious diffusion through settlers into Alaska helps explain diversity of denominations in Sitka; however, it does not explain why most residents in the state lack any organised religious affiliation, or why four Pioneers’ picnic attendees claimed to choose their Sunday service depending on ‘how they felt that morning,’ (Field research 2000). Hixie Arnoldt attends different church services:

> My husband was Catholic – I went with him...When people say “what’s your [religion],” I say well, I think we’re all going to the same place, so what does it matter? (Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 02 July 2000).
The growth in number and type of religious denominations in America can be related to its lack of tradition and short history, combined with the foundations of the American nation that include freedom of religion and tolerance of diversity. At the same time, Boorstin (1965:312-313) discusses the growth in importance of oratory. The approach contradicts traditional religions with strict adherence to ritual as is the case with Orthodoxy and Catholicism.

During and post-WW2, “there was a building spree of unprecedented proportions,” (Clowney and Clowney 1982:88) where new denominations diffused to Sitka to meet the population influx. The period resulted in the establishment of 71% of Sitka’s places of worship (See Appendix 11) as is discussed next. With a multiplicity of places of worship and the American articulation of religious tolerance, one would expect a diversity of cultural spiritual beliefs and reflective distribution in the spiritual landscape. Autonomy and independence characteristics are congruent with American attitudes for the state function. Boorstin (1965:423) suggests it was this flexibility in approach and independence that facilitated most of the continent to be “led from colonial rule to self-government within a century and a half.” In Alaska, that time was compressed. Why then does the spatial spiritual landscape appear to protract historic colonial cultural divisions? The next section examines Sitka’s places of worship (Map 7) and cemeteries looking for answers.
6.2 Places of Worship

Sitka’s places of worship provide material evidence of its colonial history and the socio-political changes that occurred during its growth post-WW2. The central hub of power maintains a colonial heritage with traditional denominations being preserved in the landscape through government designations and ongoing financial support. The segregation between denominations and race continues as a feature in the places of worship landscape where planting strategies facilitate siting criteria more than economic or topographic features. Finally, geom mentality links between ‘what is deemed sacred,’ influence the design and preservation of church buildings as opposed to other meeting places. Environmental factors, such as the limited availability of stone and brick as building materials, means that the landscape is filled with mostly wooden structured worship facilities. A closer look at the places of worship provides evidence for these patterns.

Sitka’s 24 places of worship are distributed amongst: the Residential district (79% or 19 places with 15 of these established post-WW2); the CBD District which is home to 4 churches; and the Public Lands zone of the chapel in the Sitka Pioneer Home, the oldest and third largest state-owned and operated assisted living facility in Alaska. Looking to the Residential zone, only the historic Presbyterian Church is located in the spatial development zone 1, with most places located in the suburbs (53% in zone 3 and 13% in zone 4). Government intervention in Residential districts is less active than in Public and CBD areas, since residents seek ‘individual level’ protections like limiting noxious uses and promoting quiet enjoyment (Leung 1989). Churches are conditional uses, permitted in only certain residential zones. Synagogues would be limited to outer zones, not within the CBD where Shilhav (1983) argues is best to achieve a service threshold population.

Jewish believers never had a visible building identified as a ‘synagogue’ for worship according to Dr Jim Davis:

After the transfer – most [of the Jewish people] came from San Francisco...with two families from the Seattle area...Others I don’t know – I think they probably would have been gold seekers and didn’t

---

237 “Conditional status” means they will be ‘permitted’ where the said uses could be considered ‘appropriate,’ and have received prior council ‘approval,’ (Sitka Zoning Bylaws 1986:256).
make it, so they came up here…After the transfer, a Jewish man – Breun – he opened a little restaurant…they used the back of it…for a synagogue. There were 12 Jewish families that lived here – they didn’t have a rabbi, but Breun was the reader. They met every Saturday over there in the back of the restaurant…They just had that thing. [Afterwards] just across the street…was a Jewish doctor – and they met in his house for a long time. He had all the accoutrements that they needed for worship. There were a few families left then, but I don’t know if there are any now (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

While there is no synagogue in Sitka or a physical address for the current Jewish services (identified in the local Sitka newspaper, July 2000), the potential inconsistency between preferred service and zoning location could pose difficulty for future siting.

Most population growth occurred in a north-westerly manner following the shoreline, where four of the seven new places built were of a Protestant denomination and three independent (i.e., The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (CJCLDS), Jehovah’s Witnesses, and Unitarian Universalists). Map 7 illustrates place of worship spatial patterns in the Residential zone. The Unitarians are located closest to centre of town in Sitka. The Association is the only place of worship that does not represent a denomination of the Judeo-Christian religion, with principles modified to reflect changing spiritual beliefs:

Unitarian Universalists promote unique beliefs of a person that are based on their individual thoughts, and can go anywhere from a strict monotheistic belief to more of a philosophical view of things...Spiritual teachings of earth-centered traditions which celebrate the sacred circle of life and instruct us to live in harmony with the rhythms of nature were added to explicitly include members with Neopagan, Native American, and other natural theist spiritualities, http://www.unitarian.org.nz/auckland/NZ%20UU%20History.html, accessed 17.11.2008.

The Unitarian Universalists appeared more aligned to traditional Tlingit belief systems; however, when queried regarding Tlingit membership, the on-site representative noted it is not dominated by Tlingit:

Universalism appeals to many walks of life, particularly those new to Alaska that come for the beauty in nature...respectful nature types (pers comms, Sitka, 14 February 2008).

The CJCLDS is located far from town along the eastern shoreline in zone 4. It is physically separate and independent, with no other place of worship siting there until the 1990s (20 years later). The Sitka Assembly of God and the Church of Christ are located farthest from town, though still accessible by road. The location choice could be influenced by cost and/or availability of land, or a desire to be close to their congregation. Another explanation is derived from Bainbridge and Stark’s (1980) study of Nazarene, Assemblies of God and Seventh-Day Adventists sects where:
different standards of behaviour expected of believers, antagonism between the sect and society that is manifested in mutual rejection, and the creation of separate social networks that can tend to make sects introverted (in Park 1994:135).

A desire to be physically separate socially could also explain the site selection. A National Cemetery groundskeeper (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000) said “the thing that separates the town people is religion.” Having a physical distance between different denominations means limiting exposure to undesirable influences from non-believers. As part of the ‘ordinary’ landscape, residential churches are able to conceal social relationships.

Separation was also a feature of the Presbyterian Mission planting strategy to convert indigenous Tlingit people from heathens to Christians in early post-transfer times. However, a dichotomy in Presbyterian siting exists: the Presbyterian Church for whites is located in the town centre, near the seat of power (Harris 1997), while the Presbyterian Mission and former Presbyterian Church for Tlingit was outside of town. The difference in siting is best explained with the Protestant planting strategy for Natives. The Sheldon Jackson Mission (and the Presbyterian Church, school, community hall and museum complex) was established to be separate from the Russian settlement, the Orthodox religion, and the Tlingit community where the separation continues today (see Map 7). The Presbyterian mission approach contrasted the Russian approach. While the Orthodox Church kept the native Resurrection Church and the native school near the Tlingit village, the Presbyterian mission activity was located far from the Tlingit village. If one considered an economic rationale for the Mission location, an argument could be made regarding availability of vacant land. However, Chapter 3 discussed the primary reason as distancing children from the perceived ‘negative influence’ of their families that would emphasise traditional ways and challenge Protestant conversion efforts.

Looking to the Salvation Army, its general focus on urban missions for the poor explains citadels located in inner cities or CBD districts. Although in a Residential zone in Sitka, it is adjacent to the CBD with a plain building design supporting its ‘service’ focus. Information about Sitka’s Army mission was limited. One reference discussed its assistance during WW2 to deliver babies and perform minor operations (Rands, in SASSY 1994:32). Generically, the Salvation Army was founded in East London in 1865 with a quasi-military command structure started in 1878 that enabled rapid deployment of missions at the end of the 19th century, including when it was established in Sitka (http://www1.salvationarmy.org.uk, accessed 27.04.2007).
The preponderance of places of worship in residential districts is not surprising when considering the findings from McKinney and Hoge’s (1983) examination of successful Protestant churches. Focused on community and congregational factors in the growth and decline of Protestant churches, the authors found 50-70% of success attributable to the local context and institution. A strong residential community was a main success factor (along with an affluent neighbourhood and no other Protestant churches nearby). Proximity to users and lower rents in residential areas also facilitates entry for places of worship from an economic rationale. Growth in worship has mirrored residential growth (e.g., eight places of worship near Watson’s Point in zone 3). As land prices decrease from the city core, higher density zoning and the presence of mobile homes/trailer parks appear outside the city centre. The importance of proximity to amenities and links to economic drivers like labour supply, influence the distribution of newer churches. Patterns extend from the central city along the main roads to the ferry (e.g., adjacent to a commercial strip mall) and to former employment hubs (e.g., sawmill) in a ribbon pattern (Hoyt 1939). Land availability in non-core areas also facilitates siting, though topography remains a key limit to construction. Newer subdivisions appear at higher elevations where Jordan and Rowntree (1996:392), note the higher construction costs of hill sites is passed on to owners, thus explaining the larger, more affluent buildings erected in some elevated areas (Field research 2000).

Sitka’s CBD District has four sacred places, all churches: Sitka Lutheran, St Michael’s Cathedral, the Russian Bishop’s House, and the Church of the Nazarene. The CBD zone is inherently spatial being the ‘centre’ of the city where prominence is well established (Tuan 2001[1977]) and typically commands the highest land rents in the city. It is not unusual however, to have historic sites preserved in the city centre since the sites were established in the 1800s. Church ownership of the Cathedral and Lutheran sites has persisted today on freehold land, diluting the argument of high rent impacting siting criteria. The rationale for the Church of the Nazarene establishment in 1956 is less obvious. Interview and field data could not confirm the rationale for siting or establishment. The arrival of Nazarene movement to Sitka could have been delayed as the mission set up in larger centres first (e.g., Sitka’s status as capital of Alaska shifted to Juneau). The church movement had a planting strategy that appears to locate in larger Alaskan centres. Another reflection regarding this

---

238 Satisfaction with the laity, worship programme and congregational cooperation were characteristics regarding the successful local institutions.
church’s location is that while it is zoned as part of Sitka’s small CBD area, across the street from
the church it is zoned Residential. The church is also in zone 2 which is outside the original
settlement and does not feature in the same building style with the other three traditional church
denominations (to be discussed shortly). In Sitka, these historic buildings give visual identity to the
city centre as their form and function add to the city’s heritage. Closer examination of these places
in the next section enhances understanding of the cultural influences that created them, their colonial
history and contemporary messages they convey for present residents.

6.2.1 ARCHITECTURE

An examination of external building materials and distinguishing features of all places of worship in
contemporary Sitka (Photos 17-51) reveals: a majority (54%) have no distinguishing external
features to indicate function (e.g., cross, stained glass, picture of Jesus), with seven of 13 having
only external signs with the place name;239 six of 13 have no external signs;240 and all have plain
external paint colours (e.g., light beige (33%), pale grey/light blue (33%) or rust brown (33%)).
Harris (1982:336) cites several traveller accounts that actually “condemned the American public
buildings for being overmodest.” The most inconspicuous places included the Victory Fellowship,241
located in a commercial strip mall indiscernible from other shop fronts, The Salvation Army with
only an A4 paper notice on its front door, and Grace Lutheran which blended into the forest
background and was difficult to see from the roadway. Such sites are, “typical of Protestant
buildings,” state Clowney and Clowney (1982:74-79) offering a variety of “hall-type architectures,”
that reflect the meeting-place nature of these churches. Jehovah’s Kingdom Hall, Salvation Army,
CJCLDS Fellowship Hall and the Unitarian Universalists Meeting Hall all are established as
‘meeting spaces.’ In sharp contrast were the spires and stained glass visible at the Russian Cathedral
and St Peter’s churches, and stained glass at the Presbyterian and interior of the Lutheran churches.
A cross symbol appeared on five rooftops242 and at the front of six buildings.243

239 Places included: Assembly of God, New Testament Lighthouse Church, Seventh Day Adventist, Sitka Church of
God, Church of Christ, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and Unitarian Universalists.
240 All 3 chapels (sites #11, 23, 24), Church of Jesus Chris of Latter Day Saints, Victory Christian Fellowship, and
Salvation Army had no external signs.
241 Victory Fellowship ceased services by 2007.
242 Rooftop cross places include Russian Cathedral, Lutheran Church, Presbyterian, St Peter’s and United Methodist.
243 Front of building crosses included St Gregory’s Catholic, Nazarene, First Baptist, United Pentecostal, Trinity Baptist
(on lawn), and Grace Lutheran.
Photo #21
Study Site #22
Salvation Army
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Church Of Christ
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Sitka Assembly of God
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(First) Presbyterian Church
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Church Of The Nazarene
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Sitka Christian Centre
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United Pentecostal Church
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Study Site #19
Jehovah’s Witnesses Kingdom Hall
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Photo #35 - Study Site #20
Victory Christian Fellowship & Bible Training
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Photo #33 - Study Site #6
New Testament Lighthouse Church
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Photo #36 - Study Site #16
Trinity Baptist Church CBA
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Photo #34 - Study Site #4
Grace (Evangelical) Lutheran Church

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #37 - Study Site #21
Unitarian Universalists Association

Source: Alexander 2000
Excluding chapels, 50% of places were one storey buildings and the Assembly of God, Nazarene, Lighthouse, Catholics, Seventh Day Adventists, Lutherans, United Pentecostal, Trinity Baptist, Church of Christ and Unitarian Universalists each had two storey structures.

Some of the reasons for buildings being ‘overmodest’ and ‘unsigned’ could relate to Sitka’s small size. First, signs are typically used to advertise or to provide instructions that ‘identify’ a place, not critical in a small centre where word of mouth is likely to be a key communication method, and the local newspaper being another. The Sitka Sentinel, for example, identified 6 worship services not identifiable in the visible landscape. Signage would similarly be unhelpful unless a place was located on a major thoroughfare (one of two streets in Sitka) as unless one drove through the suburb residential locations, they would not see any place of worship signage. Regarding the modest construction and style of buildings, explanations that may be considered include the distance away from available materials (e.g., see story to obtain stained glass for St Peter’s Church below); the ongoing maintenance issues (e.g., including money and people resources) where cemetery maintenance requires the volunteer and not-for-profit service groups to contribute to provision of services and maintenance; and finally the difference in denomination between traditional and modern places of worship (e.g., houses of God versus meeting places as discussed below).

From an architectural viewpoint, the traditional forms of Sitka’s early places of worship were joined by this wave of post WW2 new religious movements that were typified with simple building structures and varied denominations. The Jehovah’s Witnesses Kingdom Halls for example have architecture with an educational purpose in mind. Halls were used as meeting places for worship, Bible instruction, public talks, and preparation prior to “their door-to-door ministry,” according to the Jehovah’s Witness website:

Halls have different sized standard construction designs (quick-builds), have a noticeably dominant architectural style, and are sometimes built without windows for security reasons and to save money. They can take as little as two days to several weeks to build. Maintenance is covered through unsolicited donations. No religious symbols are evident, and structures are modest, functional, clean and attractive, essentially practical (http://www.jw-media.org/index.html, accessed 11.11.2008).

Handlin (1985) comments how in America, traditional styles suffered from links to England as American churches in New England colonies were dominated by independence and:

conceived as an alternative to pomp and ritual of the Church of England…The result in architecture was a unique building, a four square house which served both religious and secular functions…The alter was replaced by a pulpit situated in the middle of the hall (pp 14-16).
Early period architecture writers in America (Handlin 1985) and Melbourne (Freeland 1963) noted how each place of worship competed with each other to present a fresh and fine building that represented their uniqueness. In Sitka however, the post-WW2 building designs, “were utilitarian blocks with no pretensions to being architecture,” (Clowney and Clowney 1982:88). Salvation Army places of worship fall into this category. They are unlike traditional religions that view churches as a house of God. Its focus on activities, not buildings, better explains the current appearance of the Salvation Army building in the Sitkan landscape (see Photo 21). Army beliefs emphasise ‘worship’ through service and the personal faith and spiritual relationship with God being most important, not a dependence on things ‘external.’ No sacraments are used in worship since a holy life and the grace of God do not require these:

Salvationists believe that once we have entered into a relationship with God our lives become his temple (http://www1.salvationarmy.org, accessed 27.04.07).

This understanding better explains the lack of distinguishing features upon the Army building.

It is useful to compare Sitka’s colonial architecture experience to other countries such as New Zealand (Stacpoole 1976), Melbourne, Australia (Freeland 1963:35), and America (Handlin 1984). Stacpoole (1976:32) stresses the utilitarian basics in the design of colonial buildings. He comments on the, “lack of architectural pretension,” and notes that the only interesting buildings in New Zealand were confined to churches, courthouses, barracks and hotels (e.g., St James Church, Waimate Mission House, and Anglican Church in Russell). This parallels to Sitka where the most elaborate designs are the Russian Cathedral, Bishop’s House and St Peter’s Church. The oldest historic church designs in Sitka generally follow Freeland’s (1963:35) rule that ‘the more traditional a church is, the greater the conformity to traditional features.’

The early established places that reflect a traditional style include the Russian Cathedral and St Peter’s Church. Discussing colonial architecture, Stacpoole (1976) comments that buildings were less formal and smaller than imperial buildings, but similar in function (e.g., courthouses, churches, commercial premises) noting that designs were more amateur and workers less skilled. The design influence of the Cathedral and Bishop’s House for example came from a priest (Veniaminov) not a trained architect. Materials and building methods of construction were limited by the environment.
For church building Freeland (1963:14) notes the prerequisites were, “men and materials.” In Sitka there was plenty of wood, but the Russian promyshlenniki were fur traders, not skilled builders. Construction was predominantly by migrant Finnish carpenters, who brought their own building styles in a manner analogous to religious diffusion. Colonial experiences in New Mexico were similar as Johnson notes:

the lack of resources and skilled craftsmen forced local materials and traditional church forms to adapt to one another…[forming] a folk version, or kind of frontier baroque (in Howarth 1985:16-17).

Finnish shipbuilders in Sitka were experienced with large log design of building sea ships so these skills were applied to Russian church buildings. Both St Michael’s and St Peter’s as traditional denominations strived to adhere to established traditions in building design as is elaborated in the discussion of palimpsest.

Wood remains the primary building material in Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape with 21 separate wooden structures: 16 places (76%) use wood cladding, two (9.5%) use a mix of cladding and stone, and only one is built of brick and another one of stone. Unfortunately, building in wood in the severe Sitka climate translates into buildings that are prone to rot (due to the mild, moist climate) and fires, which were widespread and destructive over the early settlement. The Finns, who were accustomed to building with wood, placed great distance in streets to take precautions for the spread of fire. Richards (1966:17) notes the Russian influence on Finnish architecture resulting from decades of being a Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire, and creating “typically Russian townscapes.”

The visual charm of Russian architecture’s primary building materials of brick and white limestone (Auty and Obolensky 1988) were not available in Sitka. The use of colour however was similar in both locations. Russian buildings were distinguished from the simple wooden structures of western American towns with the use of wood as in Russia where it was part of folk tradition to decorate buildings using “intricate carving and moulding,” “wooden sculptures,” and “elaborately carved and

244 Freeland (1963) adds ‘money,’ as a third prerequisite for modern church building.

245 Interestingly, though no longer a part of the Sitka landscape, the former Orthodox Church for Tlingit (Chapter 3) showed a similarity in traditional design. Comparing an 1800s drawing of St Michael’s Cathedral (HABS Collection (23)) to a wash drawing of the Orthodox Church for the Kolosh (Alaskan Russian Church Archives (18) at 28 April 1846) revealed a simpler Kolosh Church design, however, similar in Orthodox design elements of a domed roof and crucifix on top and a similar cross-shaped base floor plan (Library of Congress website www.loc.gov, accessed 17.03.2007). The adherence to the religion’s traditional design elements superseded the need to distinguish by race.
gilded wooden iconostases,” characteristic of the period (Auty and Obolensky 1988:86). In Sitka, these features were reserved for more important buildings, including the Governor’s House (see photo in Black 2004:277) and the Russian Cathedral (Photo 38). In Russian architecture, class and status were also reflected in building design. Auty and Obolensky (1980:79) illustrate model houses in St Petersburg according to categories of: humble, well-to-do and wealthy residents. These strongly resemble the building styles of Sitka’s Russian American Company (RAC) officers barracks, the Russian Bishop’s House and the Governor’s Castle, respectively.

The Russian Bishop’s House building served as a residence for 127 years, provided quarters for staff, and housed classrooms, a seminary, offices, a kitchen, dining room, and formal reception room (Woolsey 1992:5-6). The House was constructed with: double paned windows that could not be opened except for the brass top slides for ventilation; wall widths to ship construction standards; sand and timber flooring insulation; an Alaskan entrance to block the cold at the entranceway; and an S-shaped flue for the fireplace to preserve back draft. The tour guide used the word, ‘overkill’ regarding the strength and sturdiness of the construction (pers comms, Sitka, 07 July 2000). Dorrie Farrell was of the same view:

The Russians were expecting Siberia. But the winters don’t get cold enough to warrant it because of the west coast waters’ calming influence making it more temperate. We’re at the same latitude as Glasgow (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000).

Used to the Siberian winters, the transplanted design direct from Finnish and Russian experiences meant, “the very incongruity of a transplanted design, unaltered, underlined its colonialism,” (Stacpoole 1976:9). Richards (1966:17) speaks of the harsh climate in Finland, “where nature and man must concentrate on holding their own,” which is clearly reflected in its architecture. The Bishop’s House was, according to Woolsey ed. (1992):

the culmination of two-hundred or more years of Russian log-building technology…every energy-saving device known…the House has stood for over 140 years in testimony to the skill and knowledge of its colonial craftsmen (p8).

He notes the House as the best example of the Finnish influence in Sitka’s architecture. Following the transfer in 1867, Swagel (2007) acknowledges continued Russian church support to the former colonial religious institutions in Sitka, until the time it ended with the October Revolution in 1917.

---

246 Teichmann (1983[1925]) criticised the wooden Russian Cathedral saying “if one can bestow that name on a building made entirely of wood,” illustrates his American interpretation and lack of regard for the meaning of the building within the Orthodox faith.
Photo #38 - Study Site #8 - St Michael’s Cathedral

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #39 - Study Site #24 – Russian Bishop’s House Chapel

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #40 - Study Site #24 – Russian Bishop’s House Chapel

Source: Alexander 2000
Financial hardship led the church leaders to rent parts of the bishop’s building as apartments, but eventually sold the church in the late 1960s to the National Park Service. Photos 39 and 40 illustrate the past and present structures, respectively.

The Chapel of Annunciation to the Virgin Mary found in the Bishop’s House, is a sacred place as defined in this study.\textsuperscript{247} It was initially completed in 1842 with similar but smaller scale eastern church interior and features (screens, nave, icons, etc.):

The magnificence of the Chapel of the Annunciation testifies to the strength of spirit, body and faith that brought men and women to this farthest edge of empire in the service of God and Tsar (National Park Service 1996:1).

It was the oldest continuously used Orthodox chapel in the Western Hemisphere until its desanctification in 1973. It was deconsecrated in 1988 following the completion of the reconstruction of the Bishop’s House (Woolsey 1992:11). The scale and prominence of the Russian Bishop’s House reinforces the Orthodoxy belief that agents responsible for representing God, like bishops and priests, are considered closer to God, and perhaps justify a more dominant feature in the landscape (alongside the multifunctional uses described above).

The rationale for the restoration of the Russian Bishop’s House was clearly stated as dedicated to, “expanding the horizon of understanding and appreciation of Russia’s role, and of Alaska’s, in the history of the North Pacific basin, and in the building of the United States,” (Woolsey 1992:7). Poor physical condition forced the Orthodox Church to close the residence in 1969 as,

rot had destroyed 75% of the south wall…the roof leaked and sagged…floors tilted…and it seemed in danger of collapse (NPS 1996:1).

By 1972, Congress recognised the need to, “commemorate and preserve remnants of Alaska’s Russian American past,” (Woolsey 1992:6), and the purchase of the House was added to the Sitka National Monument to create Sitka National Historic Park. The Russian Bishop’s House restoration was without precedent as:

the only original Russian colonial structure restored to period condition…The building was literally dismantled, studied, and put back together (Woolsey 1992:4).

\textsuperscript{247} The chapel is presently consecrated and functioning as a sacred place and thus included as one of Sitka’s contemporary sacred places. The Russian Bishop’s House does not constitute a ‘sacred place,’ for its historic function, however, is still part of the contemporary spiritual landscape as part of the historic/homelands site of Sitka National Historic Park (managed by NPS).
Retired school teacher, Dorrie Farrell, incorporated the restoration of the Russian Bishop’s House in her House & Furnishings classes:

> the Russian Bishop’s House became my laboratory of how construction was like back then, the furnishings, china…I just loved it, and the kids got such a feel for how people coped with their environment (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000).

At the completion of the restoration, over 70% of the original “ecclesiastical palace” structure remained. The next section discusses other restorations of places of worship in Sitka’s central city explaining the palimpsest evident in the contemporary landscape.

### 6.2.2 PALIMPSEST IN CBD CHURCHES

This section focuses upon palimpsest in CBD churches. In Sitka, places of worship demonstrate palimpsest defined for this study through their physical remnants of cultural influences that remain visible in the spiritual landscape (e.g., retained period icons and artefacts, reused pulpits and building materials). Chapter 3 illustrated how palimpsest at homelands sacred places explained the history and politics of culture group relations displayed in physical form. Church restorations also provide palimpsest insights to history and inform contemporary values with ‘historic designation’ status. Several studies explore rich cultural understanding from single site palimpsest (DeGraft-Hanson 2005, French 1983, Schmidt 2005, Sidorov 2000, Sobti 2005). Four places of worship with palimpsest evidence are located in the CBD, all within the original settlement boundary (zone 1): St Michael’s Russian Cathedral, the Sitka Lutheran Church, St Peter’s By-the-Sea and the Russian Bishop’s House (discussed previously). The first buildings at each site were established during the 1800s. All are located on Sitka’s main thoroughfare Lincoln Street and on the National Historic Places Register. All have been reconstructed or restored as set out in the data table in Appendix 10.

Sidorov (2000) and Pickles (2006) emphasise the dynamic nature of palimpsest sites and how buildings that replace other buildings represent changing notions of nation and society. In contrast, in Sitka the re-building of exact replicas stress a desire for constancy and place preservation. The Russian Cathedral, Bishop’s House and St Peter’s buildings are rebuilt as exact replicas. The Lutheran Church has changed in external design but retains key artefacts inside. Construction materials provide a technical context explaining building replacement. The location of the Russian
and Lutheran buildings has persisted since Russian settlement in early 1800s. As wooden buildings, however, it is expected that alterations would occur over time with fire damage or decay. St Peter’s was the “first semi-stone structure in Alaska,” (Ricketts 2006:29) with durable construction material explaining why the 1899 building endured restoration until 1996. Church restorations and cultural palimpsest evidence refutes Jacobs’ (1996:22) negative inference to, “lingering markers of imperialism in post-colonial cities,” as these markers are important to American history. Handlin (1985) stresses:

[co]lonial buildings have primacy (except for native structures) because they are the oldest...But they are also attractive because they represent the nation’s infancy, a seemingly untrammelled time that contrasts sharply with the more complex periods that followed (p 36).

Given America’s need for a history as a young nation, and its stark resistance to all things British (Jackson and Penrose 1993), the Russian settlement markers like the Russian Cathedral, served America’s heritage needs. Harris (1982:195) offers the young nation a choice to “grow or decay,” discussing the need of “artificial aids” for Americans to “nurture...Truth and Justice, Intelligence and Virtue, Piety and Religion.” In Sitka, this is further illustrated at Sheldon Jackson Museum with a collection of artefacts that preserves all aspects of Native, Russian, plant/animal specimens including “objects from the crumbling Lutheran church,” (Carlton 1999:35).

6.2.2.1 Russian Orthodox Cathedral

St Michael’s Cathedral original cornerstone was laid in 1844 and remains today. The Cathedral in Sitka (Photo 38) is true to the form of the eastern church, adhering to: the separation of the congregation and the clergy, the use of screens, and the nave being used more for processions while the congregation stands further away from the altar (Clowney and Clowney 1982:34-37). Its typical plan of the Greek cross with four arms of equal length parallels Christ’s body on the cross making divinity incarnate in the church design (Humphrey and Vitebsky 1997:36). Creating a material link between heaven and earth aligns to notions of sacred and profane in Judeo-Christian geomancy.
In this belief system there is a need for human agency to ‘create’ holy places, or the strict adherence to Orthodox traditional form to reinforce the ‘right’ and wrong ways of living articulated in religious texts. God’s omnipotent status over humans is adhered to in building design and practice as explained by Sitka’s Archpriest Zabinko (Field research July 2000):

It has become fashionable nowadays to attend a church which fits the attended, but we Orthodox have never succumbed to fashion, and rather than attend a church which fits itself to us, we attend the church which Christ founded for us, and then try to fit ourselves to Him.

It is important to remain thoughtful of why a building is established as a place of worship, what it represents and what that building means to its followers. Orthodox churches are where “the Divine grace visibly abides…hence people feel deeply moved in its devout shelter,” (Kashevaroff 1947:1). Clowney and Clowney (1982:36) note that while the exterior building can be plain, this reflects, “the fact that God is not simply concerned with external appearances,” while the interiors are, “a model of heaven on earth, a kind of preview of the presence of God.” The interior contains holy icons laden with gold and colours resembling heaven with the iconostasis (screen) separating the naos (worship area) from the holy altar (representing the Heavenly Kingdom). There are no pews, as according to Kashevaroff (1947:1), “in the Courts of Royalty would you be seated in their presence?” The ‘making’ of the church building as a ‘holy’ place through human agency illustrates a difference in sacred notions between Orthodoxy and indigenous views where the environment is inherently sacred.

The rebuilding of the Cathedral adhering to traditional Orthodoxy design is significant as the building is a key feature in Sitka’s landscape. The connection between the church and Sitka residents is illustrated following the fire that destroyed it in 1966. Numerous accounts have parishioners running into the burning church to save icons, holy books and religious objects (DeArmond 1993, Kan 1999, Oleksa 1992, Pierce 1990a). These ‘saved’ objects form part of the palimpsest evident in the Cathedral today. The old Russian nails collected after the fire “became sacred objects themselves,” (Kan 1999:616). The initial brining of icons from Russia represents a material ‘planting’ of Russian culture and Orthodoxy into Sitka’s spiritual landscape. It was not until the icon of the Archangel St Michael, the patron saint of the colony, arrived in Sitka, that, “the chapel then in use was converted into a church,” (Kashevaroff 1947:1). Another icon, “Our Lady of Sitka,” affectionately known as the Sitka Madonna, “is the first miraculous icon...in the New World,” (Gregory Bishop of Sitka 1987:1). According to the Archpriest’s wife, Maggie Zabinko, the
Sitka Madonna has travelled many times around the world to “create miracles,” and remains in great demand across the United States (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000). These aspects of material culture left by the Russian occupation of Alaska stress the importance of architecture, icons and archaeological remains to Sitka’s history (Sweetland-Smith et al., cited in Pierce 1987). Appreciating cultural mentality underpinning material aspects deepens their importance.

The Cathedral rebuilding is “linked to a resurgence of the Russian Orthodox faith in Alaska,” (HABS Report 2007:5). The active use of the church to celebrate Russian Christmas and Easter, perform wedding and funeral ceremonies was noted by Mary Zabinko (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000). However, it also has strong psychological functions for its residents (Walter 1985, in Park 1994) and has tourism value and aesthetic appeal (Swagel 2007). St Michael’s “Russian” Cathedral remains synonymous with the identity of Sitka (Kan 1999:527). Residents in perception interviews regard it as “the heart of Sitka.” Its spire draws attention to the town centre despite it being at a lower aspect than Castle Hill. Continuing to symbolise Sitka’s Russian heritage, the building remains one of the “most photographed tourist sites,” (D Farrell, Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000) and adding value “to the city’s visual texture,” (Leung 1989:110). Its physical palimpsest with structure and icons retain a prominence in Sitka’s spiritual landscape connecting material visual character and symbolic connotations.

6.2.2.2 Lutheran Church

The heart of the Lutheran Church resides ‘inside,’ (Photo 43) so it is not surprising each of the four Lutheran Church building exteriors vary and appear plain and simple compared to the Russian Cathedral. Common construction practices at the time best explain choice of exterior building materials.

---

248 Maggie discussed the wonder working icon of Lady of Sitka: “She was requested, her presence, in Maryland for the dialogue between the Orthodox Church of the World and the Roman Catholic Church of the World. It just speaks a little about what she is, and what she means to both churches. People venerate that icon throughout the entire world...You can’t just go anywhere and find what we have here – it doesn’t exist anywhere else...What we have here is from that time,” (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

249 The Czar approved the Lutheran Church for New Archangel in 1839. Uno Cygnaeus was the first Finnish-Lutheran pastor and started worship in Governor Etholen’s Mansion until the Finnish Lutheran Church building was dedicated in 1843. See Chapter 3 for further discussion.
Photo #41 Sitka Lutheran – 1840s

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #42- Transfiguration of Christ painting (1839) by Godenhjelm


Photo #43 - Sitka Lutheran (interior)

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #44 – Study Site #13
Sitka Lutheran Church 1950s

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #45
Study Site #13
Sitka Lutheran Church 2000

Source: Alexander 2000
The original wooden Finnish Lutheran Church building (Photo 41) was dedicated in 1843:

The outside appearance of the church building was humble, but its interior was richly decorated…[with] furnishings…likely gathered as a result of the 1% tax on salaries of each member, (Maakestad ed., 1967:14).

It was the only church that was recorded as proactively seeking member contributions by deducting contributions directly from workers’ salaries to aid in the church’s upkeep (DeArmond nd., Arnoldt Collection). Richards’ (1966:25) discussion on Finnish architecture explains the exterior of the Lutheran Church, stating “external embellishment is rare,” with a greater emphasis on the pulpit as associated with Lutheran religion, the choir screen, and a “visually inseparable church and bell tower.” The Lutheran Church’s exterior would be influenced to not visually detract from the Russian church and mission effort as sanctioned by the monarchy (DeArmond 1993; Pierce 1978, 1990). Bill Kleinert (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000) commented how Governor Etholen decided on the location and style downplaying the visual presence to be respectful of the Russian American Company and Tsar. He ensured it had no distinguishable ‘church’ features to distinguish it (e.g., no exterior cross) and it was painted yellow and red (ochre), like all Russian buildings of the time in Sitka (Black 2004). Only the fan shaped windows and slightly larger size set the building apart. Photos 42-45 show the present day Lutheran Church and interior.

Palimpsest evidence of the Lutheran and Finnish influence in Sitka’s spiritual landscape is represented by objects and pieces of the former church sites rather than replicating the church building as with the Russian Cathedral. The importance of the Lutheran church interior is discussed by Richards (1966) where numerous objects are preserved, refurbished, and restored for present use and veneration including: the 1839 painting *The Transfiguration of Christ*, by Finnish artist Berndt Godenhjelm (see Photo 42); the 1840 pulpit, communion rail, kneeler and platform; the 1841 alabaster altar set; the 1942 altar reused twice from damage by fires in 1966 and 1993; the Estonian-made 1844 Kessler pipe organ restored; and the 1967 ‘Christus Rex’ originally on the sanctuary on the external part of the church (SLCHC 2000:4). The value of material objects, particularly the pulpit and organ, is explained within the Lutheran belief system. The Protestant Reformation impacted church buildings by reflecting “the doctrinal shift from altar to pulpit,” and an emphasis on hearing the preacher (Clowney and Clowney 1982:72-74). The pulpit and organ were given the most important positions in the church interior explaining the original church pulpit restoration and

---

250 Sitka’s Lutheran Church was built in 1967 with the connected bell tower mentioned by Richards (1966).
retention in subsequent buildings (Richards 1966:25). Remains of the pulpit and the original Kessler organ are honoured through prominence of place at the entrance of the present church building. These materially represent the survival of Lutheran worship in Sitka despite difficult circumstances.

Information on Sitka’s Lutheran Church remains scarce. Maakestad’s (1967) work contains limited information about Sitka. The National Park Library contains a Lutheran/Finnish collection, and the Church website is helpful (http://www.sitkalutheranchurch.org, accessed 12.04.2007). Further research is needed on Lutheran and Finnish history, to better understand Finnish cultural influences upon America’s colonial history. Bob DeArmond (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000) advised Maria Enckell, a descendent of a Lutheran family in Sitka during the 1800s, would soon publish a book of letters of her family. Several of Ms Enckell’s writings (2004, nd.) have since been reviewed. Other English translations will expand the Finnish knowledge and influences the same way Russian translations have enhanced understanding of Russian colonial influences (H Brandt, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

6.2.2.3 St Peter’s By-the-Sea Episcopal Church

*St Peter’s By-the-Sea Episcopal Church* reflects restoration justified based on importance to America’s colonial heritage as with the Russian Bishop’s House. The cornerstone for the Gothic style church was laid on St Peter’s Day, 1899. The pipe organ in the church was built in 1877. The *Church* and separate *See House*, containing the priest’s residence and parish hall (originally built in 1905 for the Bishop, See Photos 46-50) were both buildings deemed to have importance “not only to Sitka, but to the state as a whole,” (Sitka Historical Society 1996). The consecration on Easter 1900 was recorded by Ricketts (2006) as the ‘first such ceremony’ since the Russian Cathedral’s in 1844. Despite no tie to Sitka’s early Tlingit, Russian or Presbyterian beginnings, support of the restoration was awarded a proclamation by the Alaska State legislature. The restoration Committee also identified a museum section for historical documents and artefacts from the 1800s. The difficulty of acquiring building materials in colonial settings such as stained glass is illustrated with the rose window in the *Church* sanctuary. While *St Peter’s Church* was under construction, an order was made to Eastern US suppliers for a window with Christian symbols to fit the opening. The importance of stained glass is discussed by Humphrey and Vitebsky (1997:50) emphasizing its use in
mostly Western religions to “instruct subject matter by using recognisable imagery.” When received in Sitka, the glass centre of the rose and focal point of the design contained the six pointed Star of David rather than the Christian symbol requested. A replacement would take too long so the Star of David rose window was installed and serves as a reminder of Christianity’s beginnings.

*St Peter’s* was the only architecturally designed church in the Sitkan landscape when established. This influence is explained since architects in America had just established as a profession after the Revolution (Clowney and Clowney 1982:79). Influenced by a “religious revival” and a strong missionary outlook may explain why during the late 1800s, *St Peter’s Church* was built according to architectural plans developed in Philadelphia and financially sponsored by American interests on the opposite coast (Field research on-site signage 2000). Photos 46 and 48 show the church front and rear respectively, and Photo 49 illustrates the interior. These emphasise the traditional gothic influence in the period, but also the more elaborate form compared to later post-WW2 place of worship buildings found in Sitka’s residential areas. In the traditional style, *St Peter’s* has: a spire, ornate stained glass, an historic stonewall fence, bell tower, and a historic gravesite on its front lawn. The exterior shingle siding of the church was labour intensive when built and required historical specialists during restoration to maintain its original character (*Daily Sitka Sentinel*, 28 June 1996:3).

An important distinction of this church as a building is that where the people sit is not an ‘auditorium’ as they are not an ‘audience,’ rather it is a ‘congregation’ as the people are part of the church and play an important part in worship. While the church adheres to ancient rituals and considers the building a ‘holy’ place as discussed with the Orthodox Cathedral, as a ‘people’s church’ worshippers are reformed and have declared their separated allegiance to Rome (Smith 1989:7-11). *St Peter’s* missionary activity was also distinctive as Bishop Rowe explains:

Our mission in Sitka is exclusively for the White population because I make it a rule not to establish a mission among the natives wherever I find one already established by another church or denomination (in Ricketts 2006:25).

The building, services and intent for establishing *St Peter’s* in Sitka was different to previous politically linked establishments of Russian and Presbyterian denominations. This variation illustrates the individuality and freedom of thought valued within the American geomentality.
Photo #49
St Peters By-The-Sea

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #50 – St Peters - See House

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #51 - Glastonbury Thorn

Source: Alexander 2000
As a final note, there is a cutting of a Glastonbury Thorn from England, planted in 1999, in the garden at St Peter’s (Photo 51). It is one of only four locations in the world where the thorn is growing. This sacred object represents an ‘offshoot’ of a separate tradition ‘planted’ in foreign soil. The physical analogy parallels the diffusion theory in the spread of ideas and beliefs. The physical representation holds far greater significance than what appears to the naked eye. Understanding the thorn’s origin raises awareness of its significance. The thorn is physically a natural object, however, in the Judeo Christian view, it is a manifestation created from Jesus’ staff. Those drawn to connect the ‘natural’ aspect must heed that the significance in the Judeo-Christian worldview is not in the natural object, rather in God’s power to create nature. Jesus represents God in human form with actions that reinforce human domination over nature. The selection of Sitka to locate this sacred object is testament to the industrious and tireless efforts of Sitkans and their desire for historic preservation. Given the spatial distribution of the other sites housing the thorn, the West coast, and Sitka as the cradle of Alaska, is an appropriate location for the cutting.

6.2.3 CHANGING FUNCTIONS INFLUENCING PLACES OF WORSHIP

In addition to being a place for worship, there are several secondary functions of churches that are well supported in the literature (Connell 2005, Park 1994, Pyong-Gap Min 2000, Tuan 2001[1977], Walter 1985, Yoon 1986). In Alaska, during the 1960s, religious organisations played a role:

not only to defend support social services initiated by Native congregations, but also to defend and enhance Native participation in the Alaska economy and society. Churches [of the lower 48] were one of the funding sources of regional Native associations and the state-wide Alaska Federation of Natives in the land claims area (McBeath and Morehouse 1980:25).

Multi-purpose functionality can include provision for schools, community centres, study rooms, lounges, meals, etc. This trend influences the church building by introducing “an informality of worship” and a “multi-functional sense of community meeting place,” (Clowney and Clowney 1982:88-89). More modern function trends today are captured by Connell (2005) who discusses Hillsong, a Sydney church based at a shopping mall to be closer to its followers. The spread of religion into the suburbs with ‘new’ places of worship are characterised by flexibility, increasingly important social functionality, and a local sense of place created by the church’s social groups.

---

251 The other locations include the gardens around Glastonbury Abbey, the Queen’s garden and the garden at the
(Connell 2005). Social functions are carried out in Sitka’s places of worship motivating attendance. Other studies note this socialisation function (e.g., in French rural towns, particularly during winter when the cold discouraged people from venturing outdoors (Tuan (2001[1977]:167), and to aid immigrants settle into a new city (Pyong-Gap Min 2000)).

There is limited geographic literature to connect education functions and places of worship, though post-colonial studies often mention education as a component of assimilation (e.g., Sitka Native Training School as part of the Mission, the Russian Bishop’s House providing education for Creoles, and later a school for girls (Enckell 2004)). The connection of places of worship to education was explored spatially. In Sitka, there is a cluster of places of worship within the catchment for Verstovia Elementary School (e.g., Sitka Assembly of God, Grace Lutheran, United Methodist and Church of Christ). Several other churches are located near schools including: the First Baptists across the street from a school and playing field, the Bishop’s House and Catholic Church are near Etolin school and playground, St Peter’s is next to a childcare centre, and SJ College is itself an educational institution. The only active religion based school operating at 2008 was the Seventh Day Adventist Church & School. It is located near a trailer park residential zone and a now closed industrial site on the main road of Halibut Point Road. Education is also among the Salvation Army’s charitable efforts of benefit to society though no physical evidence of this activity was observed during field work (http://www1.salvationarmy.org.uk, accessed 27.04.2007). Time and space limitations preclude thorough investigation of socio-economic links to church denominations and residential zoning though a sufficient range of study objects exist in Sitka for future study (e.g., Trinity Baptist and United Pentecostal church locations were within a higher socio-economic neighbourhood in a newer subdivision on Cascade Creek Road).

The Salvation Army provides another set of ideas about what ‘sacred place’ or ‘sacred space’ might mean. The band performances (held in marches, at outdoor rallies and on the streets or main halls) help to construct a sense of the sacred through the metaphor of the military and the march. The spread of the Salvation movement met with competition from other militarist movements including the trades unionists, communists and later fascist movements. The link to the military capitalises on the power and mood of wartime, particularly relevant to Americans willing to ‘fight’ for just causes and freedom. Connecting beliefs to patriotism in a young country builds a following from those

commemorating fallen soldiers and who have helped build the country. In America, marching bands often accompany sports teams and parades. They were prevalent at the 4th of July celebration in Sitka (2000). The role of ceremonies like marching bands perform a social function, giving participants a sense of belonging, familiarity (common songs, camaraderie), and provide a recreation/leisure function, broadening worship beyond a passive reflective activity in a church.

Finally, a number of places of worship contribute to the local (and church) economy, as tourist attractions. Tourists visit the Russian Cathedral, St Peter’s Church, the Russian Bishop’s House and other places in the spiritual landscape. Entry to the Cathedral was $2 per visit, and other venues were free of charge (or by donation). The potential for sacred places to contribute to the tourist economy has merit for many less developed countries, particularly with historic or UNESCO designations, which draw tourist attention as discussed in Chapter 5 (Okasha 1972).

Functions for places of worship will continue to evolve as discussed by Loy (1997) with changes in beliefs affected by society and commercial interests. Faith as capital, and the role of faith-based organisations as playing a key role in society is more overt and given greater prominence. The Furby et al. (2005) report, discusses the important source of social capital found in faith communities as well as the recognition by government in use of such communities to advance varying social agendas. Simons (2007) *Faith, Money and Power: What the religious revival means for politics*, provides a discussion about the influence of religion on politics and the attention afforded religious groups by politicians to gain support and work in partnership to find solutions that address various social problems. The growing interest in the last fifteen years in social capital has been seen in governments from the UK to America and New Zealand. Increasing use upon technology will also impact worship functions, place design and services. The mega church of Hillsong with its stadium show, distinct architecture, and overt materialist orientation according to Connell (2005):

> exemplifies the globalisation of religion, while simultaneously stressing local ties, with contemporary media technology in a traditional theological and modern social context (p 315).

Changing functions of places of worship and service delivery will continue to be worthwhile areas for cultural geography investigations.
6.2.4 SUMMARY

This section has explored Sitka’s 24 places of worship revealing how denomination planting strategies have influenced location, as with the Salvation Army in the central city, or with Presbyterian Mission schools separating Native children from their families in distant locations to the ‘Indian Village.’ The availability of materials and changes in worship styles influenced building design, particularly with the post-WW2 population growth. The distribution of places of worship in residential areas is noted, while the spatial patterns of older traditional churches in the centre of town and their persistence through rebuilding retains the symbolism of Sitka’s colonial heritage. These palimpsests represent “political manipulations” of memories (Silverman & Small eds. 2002:5) emphasising the American government’s choice of heritage (e.g., what to preserve through rebuilding). The Russian and Finnish heritage reflect homeland through design and building forms (e.g., Orthodoxy), which also persist in the landscape due to their important contribution to Sitkan and American history. Finally the changing functions for places of worship pose future questions relating to the impacts of secularisation, the growth of faith-based capital and the spread of technology. The combined reading blending economic and location theory explanations for siting alongside socio-political, historic and geomentality frameworks results in a more comprehensive reading of Sitka’s places of worship. In the next section, the spatial analysis shifts to burial grounds where spatial patterns reinforce these trends and introduce other cultural distinctions.

6.3 Cemeteries

Sitka’s nine cemeteries combine to reflect its colonial history, changing norms in social burial practices and social constructions reflecting the American nation. This section reveals how topography is a major influence in cemetery siting, with race and denomination providing evidence of ongoing segregation in burial practices that began during initial Russian settlement. Power influences exhibited during Sitka’s colonial heritage continue to be preserved in the landscape. As ordinary places, the persistence of segregation between denominations and race can be viewed to perpetuate interracial divisions. National trends in cemetery management are reflected in Sitka’s landscape where modern practices show an increased level of government and community-wide participation. Comments on form and maintenance conclude this section, which can be observed through a geomentality lens. Map 8 illustrates all cemetery sites, each located in spatial zone 2.
Map 8: Sitka’s Contemporary Spiritual Landscape
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All cemetery locations in Sitka are found just outside the original Russian settlement area. These sites are compared to the *Sitka Zoning Map* (Downtown area) for determining location, size and pattern layout. Harris252 (1982:377) acknowledges “there is no general work on the subject of American cemeteries,” though Zelinsky’s (1994) more recent work attempts to provide national insights based on US Geological Survey data (including cemetery size, shape, compass orientation, topographic features, and cemetery names). What follows are introductory comments on Sitka's cemeteries based on available information that varies in depth and quality. The “difficult data situation,” is a major reason Zelinsky (1994:30) believes geographers have reluctantly engaged in cemetery studies, in part due to costly field research. Sitka cemetery data is listed in Appendix 9 according to estimated establishment dates. This study represents a first effort to comment on Sitka’s cemeteries, based on comprehensive field data collection and interviews. It is expected this seminal work will be added to by others. Most of the cemeteries in Sitka are zoned *Public Lands*. Previous discussions have covered other sacred places zoned in this category (e.g., all four homelands/historic sacred places and the chapel in the Sitka Pioneer Home) and further introduction to this important land use category is warranted.

Publically managed lands, especially parks and cemeteries, have a significant government role as these commemorative spaces articulate national identity and patriotism, reinforcing common origins to link the material landscape and social memory, particularly important in places where there are divergent allegiances…[that] operate multivocally and are read in divergent and at times contradictory ways (Johnson 2004:321).

Public lands are also unique as they encompass where people play, and recreate. This government role is intrusive since it has an aegis role, if necessary deeming it in the ‘public interest,’ to own and/or manage such places. Stevens (1975) describes a dual role of government in planning cemeteries for example, ensuring open spaces while also performing the utilitarian function of a burial ground. Leung (1989) points out how open space land use is most varied of all uses, yet:

> gets the lowest priority in the market place, [despite] any remedial measure later on [being] very expensive and difficult (p 77).

One of the ways public lands are protected is through designations as discussed in Chapter 5. In Sitka *Public Lands* are spatially dispersed and the most common planning category capturing the

---

252 Harris (1982) acknowledges work by Huth (1957) on Mount Auburn, and several New England places providing rich rural cemetery examples.
District’s wilderness/forest areas. Since Sitka expanded primarily along the shoreline, with the forest impeding growth inland, most residential property is adjacent or close to public lands thus residents do not suffer from distance decay from point specific services (Pinch 1985) in the same way as in larger centres (i.e., access to sacred places in this category is relatively easy requiring minimal government intervention). Residents may benefit from positive externalities like increased property value if adjacent to desirable sites like parks (i.e., greater government consideration for equitable distribution and protections are needed). The federal government began reserving public lands in Alaska from 1867 as squatters were claiming land along the town perimeters. In Sitka, President Harrison passed an Executive Order to reserve lands for a school, military cemetery, park at Indian River, barracks and parade ground, governor’s house and Japonski Island for military purposes in 1890 (DeArmond 1995:185). Cemeteries meanwhile, continued to be located on the outer edges of the town’s settlement development. A closer look at cemetery locations reveals several patterns.

6.3.1 PATTERNS

Observing the present landscape, the most striking spatial feature of Sitka’s cemetery layout is the multi-nodal clusters. The pattern contains three groups that mirror settlement development (Darden 1972) with all nine sites in spatial zones 1 and 2 (being early settlement areas). Cluster 1 contains the oldest places, being the Russian Cemetery (over two sites) and the adjacent Lutheran Cemetery. It is likely these sites were contiguous until the roadway divided the Russian site. Cluster 2 contains the Presbyterian cemetery (now substantively considered a part of the Sitka Memorial Cemetery), the adjacent Sitka National Cemetery, and the nearby Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) Cemetery. Cluster 3 contains three adjacent cemeteries: Moose, Old City, and Pioneers, each separately identified in documentation though on-site, boundaries between sites are difficult to distinguish (Field research 2000). Meanwhile, small ‘family’ type gravesites typical during early 1800s settlements, often near homes or churches (Price 1966 cited in Park 1994), were largely absent in Sitka. Only the St Peter’s By-The-Sea churchyard houses the gravesites of Bishop Rowe, his wife Dora and their two sons remain (See Photos 47 and 61). None of the early Tlingit death landscapes remain noticeable in Sitka. Most sites were built over during Sitka’s urban expansion as explained by Bill Kleinert:
...the Tlingit burial grounds near the top of the Blockhouse (see grave houses 1845 model) which eventually rotted away, or the present location of Mac’s Sporting Goods Shop being built over top a Lutheran gravesite...and where Marine Street is now, there were unmarked graves there when the road was built (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

In addition to ‘rotting away,’ Chapter 3 also discussed the desecration of Tlingit burial grounds during road building in early American occupation. The Sitka models at 1845 and 1867 illustrated some of the historic burial site locations mentioned by Bill Kleinert (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

Location theory factors applied to explain burial site locations would consider: proximity to potential users, ease of access, and cost of land (Darden 1972). Cluster 1 cemeteries neighbour corresponding churches offering easy access to ‘potential users.’ The cost of land was nominal, donated in-kind or supported through Russian American Company (RAC) operations or supported through Imperial contributions. Community donations and government contributions would have supported the Presbyterian cemetery (including support from the Presbyterian Mission). The American federal and state governments supported establishment of the National, Pioneers and municipal grounds. The power of location theory arguments to explain Sitka cemetery sites are mitigated due to the small size of Sitka and the remote study location. Other explanations better explain spatial patterns. Deductions are speculative and based on field research observation, interview results and secondary source materials since no well-accepted research has been conducted on the establishment and development of Sitka cemetery sites. The following examines these ‘compartments’ that separate Sitka’s past residents by race, religion and civic affiliation. Spatial clusters are explained using topography, establishment period (influencing race and denominations), and government involvement.

6.3.2 TOPOGRAPHY AND SITING

In all cases, Sitka’s cemeteries are located on elevated sites and ‘relatively secluded’ areas in line with Darden’s (1972) site selection criteria. Hills are also regarded as desirable sites for burial grounds due to the perception of higher land being more valued (Darden 1972, Park 1994, Tuan 2001 [1977], Yoon 1986). This American correlation between affluence and elevation is contradicted by Meyer (2005) citing 19th century ‘walking’ cities with higher land impeding access and building, which results in lower socio-economic residents living on hilltops in Latin America.
As offered by Meyer (2005), major topographical features shaped early patterns of development more than land price or status. This appears in Sitka where features like Indian River, the harbour and, initially, the palisade around the Russian settlement shaped the development patterns.

Sitka’s muskeg terrain would limit available burial places as well as limit the carrying capacity at such locations (i.e., topography influences the number of bodies able to be buried within a place without causing unsanitary conditions). Salisbury (1962) summarises the topography as:

…covered by a spongy mass of rotten wood, partly decayed vegetation and roots reeking with water, offering no firm footing for the trees…think of trying to make a cemetery out of such a location, but it has to be done if there is to be burying (p 26).

Dorrie Farrell noted the origin of the term muskeg as an Algonquin First Nations name:

The Norwegians that settled on that part of the world called them bogs – the Algonquin tribe described it in their language as muskegs. I learned a lot about them when an engineer was on my walking tour and asked about the construction of the boardwalks over the muskegs. I had to do some research on it. We now have a walk up the muskeg trail by the Rapture Center. It is a unique eco-system (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000).

According to a National Cemetery Groundskeeper, cemeteries are located where they are because:

the beach was too shallow, sandy and full of rocks for a cemetery…the muskegs were easier to dig upon (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

Robert Sam spoke about land composition as a major factor in locating cemeteries noting, “it was easier to dig up on the hills,” (Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000) similar to the first Cambridge cemeteries that were located on a glacial moraine (Howett 1977). Joe Ashby, cemetery groundskeeper for 20 years, expanded on this:

Even the hemlocks that grew there used to be around three inches in diameter and about 12-15 feet high, but since they didn’t have a lot of root structure (only about 18 inch deep), it wasn’t difficult to move the clumps of hemlocks out of the way (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

The process of constructing the Sitka National Cemetery on this terrain is described by Robert Sam:

The area is filled with muskeg swamps…Some have up to one foot deep of water. The sphagnum moss grows the fastest and dwarfs the trees. The National Cemetery was built over a large muskeg - they poured 18 inches of gravel over it. Where they hit muskeg areas after the soil was in, the gas would bubble up. This decomposing peat created natural methane. They would light up the methane – it would flame for 30 minutes and as they went on they knit and sealed the areas. They put in aerators where appropriate…[In this terrain], any organic material (e.g., a log) will decompose and cause a depression…following enough decomposition, caskets collapse creating a depression. We would use a compactor and fill it in over top of other caskets (Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 05 July 2000).
Reflecting on this rationale, it is concluded that topography and limited land availability are major influences in the current spatial distribution of burial grounds in Sitka. Race and denomination variations further explain cemetery patterns.

6.3.3 RACE AND DENOMINATION

In the early 1800s, disposal of the Russian, Finnish and Tlingit dead was separate. The Russian Orthodox Cemetery (including former Trinity Cemetery) and Lutheran Cemetery illustrated how race separated Sitka’s early settlers, despite limited space for burials. Similarly, Tlingit were buried in their own location (see Blashke’s 1836 map Figure 7) following the introduction of Christianity when interment replaced cremation practices (though tradition continued to guide disposal of shaman remains). Today, the physical separation continues to reflect divisions by race and denomination.

The Russian Orthodox Cemetery is now represented as two land parcels divided by Marine Street. In Map 8, it is shown as one site based on early references to Trinity Cemetery (DeArmond 1993, Kashevaroff 1947), and illustrations in Sitka models at 1845 and 1867. This cemetery now encompasses the largest of all the cemetery site areas in Sitka. The establishment of Trinity Cemetery is estimated post-1836 since is does not appear on Blashke’s 1836 map, but has a stone grave marker dated at 1848 (Photo 54). Black’s (2004) estimate of the building of the nearby Trinity Church by 1848 also supports this timing. The two sites of the Russian Orthodox Cemetery at July 2000 remain visibly different. After the Trinity Church was abandoned,

the ground became so thickly overgrown with trees…that not a single grave could be seen. At present…[it is] a beautiful park (Kashevaroff 1947:np).

A tourist website lists it as the “Old Russian Cemetery, with the oldest known tombstone, dating back to 1869,” but makes no mention of, ‘Trinity’ Cemetery, nor a Lutheran Cemetery with burials earlier than 1869 (http://207.201.129.33/sights.htm, accessed 18.09.1999). There is a, “Historic Russian Cemetery,” sign at the Trinity site location, and a series of concrete stairs leading to the grave house memorial. The site is surrounded with a white picket fence and contains marble and stone ground grave markers all with Russian Cyrillic lettering with legible burial dates that ranged from 1848 through to 1897. It is probable this was the original Russian cemetery and likely managed by the nearby Russian clergy and bordered the palisade. In contrast, Photos 56-58 illustrate the main
Russian Orthodox Cemetery site that is still used today (B Sam, Interview, Sitka, 2 July, 5 July 2000; and M Zabinko, Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000). It has numerous gravestones and markers varying in size, height, location, direction facing, fence and marker materials. Gravesites have some living floral arrangements, others have plastic flowers. Maggie recalled at her home town gravestones faced east, but that here there is no pattern.

The Russian Orthodox Cemetery grounds are not ‘park-like’ with seating or places to stop and reflect, rather are confused and rather intimidating like an unknown dark forest with numerous species of native trees growing throughout. Orthodox crosses dominate the grounds. Some grave sites have less than 30cm high edging surrounds, with others fenced in with nearly a meter high white pickets. The majority of stones appear to have Tlingit names contrasting very few Russian names. This could be because there were never more than 500 Russians in Sitka (Black 2004). Based on the size, area and configuration of gravesites, an estimated 500 burials are in the current site. Limited maintenance of the grounds could contribute to its natural feel. During early Russian times, burials would have met utilitarian objectives rather than be concerned for aesthetics. Over time, Harris (1982:201) discusses the role of rural cemeteries in America as places, “not for the dead. They are for the living,” citing the first landscaped cemetery Mt Auburn in Cambridge in the 1830s that “showed both a love for God and remembrance of the dead.” It was some time before Sitka embraced such aesthetic ‘memorial’ attitudes for burial grounds.

It is unusual that the Russian Cemetery (one site divided by a road) and the adjacent Lutheran Cemetery are zoned differently since cemeteries are permitted Public Lands zone uses. Further, an argument criticising area based zones due to their ‘lack of precision’ cannot be substantiated in Sitka’s case since the Russian cemetery size is sufficiently large to be readily represented in area zoning. Given the location and proximity to the CBD, these cemeteries could have been zoned in the CBD district, or as Public Land, as with the chapel and Pioneers Home situated near a CBD park. Non-government ownership better explains the classification. Fewer ‘public good’ protections are available on privately held lands with higher density zoning. Municipal staff could not confirm zoning classification rationale, though did assert there were no plans to convert the cemetery into residences (Wells Williams, Interview, Sitka, 06 July 2000).

---

253 NPS staff suggested another explanation where the lower cross bar represents whether someone goes to heaven or hell, with the cross bar illustrating the directions (up to heaven or down to hell) (pers comms, 14 February 2008).
Photo #52
Russian Memorial at Sitka National Park

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #53
Replica of Russian Blockhouse (2000) by Old Russian (Trinity) Cemetery

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #54
Headstone at Trinity Cemetery circa 1848 - Study Site #1
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Photo #55
Trinity Cemetery
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Photo #56 - Study Site #1
Russian Orthodox Cemetery

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #59 - Study Site #2
Lutheran Cemetery

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #57 - Study Site #1 - Russian Orthodox Cemetery

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #60 – Study Site #2
Lutheran Cemetery as at October 2004


Photo #61 - Rowe Gravesites at St Peters

Source: Alexander 2000
Despite the spatial distinction for Lutheran and Russian burials, the Lutheran Cemetery, like the historic Lutheran church, lacks presence in the current landscape (Photos 59 and 60). There were no recognisable ‘Finnish’ influences observed during field research in July 2000, however by 2004, historic preservation efforts re-emphasising Sitka’s Finnish heritage adding a “Lutheran” signpost at the cemetery. Significantly more attention is required to heighten the awareness of the Finnish influence in Sitka as the visible landscape only offers a partial showcase.

The third race-based burial ground in the contemporary landscape is the ANB Cemetery. No evidence was found to support a premeditated siting linking Tlingit geom mentality (i.e., links to nature and ‘power’ places) to burial ground selection criteria, as some East Asian cultures would apply feng shui principles for siting (Lai 1974 in Park 1994; Yoon 1992, 1979, 1972). To a visitor, the peripheral location of the ANB Cemetery appears segregated (Francaviglia 1971) and disconnected to the historic Indian Village, particularly since earlier accounts discussed the proximity of burial grounds adjacent to clan houses (Chapter 3). On-site, the ANB Cemetery appearance closely resembles the Russian Orthodox in burial style (see Photos 63-64), though it is more densely forested (i.e., far more spruce trees and little open space with no readily worn pathways through the grounds). There is a mix of stone, bronze and wood grave markers, with many hidden by trees. Some graves have subsided and others have gates or fencing around the burial site.

Examining headstones, there was no apparent organisation by type, neither direction facing, nor consistent use of fencing. Selecting three dozen headstones randomly, no Russian, Finnish or obvious non-Tlingit names were found. Burial dates on these markers ranged from 1902 to 1988. No floral arrangements were seen as in the Russian Orthodox Cemetery on Tlingit named gravesites. This variation could be explained as Tlingit Russian Orthodox believers adopted the laying of flowers at the gravesites as part of the burial practices of that religion. In deathscapes, the use of trees or flowers from one’s homeland creates a symbol “that each of the dead lay within a garden representative of their respective homelands,” (Morris 1997, cited in Kong 1999:7). Applied to the Tlingit cemetery, the forest is representative of their homelands. An event in 1885 suggests the timing of establishing ANB Cemetery was prior to 1885. Sheldon Jackson was arrested for constructing a fence that, “allegedly obstructed a public road leading to a nearby cemetery,” (Carlton 1999:30). The ‘nameless’ cemetery suggests a Tlingit use as a White/Russian use would likely be named (due to their proclivity for toponyms).
Photo #62
Tlingit Memorial Pole, Sitka National Park

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #63
Study Site #9
Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) (aka Indian River Road or Tlingit) Cemetery

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #64
Study Site #4
Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) (aka Indian River Road or Tlingit) Cemetery

Source: Alexander 2000
The location of the *ANB Cemetery* could represent a *place of choice* burial grounds for the Tlingit if considering the Tlingit geom mentality. It is near Indian River, an area important to the Kiks.ádi clan and representing ancestral homelands. It was secluded and near the forest area, perhaps less likely to be vandalised or desecrated as in the past. Located on the outskirts of settlement (at the time), it would also unlikely be subject to ‘relocation’ with urban growth. At the time of field research (2000) however, the area surrounding the cemetery was already under residential development. A second explanation for the location of *ANB Cemetery* is linked to the Presbyterian Mission. Already the Mission was far from the developed settlement area and the Tlingit village. The *ANB Cemetery* could have been established for the newly converted ‘Presbyterian’ Tlingit. This rationale would be in line with the Presbyterian policy to keep children from family influences through the distinct *ANB Cemetery* location near the mission site, but separate to the *White Presbyterian* cemetery. Race remained a divisive factor in the spiritual landscape even for those in the same denomination.

No signposts on Indian River Road mark the burial ground (i.e., no ‘This is sacred grounds’ signage as at the Russian grounds). Hixie Arnoldt tells of her journey into the *ANB Cemetery* without knowing where she was:

[As I entered] ‘the woods,’ I saw this old gate and said, ‘that would fit perfectly going into my walkway,’ (Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 02 July 2000).

It was some time before she realised the place was a cemetery. Even though it offers minimum protection, a municipal government designation of sorts is the: *This is sacred grounds* signage at all other burial grounds, but absent at the *ANB Cemetery*. Whether an oversight, or purposely avoided for other reasons (perhaps to avoid attention), the sign symbolises the human act of ‘consecration’ of a burial plot (Harris 1982:379). In a Judeo-Christian worldview, humans can designate physical space (in nature) to be sacred, rather than the place being inherently sacred (Tlingit geom mentality). The ease to ‘make a place sacred’ also reinforces the dominance of humans over nature with a human ability to ‘create’ holy ground.

Several historic sources note a ‘*Presbyterian Cemetery*’ without stating a location (DeArmond 1993, Kamenskii 1985, Pierce 1990a). The “*Presbyterian Cemetery,*” is located behind the *National Cemetery* (H Arnoldt, Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 02 July 2000; J Ashby, Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000; Groundskeeper, Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000). In the zoning map there is a notch in the National Cemetery north boundary, which is the location of the Presbyterian cemetery. Old
gravesites (dated 1908 to 1932) were found at this site (Field research 2000). A National Cemetery Groundskeeper (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000) stated, “[the Presbyterians] are responsible for maintaining this site, but don’t.” As such, maintenance is sporadic with private donations used to “tidy it up,” (H Arnoldt, Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 2 July 2000). The location satisfies Darden’s (1972) siting factors including proximity to potential users, ease of access and cost of land. DeArmond (1993:77) refers to four men of the Civilian Conservation Corps at Sitka buried in the cemetery on the grounds of the Sheldon Jackson School in October 1937. Given General Davis and Governor Brady’s Presbyterian affiliations, it is probable that the cemetery would have initially been part of the SJ College grounds dedication at the same time as the National Cemetery lands, discussed next.

6.3.4 NATION

This discussion of cemeteries reflects social constructions of nation, articulating aspects of American mentality within Sitka’s landscape of death. Given the absence of an adequate municipal government in early transfer years discussed in Chapters 3 and 5, service organisations like Moose Lodge provided much needed community services, as Commandiner (1950) comments:

Nineteenth century Americans embraced with peculiar enthusiasm those fraternal organisations that gave him an artificial sense of security and companionship (Commandiner 1950:17).

In Sitka’s landscape, Cluster 3 sites fit this description including the Old City, Pioneers’ Home and Moose Cemeteries. Similar to the colonial influences from the state/monarchy (e.g., Imperial Russia ukast legitimising religious activity in Sitka), American voluntary ‘organisations’ associated members around a common purpose (social functions) within a constructed Judeo-Christian rationale tied to the wider American geomentality sentiments discussed in Chapter 4

Siting factors for Old City, Pioneers’ Home and Moose Cemeteries again appear influenced by topography, access and proximity to users (Darden 1972). This cluster location is on the outskirts of the Russian town in Blashke’s 1836 map (zone 2). Hixie Arnoldt confirmed:

You used to be able to drive up through the three cemeteries to Pioneer’s Cemetery (Interview, Sitka, 28 June, 02 July 2000).
The area became landlocked over time with the natural forest boundary and residential encroachment. Presently, these adjacent sites have minimal physical evidence delineating respective boundaries despite separate naming and property parcels on city zoning maps. The *Old City Cemetery* may have been established under Roosevelt’s *Executive Order 8854* in 1941 that released appropriated lands from the magnetic and seismological observatory as the Order refers to Moose Lodge and Pioneer Home cemetery boundaries (http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/w5/?pid=60908, accessed 17.04.2007).

This cluster of cemeteries is typical of the period “lawn” cemeteries where Howett (1977 in Park 1994:221) suggests the setting is important, but there was also a desire for minimal landscaping (e.g., flat lawn to easily cut grass). A National Cemetery groundskeeper noted that:

> the City only mows the Old City Cemetery once per year. They still bury people there, but I don’t like to go into it since it is difficult to figure out what’s where (Interview, Sitka, 05 July 2000).

Overgrowth of vegetation on ground markers at most sites prevents accurate on-site data collection for further analysis (e.g., moss at the Old City Cemetery made several illegible, and no ordering of markers at the *Pioneers Cemetery* and *Moose Cemetery* meant all faced in different directions). Grave markers are mostly bronze or stone. Both these materials were more durable than wooden markers, and use of marble markers was limited due to cost and availability. The ‘sacred grounds’ signage appears at the two access points on either side of the cluster of cemeteries (Arrowhead Street and Baranov/Geodetic Way), but no other signage indicates cemetery boundaries.

Based on field observations, approximately 400-500 bodies are buried between the three sites, dating from 1939 through to the 1970s. Supposition based on average distribution amongst lots and area boundaries on the Sitka Zoning Map imply: approximately 65% of burials are in the *Old City Cemetery* (Photos 65-67); 30% are in the *Moose Cemetery* (Photo 57); and 5% are in the *Pioneer’s Cemetery*. These sites show how over time, the *primary* emphasis shifted from utilitarian burial needs distinguished by race and denomination to introduce ‘social’ groupings of citizens (e.g., Pioneers, or Moose Lodge members). Denomination however, continued to feature as a secondary characteristic within cemetery layouts as will be seen with *Sitka Memorial Cemetery*. Introducing social and civic dimensions aligns modern burial concepts with *Public Lands* zoning intentions. This shift marks an enhanced role of government in cemetery management, a role well illustrated with Sitka’s *National Cemetery* (Photos 68-70).
Photo #65 - Study Site #4
Old City Cemetery (October 2004)

Photo #66 - Study Site #4
Old City Cemetery (October 2004)

Photo #67 - Study Site #5
Moose Cemetery as at October 2004
Photo #68 – Study Site #8
Sitka National Cemetery

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #69 – Sitka National Cemetery – Name Lists

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #70 – Sitka National Cemetery (October 2004)

The *Sitka National Cemetery* is the only cemetery listed in the *Sitka Yellow Pages* (2007). It is the most visible impression left by the war (see Photo 68) as other war infrastructure is visible but not attributable to the war. The *Cemetery* site is fenced with an American flag pole located on the hill in the centre of the cemetery. Hardwick, Claus and Rothwell (1971) note the:

> prestige and status...of military sections of some American cemeteries, where the most expensive lots are closest to the main flag pole (in Park 1994:223).

Such economic arguments do not apply in Sitka where older gravesites are located nearer the top of the hill and more recent sites closer to the gate entrance on flat land. It is suggested that spaces higher on the hill were simply built upon first, rather than being apportioned according to land cost primarily due to the small population at Sitka.

The *National Cemetery* history is well documented at the US Veterans Affairs website where this sacred place fell into neglect during Sitka’s dark days (see Chapter 3):

> From 1912 until 1921, the cemetery was practically abandoned and a dense growth of trees and underbrush grew up almost obscuring the site. In 1920, representatives of the Sitka American Legion post wrote to the Secretary of War calling attention to the neglected cemetery and asking for remedial action; they were told no funds were available. In 1921, they appealed to the Secretary of the Navy, who allocated $1,200 toward reconditioning the site (http://www.cem.va.gov/nchp/sitka.htm#hi, accessed 17.04.2007).

Its initial location outside of the town settlement offered room for growth and likely influenced siting. It occupies a large site (4.3 acres) including land donations by the Presbyterian Church. The financial support from the Presbyterians for a ‘national’ service strengthens earlier arguments linking Presbyterian interests and government power. In 1945, a Bill was introduced but not enacted, to move the *Sitka National Cemetery* to Juneau, Alaska’s new capital city (DeArmond 1993:97).

The Cemetery complex is well organised with clearly marked entry and signage: 254 “This is sacred ground.” A glassed cabinet lists all people interred by row and site number (See Photo 69), making it the only site offering complete burial information. For example, John Green Brady, former governor of the Territory of Alaska from 1897 to 1906, died in Sitka in 1918 and is now resting in Section R, Plot 4, with inscribed monument: “A life ruled by faith in God and Man.” Each row is sectioned off with stairs and labelled according to the alphabetic reference for each person buried.

---

254 This sign is similar to that at the entrance to the Russian cemetery grounds that reads, ‘this is sacred grounds,’ with the difference being the National Cemetery sign reflects correct grammar.
All grave markers face east at the entrance to the grounds. Large lights target the flag pole and are lit each night. Car parking and a Department of Veterans Affairs’ ancillary shed for maintenance workers and tools are on-site. Matching marble headstones mark each gravesite with the denomination for each set in the centre top of each stone (e.g., Jewish, Orthodox and or plain crosses (see Photo 70)). The distinction by denomination suggests an ongoing separation of people distinguished by religion, despite the ‘sameness’ of being American and fighting for your country. Headstones also contain information of the battles fought by the person (e.g., Vietnam, WW2). Standardised headstone information are a form of public memorial according to Humphrey and Vitebsky (1997:154) who comment on these as common post WW1 into the 20th century with a function to “glorify the victors’ political system.” This sentiment would support the American geom mentality with emphasis upon the founding of the nation. The back of grave markers can contain information of the deceased wife and/or children, as family members might be buried alongside or on top of the military members. Applying Tuan’s (2001[1977]) concepts of front and back to grave markers, the placement on the ‘back’ of the tombstone indicates a lesser importance of family to the military role having prominence on front. However, the inclusion of the family unit upon the same marker also serves to reinforce the important sense of family within the American cultural identity. The use of marble (not readily obtainable and costly) connects national symbols consistent across all National Cemeteries signifying all military service people are treated the same irrespective of location. The commemoration of those who contributed to the founding of the nation was similarly depicted in street naming (see Chapter 5). As a federal cemetery commemorating war veterans, Sitka National Cemetery continues to represent the nation’s identity with its ongoing military role intervening in various global conflicts.

The variable role of government and ongoing public/private interest regarding cemeteries is reflected in Sitka’s first real ‘planned’ cemetery, Sitka “Memorial Park” Cemetery, located behind the National Cemetery. It represents the latest ‘parkland’ style in the evolution of cemetery types (Boorstin 1965, Darnell 1983, Harris 1982, Park 1994). The Sitka Cemetery Association was established in October 1981 (DeArmond 1993:198) driven by the need to address the lack of cemetery space in Sitka, plus the “deplorable condition” and lack of maintenance on municipal sites (Sykora 1991:7). The venture maximised existing resources, blending maintenance functions at the National Cemetery and Memorial Cemeteries for economies of scale. The Association also established a mausoleum. Through private donations they established: carillon bells, a tower
donated by Hixie Arnoldt, a gateway arch over the cemetery entrance, a large white cross on the hill on the cemetery site, and a flower bed and trees. It cleaned up the Presbyterian Cemetery, which was simply referred to as “a tract of old graves between the National Cemetery and the new city cemetery,” (Sykora 1991:7). The willingness of the community to intervene retains the social service ethic displayed throughout Sitka’s history. As pointed out by the Planning Director, Wells Williams:

The cemeteries were present before the planning directorate was established. Local government evolved slowly in Sitka, with the first planner appointed only 25 years ago (Interview, Sitka, 06 July 2000).

The situation emphasises the limited resources in smaller centres, which can endanger the extent to which historic and community interests are protected. This is one of the reasons national designations and local zoning regulations are established. Interestingly, denominations in Sitka continue their impact on the spatial layout within constricted sites. Maggie Zabinko commented that “there is a side there [in the Sitka Memorial Cemetery] and a section among them where a lot are Orthodox,” (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

Many urban areas are facing short supply of burial plots as encroachments put pressure on existing burial grounds that were originally in the outskirts of town. A recent New Zealand newspaper article noted a new cemetery in Porirua that will open in 3 years. It will cost the city about NZD $2m (Dominion Post 24 April 2007, p A3). Early planning to meet future resident needs is not only important to governments from a financial perspective, but also as provider of public goods. Governments have a role to play to ensure a range of burial options are available to suit diverse ‘publics’ however these are defined.

### 6.3.5 FORM AND MAINTENANCE

*Sitka National Cemetery* was the only cemetery actively maintained during field research (i.e., with a groundskeeper present). Joe Ashby worked for the Parks Service taking surveyors, geologists and ornithologists to Glacier Bay where they were establishing a new park. Without tourist accommodation, Joe tended to visitors staying on the boat. Without work in winter, the Service asked him if he would look after National Cemetery:
Now, no one likes to do this – dig graves and bury people – so I took it. So I worked here in town and when I caught on that the Parks Service didn’t want that National Cemetery, and the army here in Alaska was to take over [maintenance] from Anchorage… I contacted them, and they were happy to keep me on to look after it as a civilian contractor…I started in 1956 and stayed through to 1975 (Interview, Sitka, 03 July 2000).

During field research, no groundkeepers or visitors were on-site at any of the cemetery locations (July 2000). Perhaps as with Haida totem poles at Ninstints, where burial sites are allowed to go back to nature, the maintenance at ANB Cemetery reflects the Tlingit geomentality toward landscapes of death. Material changes in form need not equate to changes in invisible beliefs. This situation was also evidenced by Yoon (1986) in Māori burial practices in the East Coast of New Zealand. Bearing this in mind, one must be cautious in making interpretations of culture based on physical form alone. Ways of remembering or commemorating the dead, including active or passive cemetery maintenance likely reflects cultural attitudes if deeper investigation is considered.

Looking to the form of cemetery sites in Sitka shows difference in natural settings. A useful analogy explaining cemetery form is the difference in French and Japanese gardening styles identified by Yoon (1994). The well-maintained National Cemetery compared to the ANB Cemetery show different cultural attitudes toward nature. The French domination over nature, actively shaping the environment (e.g., topiary) contrasts the natural pattern of the Japanese gardening representing communion with nature (e.g., bonsai). Even with the evolution of a cemetery landscape to modern ‘park-like settings,’ the American park is not ‘natural,’ rather constructed to be pleasant and ‘shaped.’ Gardens in cemeteries, argues Harris (1982), are primarily for beautification. Interestingly, there are no flowers in Sitka National Cemetery, despite Morris’s (1997) argument of flowers and gardens in post-WW1 British cemeteries:

feminized the landscapes of war while upholding a military ideal of male community, comradeship and common sacrifice (cited in Kong 1999:6).

The sense of community and brotherhood are exemplified in the American geomentality discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. So perhaps maintaining a cemetery with flowers is cost-prohibitive in the small population of Sitka. Perhaps also, the lack of female presence in place names (Chapter 5) denotes a lesser importance to such feminist symbols. The absence of flowers is part of Sitka National Cemetery’s national standards and policies (e.g., floral/grounds regulations are publicly posted and available on the Veterans’ website). So comparing Sitka’s cemeteries to trends in the lower-48 states, indicates different practices with a lesser remembrance of ancestors as providing American
‘roots’ than was found in naming. Toponyms are more readily changeable than burial sites. More nature-focused, universalistic views of the world are reflected in the ANB Cemetery. The colonial past is preserved with Russian and Lutheran Cemeteries, contrasted with naming lists, numbered rows, and ancillary functions at the National Cemetery, or the recent Sitka ‘Memorial Park’ grounds. This multiplicity symbolises Sitka’s history.

6.3.6 SUMMARY

Applying a comprehensive approach to analyse spatial patterns in Sitka’s cemetery sites allows for connection across various explanatory rationales. Establishing location criteria via traditional siting methods (e.g., economic/location rational (Darden 1972), and socio-historic and political approaches) is complemented with geom mentality explanations offering a fresh view to link the invisible into different cemetery styles. Changing values and attitudes are reflected in changing manifestations from the colonial experience through to Sitka’s early growth period and present day where more common American trends (e.g., park-like settings) are appearing. The period of occupation impacts social heterogeneity (e.g., diversity among cultures) thus a contributing factor to higher densities of cemeteries (Zelinsky 1994:35). Combined with traditional cosmologies around attitudes toward death, burial sites provide an interesting combination of changing form with steadfast invisible attitudes continuing to influence behaviours. These contradictions become evident when considering the overall spiritual landscape. In his plea to study cemeteries as ‘total landscapes,’ Francaviglia’s (1971) emphasises the benefit of complementing geographic (spatially focused) work with anthropological approaches (e.g., archaeology). The comprehensive approach of this study, with geom mentality, socio-historic, political and economic explanations, serve as markers for the convoluted path that links cemetery studies to wider social insights (Silverman & Small 2002:3). This spatial analysis of Sitka’s cemeteries illustrates the complementary nature of geographic insights to add to earlier works by Kan (1989) explaining the role of death and mortuary complexes in the Tlingit society. This dimension of the spiritual landscape is now complemented with consideration of tourism and sacred places.
6.4 Tourism and Sacred Places

On a global scale, World Heritage Sites (WHS) provide a tourism ‘trademark’ that brings economic benefits to the 730 sites marketed with the WHS designation at 2002 (Kammeier 2003:2). Interestingly, most are in Europe, with Asia contributing only 130 sites (i.e., 28 in China, 23 in India). The spatial distortion contradicts the intention of global reach to designate cultural and natural places of significance. Competition around new nominations and background political lobbying obviously impedes countries with limited resource and experience in such forums (Kammeier 2003:3). As noted previously, cultural landscapes are complex to designate in combining nature and human action. A method to better translate culture-nature attitudes that underpins behaviour may be useful to a more equitable designation process. For example, is there something fundamentally different in ‘designating’ heritage value between cultures as is exhibited in the different approaches to ‘heritage’ as displayed in Sitka between Tlingit and American geomentalities? Yoon (2006) discusses the intangibility of East Asian geomancy, which provides rationale for the lesser value of material authenticity over spiritual continuity with the Ise monument in Japan dating to the 7th century, but rebuilt every 20 years (Kammeier 2003:6). Geomantic practices in Asian countries may contribute to understanding fewer designations. Understanding geomentalities can broaden perspectives, affect geographic behaviours and impact spatial distributions of such site designations if incorporated into designation processes. Current processes are shown to be left wanting for a framework that is able to celebrate a culturally diverse heritage.

Tourism effectively began in the late 1800s through Sitka’s notoriety as the “Paris of the Pacific.” It continues to play an important role in the economy and bears mention in this work as the spiritual landscape and designated places make a significant contribution to Sitka’s appeal as a tourist destination. Bender (1974:196) discusses how a visit to mid-19th century rural cemeteries for example, “was considered de rigueur for the tourist”, and the popular press carried numerous articles on romantic burial grounds. Dorrie Farrell (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000) stated visitors come to Sitka to see the natural beauty of the area, to visit the historic sites (including buildings), and see the traditional Russian and Tlingit dancing. Designations of buildings or sites contribute to the appeal of a tourist destination. The NRHP website capitalised upon this offering a reciprocal web linking service “to gain additional exposure for your [designated] business or services.”
UNESCO actively promotes economic development through tourism in several third world countries to generate income to help preserve important heritage sites. Tourism can effectively work to promote heritage protection if managed effectively.

There is a need to balance protection of place history with access given possible damage of opening an area to tourist traffic (D’Ormesson 1972, Okasha 1972). Increasingly, the cultural aspects of heritage are recorded and incorporated into interpretive aspects at natural sites. Sitka’s National Park for example has relied on cultural activity and event data contained in NPS publications like Smith-Middleton and Alanen (1999a, 1999b) discussions of areas for specific berrying, fishing, playing games, abalone shells, et cetera. Such works help to provide the evidence to preserve cultural landscapes, however, their importance to cultural heritage requires further maturation in tourism planning (See also Alanen and Melnick 2000). There is similar tension promoting/appropriating religious places for tourism while protecting their authentic functionality (Kong 1993b). Finally, several geographers explore the role of religion and tourism in economic development terms (Kong 1990, 2000; Kong and Yeoh 2003; Park 1994). No study of this kind exists for Sitka, nor do past studies comment on cultural worldviews or geom mentality considerations when explaining economic implications.

In Sitka, religious buildings are harnessed for commercial ends (See Kong and Yeoh’s (2003) study of commercialising Singapore’s religious landscape). Buildings provide an invisible tourism function within their physical form (Rapoport 2005, 1978). The prevalence of historic building designations in a tourism context is explained by Handlin (1985):

...because Americans do not have a long architectural history, those interested in their building heritage have naturally been possessive of what they do have (p36).

Possessing and promoting historic buildings like the Russian Cathedral to Sitka’s tourist population requires great effort. Maggie Zabinko is responsible for tourism aspects of the Russian Orthodox Cathedral:

It’s a huge job – It slows down during the fall and spring, but they had their anniversary last year – I organized the banquet, the governor and mayor were here – We fed and entertained all the priests, bishops…All my time [was spent on organising] until the banquet was over. Even then, our first commitment is to worship services – bringing back things that were lost – we educate people about the faith – It’s not the history [of the church] – this is a tourist attraction – but it’s first and foremost a

---

255 Three new hotels were built and tours on both land and water expanded during the post WW2 period according to Dorrie Farrell (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000).
Cathedral. We do work around the tourism, like having our services maybe transferred to earlier time in the morning. But even on a Sunday, we won’t compromise – we cannot be rushed around because tourists want to come in (Interview, Sitka, 10 July 2000).

The preservation of cultural artefacts often goes hand in hand with heritage buildings.

The Sheldon Jackson Mission Chapel was used to house the “curios,” of the well known Sheldon Jackson museum collection from 1889 when it incorporated two ethnological organisations (the Alaska Society of Natural History and Ethnology), effectively giving the chapel a dual function to both preserve Native culture and promote its assimilation. According to Carlton (1999), the museum grew:

in popularity among tourists and Natives alike...the tourists finding a...souvenir...the Natives finding highly marketable objects easily adapted to traditional art forms (Carlton 1999: 36).

The tourist function as part of the Presbyterian based SJ Museum persists today and raises some interesting considerations for preservation of cross-cultural heritage in Sitka.

Indigenous imagery may be applied in Sitka. Francis (1992) provides examples of how images of the Indian (and totem poles) are fundamental to defining the Canadian culture, and this. He comments on how totem poles since the 1920s have appeared in a large number of public buildings, hotels, shopping plazas. “Supernatural British Columbia” was a long running tourism advertising campaign and remains the slogan featured on the number plates of cars in British Columbia. He discusses the ‘marketing’ potential linking the imaginary Indian. He cites the text of a government tourist brochure that shows what appear to be Native men wearing colourfully painted Raven masks sitting on the sandy beach with a scenic natural backdrop and the following caption:

“Only in God’s country could you meet such interesting souls.” The text refers to a version of a creation myth, “The most revered of spirits and master of ceremonies, the Raven embodies what this land is today. Magic. For here the supernatural abides in all that is living (p188).

Chapter 4 outlined the Tlingit creation story where Raven is most revered and the supernatural abides in all that is living. The irony in promoting the mystical Native indigenous culture is the impact it has on history compared to the value in preserving and celebrating diversity. LaDuke (2005:133) argues as victims, indigenous peoples “in the present have all but disappeared from the

---

256 As a historian, he uses photos, poems, paintings and performances by the media, government and artists to depict the “Imaginary Indian,” who, as he states on the book cover, “…is ever with us, oscillating throughout our history from friend to foe, from Noble Savage to blood-thirsty warrior, from debased alcoholic to wise elder, from monosyllabic “squaw” to eloquent princess, from enemy of progress to protector of the environment.”
US consciousness.” She notes the absence of Native Americans in movies and in television references asking if there is no victim, was there a crime? So is it better to promote the Tlingit culture within tourism and reworked designation and naming processes, or to continue with the paucity of indigenous naming and designations that inadequately showcase a significant part of American and Sitka’s sense of place? Sitka’s residents must decide.

6.5 Contemporary Resident Perceptions

A narrowly observational field science misses altogether the everyday textures of living and being in landscape – misses, in other words, the point of view of a landscape’s inhabitants (Wylie 2007:6).

This section on contemporary resident perceptions supplements earlier comments on Sitka’s visible spiritual landscape with “all American” and contemporary views to capture ‘the point of view from landscape’s inhabitants.’ Perceptions are distinguished from lasting cultural impressions attained via geomentality and enhance the utility of research findings by connecting to present ‘spiritual connections.’ Views expressed provide a local frame of reference (mental map) of landmarks that feature within the minds of residents. Finally, the ‘lived experience’ of interviewees is tested through responses to sensory stimuli to gain an appreciation of attitudes to living environments.

Environmental perceptions of current residents were canvassed during field research in July 2000 to explore: perceptions about key landmarks and the most ‘significant’ places, perceptions of specific sacred places (natural and built), functions of specific sacred places, tourist perceptions, personal religious (spiritual) experiences/reflections, underlying tensions and political climate, and awareness of designations. The interview methodology is discussed in Chapter 2 and interview guide found in Appendix 4. Responses are included from 12 interviewees (six males and six females), with approximately 60% (n=7) having lived in Sitka for at least 25 years, 25% being tourists or working/visiting temporarily (n=3), and 17% having lived there between one and two years (n=2). Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 87 years with 50% being over 50 years old, 42% being between 25 and 50 years old and 8% being under 25 years old. Occupations of those interviewed included: an artist, a reporter/journalist, a former teacher, an academic/author, a naval officer/National Parks staff, clergy/shaman, tourism operator, retiree, former nurse, shop clerk, and a tourist. Half of the respondents were born in the Southeast Alaska/West coast region (to Seattle).
One respondent was born in Russia, two in North Dakota and three in Canada. Of those nine respondents living in Sitka permanently: three were linked to the church (i.e., were in Sitka on assignment (posted there)) or were there for spiritual reasons (i.e., had a calling to be there); three were in Sitka because they moved to follow their returning spouse there; and three moved to Sitka because they had visited and “fell in love with the place.” Resident response analysis follows.

Interviewees were asked to imagine they had just met a tourist who has asked them to point out three key/prominent landmarks that might assist them in getting around Sitka. There was no prompting that responses needed to be of the spiritual landscape. Eighty-three percent of respondents (10 of 12) listed the **St Michael’s Cathedral** (the Russian Church) as one of the town's key landmarks. Half of the respondents listed each of **Castle Hill/Battle Hill** and **Mt Edgecumbe** as one of the key landmarks. About a third of respondents noted **Totem Park** as a key landmark and the **SJ Museum** was listed by one quarter of respondents as a key landmark. The next most common was the **Russian Bishop’s House**, a choice by 17% of respondents as a key landmark. Finally, the ‘Indian Cemetery,’ Japonski Bridge, Old Sitka, the Pioneers House and the waterfront each got mentioned as key landmarks. In summary, the most frequently occurring key/prominent landmarks (according to 86% of all responses) included the following: **St Michael’s Cathedral** (28%), **Castle Hill** (17%), **Mt Edgecumbe** (17%), **Totem Park** (11%), **SJ Museum** (8%) and the **Russian Bishop’s House** (6%). **St Michael’s Cathedral, Baranov’s Castle (Castle Hill), and Mt Edgecumbe** are also the top three places represented in 70% of paintings (oil on canvass and watercolours) displayed in the National Park Museum, Isabelle Miller Museum and S J Museum (Field research 2000). It is noted that all of the landmarks listed have featured in this study of Sitka’s spiritual landscape. A closer look at these top sites follows.

Two of the top features in Sitka’s landscape are prominent topographic features: Castle Hill and Mt Edgecumbe. These sites are recognisable in their scale (size and height). Mt Edgecumbe (Photo 10) appears on the Sitkan landscape as prominently as Mt Fuji in the Japanese landscape, both conic volcano mountains. Mount Edgecumbe is a key feature in Tlingit migration myths, and the naming reference to “Shee Attica” evolved to Sheet-ka Kwáan, to Sitka in English. Table 9 provides an

---

257 The only other topographic feature mentioned by one respondent was the waterfront, contrasting earlier discussions of the waterfront’s importance for travel/access and trade (Winder 2006).
overview of the interview responses to the question: “What three adjectives best describe Castle/Battle Hill to you?”

Table 9: Adjectives Describing Castle Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>scenic/views/beautiful</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summit/peak/high up/prominent</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspective/focus/vantage point</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political/nationalistic/cultural mix</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historic/heritage</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barren/esoteric</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Edgecumbe</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majestic</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre of town</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total:</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the majority of respondents (60%) referred to scenic and elevation aspects of Castle Hill as compared to the rich history of that place. Castle Hill was easily described by one third of respondents as “scenic” or noted for its “views.” Twenty-seven percent of respondents used words to describe the elevation aspect of Castle Hill (e.g., “summit, peak, promontory, perspective, vantage point…etc.”). Castle Hill is one of the four Tlingit homelands sites as discussed in Chapter 3 and its natural promontory a key reason for its choice as the seat of power for centuries; first the Tlingit settlement then home to the Russian American Company headquarters and now designated an American historic ‘flag raising site.’ About a quarter of those interviewed described the political and historic background of the Hill citing the “nationalistic” and “cultural mix,” among the adjectives. Only one respondent found the hill to be the “center of town,” despite this importance representing more of a historic reference (e.g., when the hill was home to the Tlingit fort or Baranov’s Castle). Several comments were made about the Hill being “barren or esoteric” suggesting a derogatory meaning. For example, synonyms for ‘barren’ are desolate, unproductive and sterile. It is technically true that the hill’s physical surrounds are absent of major structures. Today it has no buildings, but holds the American, Russian and Alaskan flags each representing a part of Sitka’s heritage, though the Tlingit flag (see Chapter 4) is absent. Chapter 4 discussed the importance of the construct of the American flag and how it ‘represents’ the national identity which explains why a national historic designation recognises a ‘flag raising site,’ as holding meaning within the American geomentality. Meanwhile, the hill’s historic importance to the Tlingit, testament to the Tlingit version of history and power, has no visibility or recognition in the place designation. Perhaps these responses say the residents are not aware of the history of Castle Hill or
that its history is less important than the physical, natural setting. The designation could also be considered innocuous (i.e., absent of site context despite the NPS interpretation sign at the base of Castle Hill) thus not referenced by respondents.

St Michael’s Cathedral was the only built ‘landmark’ noted by respondents, albeit the most frequently mentioned feature and a key part of the spiritual landscape. Table 10 overviews interview responses to the question “What three adjectives best describe St Michael’s Cathedral to you?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>historic/old</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual/heaven on earth</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authentic/real/original</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart/centre of town</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnificent/awesome/inspiring</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting/different</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian culture</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradition</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulbous</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iconic</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welcoming</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 50% of interviewees described the Cathedral as historic, spiritual, authentic and rich. The reconstruction to original design and the retention of original icons supports its authenticity. One respondent mentioned it was “heaven on earth,” which captures its intended purpose from an ‘Orthodoxy perspective’ (discussed in section 6.2). Nearly 80% of responses further describe the Cathedral as, “the heart or center of town,” noting it is “magnificent/awesome,” as well as “interesting.” Tuan (1976) discusses central location to denote importance, and in Chapter 5, Lincoln Street (Sitka’s main street) was forced to deviate around this major building. Some (12%) acknowledged the cultural connection describing its “depiction of the Russian culture” and “tradition,” without animosity. Sitka’s ‘Russian’ connection as part of Sitka’s history was ‘matter-of-fact.’ Overall, respondent adjectives seemed to view the Cathedral in a positive light, holding it in high regard and somewhat in awe. Respondents did not appear daunted by the Cathedral’s importance or grandeur, rather emphasised it as ‘quiet,’ ‘welcoming’ and ‘spiritual.’ These concepts would be supported within a places of worship function, as parishioners and travellers alike, could contemplate within this sacred place.
The responses of residents to St Michael’s appear more consistent than for other features suggesting a unified way of perceiving Russian and Orthodox influences in Sitka’s identity. It could be that the Russian influence adds to the history of the place while not threatening the American way of life (e.g., the Russian influence is limited to inert buildings). The architecture being the most striking in the landscape suggests a sense of pride in the aesthetics of the place. Perhaps the recognition of the Cathedral as a pull-factor in tourism for cruise ships is another reason (referring to its ‘most photographed status’). A few of the respondents were worshippers at St Michael’s (belonging to the Orthodox Church) which likely influenced their responses.

Travellers often visit Sitka as a regular stop for cruise ships and state ferries (Photo 11). To consider the role of the spiritual landscape in Sitka’s tourism, interviewees were asked to identify three places a tourist “must see” when in Sitka. St Michael’s Cathedral was listed as the top site by 75% of respondents. The National Park/Totem Park was second choice for 58% of respondents. Half of the respondents said each of the Russian Bishop’s House and SJ Museum are must-see attractions, and 25% of respondents felt visiting one or more of the cemeteries was a ‘must-see’ for tourists. Table 11 provides an overview of the interview responses to the question: “What three adjectives best describe Totem Park to you?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peaceful/quiet</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>battle weary/scarred/tragic/occupied</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lush/green</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fake/phoney/not original</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mystical/mysterious</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big/large</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice show</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favourite place</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequent adjectives used to describe *Totem Park* appear in direct contradiction with one another, much like the conflict within the Park’s history. “Peaceful/quiet,” was an adjective used in 28% of responses with the next most frequent adjective collection being “battle weary, scarred, tragic, and occupied,” (11%). One respondent said, “…you can still feel all the people there.” A number of adjectives (22%) described the physical/tangible side of the Park: “trails,” “lush/green,” “big/large.” For one respondent, the Park is their “favourite place,” and had been since before WW2. The respondent passion for natural features is also reflected in the descriptions of the Park perhaps since it is the most easily accessible recreation area (near downtown) with adequate paths, and is not part of the ‘forest’ areas where beware of bear signs are posted at various entry points. Some of the adjectives used to describe the park, such as peaceful and quiet are reminiscent of the earlier settler days when the park was used for social recreation purposes (Andrews 1922).

Only 8% commented on the Park’s “historic” nature, while 9% described the Park as “inspiring, interesting and/or unique.” One of the two respondents that described the Park as “mystical/mysterious,” also described the Park as “occupied.” As the main site of the Battle of 1804 and where the Kiks.ádi clan commenced their Survival March to protect and preserve their cultural heritage (the first time they had left the area in tens of thousands of years), this area of Sitka’s spiritual landscape represents a significant part of local history. The totem poles originally put there for tourist purposes, to some residents, takes away from the original history of the place (e.g., in contrast to *St Michael’s Cathedral*, 6% of respondents noted the Park to be “phony/fake/not original”). Chapter 3 discussed how the poles in the park are from the surrounding areas, though recent additions have local Ḵwáan connection. Dorrie Farrell noted that totem carving was more of a Haida craft than Tlingit (Interview, Sitka, 02 July 2000). The reaction to this question is perhaps the first overt sign of tension within the landscape unearthed through an innocuous ‘tourist’ question. The Park also represents a major part of Tlingit history that is otherwise scarcely observed in the visible landscape. Those residents aware of the history may have been influenced by the knowledge (i.e., emphasising the battle weary aspects). There is scope for discussion on how the Park and other places reflect Sitka’s Tlingit heritage.

The Russian Bishop’s House was another key feature for tourists to see, and another NPS managed place, with historic designation. Table 12 below provides an overview of the interview responses to the question: “What three adjectives best describe the Russian Bishop’s House to you?”
Table 12: Adjectives Describing Russian Bishop’s House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well preserved/pristine</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authentic/accurate</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revealing/surprising</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wooden</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow and red</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ship-like</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museum-like</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amazing</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several respondents appeared at a loss to describe the Russian Bishop’s House. Two residents provided one adjective, and a fifth was unable to give more than two. Almost half referred to the well preserved/pristine nature of the House, “fine…the preservation was beautifully done,” or made comment on its “authenticity,” “accuracy,” or “historic” nature. A number of adjectives described the House in more detail, referring to it being “wooden,” noting paint colours as “red and yellow,” or mentioning it appeared “ship-like,” or “museum like.” One adjective used to describe the Russian Bishop’s House was “Russian” with a different respondent saying, “it encompasses who Bishop Innokenti [Veniaminov] was.” Those describing the Russian Bishop’s House generally appeared to be impressed by it as a “building” and by its “authenticity.” Not only with the remarkable accuracy and precision embodied within the preservation process of the structure, but also with the preserved way of life it depicted (see section 6.2). Several people were surprised and amazed with all appearing proud advocates of the NPS effort to keep the historic treasure alive. The Bishop’s House chapel categorises the building as a sacred place according to the study definition. None of the respondents commented specifically on the chapel or captured any religious connection to contemporary Orthodoxy despite the ongoing use of the consecrated chapel in the House. The emphasis remained squarely upon the ‘historic function’ of the House emphasising authenticity.

Residents felt these top sites were worthy interests for visitors. As historically designated places, the UNESCO position is strengthened that designations can protect and preserve cultural heritage sites (d’Ormesson 1972, Okasha 1972). The absence of Castle Hill from the must see attractions for tourists, despite its designation as a historic site, suggests the presence of more inviting town
features for tourists. Another omission is the typical tourist activity of dance troupes. Sitka offers traditional Tlingit and Russian dancing. Only one respondent mentioned the Tlingit dance group at Naa Kahida Community Centre. Comparing top tourist ‘must-see’ sites with previous key landmarks shows St Michael’s Cathedral tops both lists as set out in Table 13:

Table 13: Comparing Respondents’ Key Landmark and Tourist “Must See” Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark Rank</th>
<th>Tourist Rank</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Key Landmark</th>
<th>Tourist Must See</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St Michael’s Cathedral</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Castle Hill/Battle Hill</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mt Edgecumbe</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Totem/National Park</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SJ Museum</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Russian Bishops House</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cemeteries (one or more)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Japonski Island/Bridge</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Old Sitka</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drive all 13mi of road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pioneers House</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tlingit ANB Hall Dancers</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Usual Tourist Stuff</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excluding Mt Edgecumbe, four of the top five key landmarks in the area; and three of the top four ‘must see’ places for tourists are ‘sacred places’ as defined in this study. Cemeteries were also featured among higher noted responses. The Sheldon Jackson Museum, if considered as part of the wider SJ Complex (including the Presbyterian Mission Chapel and wider missionary activity) would make all top landmarks and tourist places, sacred places. Given the residents’ perceptions of the importance of these places, it is surprising that no special planning or proactive management exists for these places as “sacred places” or as part of Sitka’s “spiritual landscape.” The only differentiation of these sites is through historic designation, the limits of which were discussed in Chapter 5 where criteria can be applied subjectively within one cultural viewpoint (e.g., ANB Hall).
6.5.1 SENSES EXPERIENCES

Interviewees were asked to think about Sitka and pick just one thing that best captures for them…the sensory experiences of: best view in Sitka, the best sound in Sitka, the best smell, the best taste, and the best touch/feel in Sitka. The question was meant to gain a deeper understanding of the way residents felt about living in Sitka aiming at beliefs that underpin responses rather than focusing only upon visible landscape features. This reasoning relates to geomentality by observing the way the environment is treated and perceived. Gilbert (1993) observes the placement of buildings in relation to landscape, garden making and landscape sculptures, where she draws parallels between artist Goldsworthy and Japanese geomentality contrasting British Christian based geomentality (Glacken 1967). However, one of the parameters of geomentality as an approach is that it should not be used to make broad generalisations at the culture level from the individual level. Where associations between individuals and culture groups are made, they must be qualified within the context of analysis. Within the context of this caveat, it was interesting to see how resident responses related to specific spiritual elements/sites/locations (e.g., Old Sitka, ravens, the sea, the forest/National Park, the Russian Church, et cetera). The most striking feature of Sitkan resident responses was their strong affinity to natural features, nature and the environment, contrasting the human dominance over the environment emphasised in the earlier discussion on American geomentality. The best view was Mount Edgecumbe; the best sound, the raven; the best smell was forest related/trees; the best tastes fish/berries; and water/natural objects topped the best touch. Greater detail for responses follows.

Responses to the best view in Sitka ranged from Mount Edgecumbe (40%), to eagles (20%), and then Castle Hill, the beach, the Russian church and the Blue Lake (each at 10%). Respondents commented on the view of Mt Edgecumbe in half of the responses, “Everyday I get up and look at Mt Edgecumbe. It’s wonderful.” The prominence of Mount Edgecumbe was noted as a key landmark feature by early Russian promyshlenniki and features in many artistic renditions of Sitka over two centuries of settlement. The prominence of eagles also features in the Tlingit social structure striking the balance between the raven and eagle moieties. The large number of eagles in the landscape is depicted by long time Sitkan Dorrie Farrell:

If you go over to the fisheries plant and look up at the trees above, the eagles look like Christmas tree decorations – like dozens of little white light bulbs…(Interview, Sitka, 02 July, 2000).
Eagles are a feature of America’s national crest and coat of arms. The eagle also features on the American quarter coin. As a bird of prey, the eagle is a fierce creature featuring a powerful hooked beak to tear flesh from their prey. It is larger than other birds, has powerful talons and keen eyesight to spot prey from far distances. These characteristics influence the choice of sports teams to use the eagle as their talisman to represent strength and agility (e.g., West coast football club, Philadelphia Eagles).

The sound of the raven (birds) topped the best sound in Sitka, for 45% of residents. The wind and sea/surf each added 18% to the best sound. For one respondent, the whistle buoy on Magnatti rock was a favourite and interestingly, for another the fire department was the best sound as it made her feel safe, perhaps in response to the preponderance of wooden buildings around town. The best smell for 36% of respondents included spruce trees, the forest, or trees generally. “Spruce trees in the spring have a special fragrance.” For others, the smell of the sea, and the salt air (27%), or flowers (13%), particularly roses, were the best smell in Sitka. Finally, one respondent’s favourite smell was the smell of the muskeg, and another preferred the smell of smoking fish. Fish/seafood (fresh, smoked, salmon, and abalone) and berries topped as the best tastes in Sitka for all respondents. These foods were staples in the traditional Tlingit diet. Two respondents commented on negoon berries that “they are not often found...only on some beaches and in very damp places.”

A third of respondents commented that water was their favourite touch/feel in Sitka. Other responses were quite varied including: sand, surf washed rocks, otter fur, soil, trees/grasses, flowers and leaves. Describing the soil, one long time Sitkan resident (and part time volunteer tour guide) commented on the specific soil that was her favourite to touch:

[Its] the soil at the base of the tree, with no chemicals, I carry gloves in my backpack and stop near the decaying trees at the rich loose black soil. I pick it up to smell it and show tourists how beautiful it is. The Sitkan climate really prohibits gardening since the first shallow layer of soil constantly gets washed away by the weather. You have to constantly fertilise.

Answering the senses experience questions was initially difficult for some. Once engaged, several people commented on how thought provoking they were and appeared to enjoy the deeper discussions that ensued. Respondents generally paused to think and consider their response, often providing a context and then a final response they wanted recorded. The best taste category conjured the quickest response, often followed by similarly quick changes in response.
In general, the responses from residents revealed a connection to nature and the environment different to what one might expect in the Judeo-Christian ‘human domination over nature.’ Many respondents and interviewees were involved in smoking fish, picking berries and fishing activities. They discussed nature aspects of Sitka more than material aspects like cars and shopping centres. While accessibility is a factor in peripheral Sitka, the residents appeared to have an obvious and visible connection to nature. It is not suggested this minor exploration stretch to contradict earlier discussion of American geom mentality, rather to consider how residents in Sitka respond to nature in a different, qualified manner. For example, the respondent's attachment to the earth, resembled the Russian pagan connection to Mother Earth and the description of the fertile and dark, rich soil nurturing the Russian people discussed in Chapter 4. Nature connections were made for a majority of responses in all categories of touch, taste, smell, sight and sound. The dominance of nature in the landscape including the scale of mountains, and the quantum of surrounding bodies of water and forests must influence resident perceptions (in the same way New York residents are dominated by skyscrapers). Natural surroundings and ‘beauty’ in the landscape were identified drivers for why residents moved north.

O’Malley (2008) emphasises tolerance and God in nature as key reasons for Alaskan religious attitudes based on views of religious experts. These perceptions are valuable to represent current and multi-denominational mindsets. Bishop Keys of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America states:

> Alaska's independent-minded and live-and-let-live personality...along with the state's frontier spirit and libertarian streak...[do not] want interference from anybody, whether it be government, or churches or institutions (O’Malley 2008:2).

He cites political and current events including lawsuits against teachers, church scandals, and economic downturns as making people distrust institutions and drive them from churches. Greg Kimura, professor of religion and ethics at Alaska Pacific University states Alaskans are, “more religiously pluralistic, more open to other religions.” Alaskan attitudes according to Kimura result

---


259 The driver for the article was the recently released Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life’s survey on the “U.S. Religious Landscape Survey,” (2008). The survey was based on samples of 100 to 200 people in Alaska and 35,000 people nationwide with Alaska's small sample having questions with margins of error up to 9 percent, but the trends echo other recent surveys according to O’Malley (2008) and researched ARDA data.
from baby boomers leaving churches and children growing up without religion, becoming unaffiliated, and now are “seekers,” looking for a path. Reverend Prevo of the Anchorage Baptist Temple focused on Alaska’s status as an escape:

People who want to leave their pasts behind may not want to attend church...it’s the Alaska wilderness. People are here to get away from things. Some people are running away. They have not realised that God still loves them in spite of their failures in the past (O’Malley 2008:2).

Prevo agreed with increased pluralism and tolerance over the past 20 years, but was critical of Christians modifying the word of God to suit self. His view contrasted Catholic Archbishop Roger Schwietz who saw religious tolerance by Catholics as positive. The strong nature link appeared again in resident responses to their favourite places.

6.5.2 A FAVOURITE ‘SPECIAL PLACE’

Interviewees were asked to consider the one place in Sitka that is, “your place – somewhere you would consider “a special place” where you go to be alone or be with people, your favourite spot, somewhere you may go to recharge your batteries or to relax.” Respondents were probed for emotional and spiritual connections to these places. “Home” was the special place for 25% of respondents who referred to it as: “peaceful,” having “excellent views” and, “it gives me a certain satisfaction.” Home as a sacred place was discussed earlier within the Tlingit geomentality. The importance of home and its spiritual orientation is discussed by Coolin and Ozaki (2004), with Tuan (2004, 1977, 1976), Otto (1950) and Harpur (1994) emphasising the ‘sacred’ aspect of home being a feeling or something that can be ‘felt.’ When asked about what made home special, respondents emphasised natural dimensions (as opposed to the built environment) being 'right on the water,' having 'excellent views,' and enjoying ‘gardening there.’ Other than home, “special place” responses included: the Russian church, which was “spiritual” to the respondent; the “remoteness” of the Blue Lake; Castle Hill because of the 360 degree ‘best view in town;’ the beach at the National Park was special as it is “shallow and different from other beach areas;” and Old Sitka was another special place where:

...at low tide you can cross to a very tiny, small secluded island...the kids go out there to smoke pot...it’s the most romantic and exotic place.

---

260 One respondent lived in their “home” special place for nearly 50 years.
Once again, the connection between special places and a spiritual connection with natural settings is dominant among responses appearing as a general affinity with the environment. The comment regarding ‘remoteness’ in a town already secluded by its location, says something about the connection between individuals and their natural surrounds. The only building or non-nature response was of the Russian Cathedral. This respondent had also commented earlier on the church being, ‘heaven on earth,’ suggesting a closer spiritual connection between the physical church as part of the Orthodox faith.

Reflective qualities were associated with one-third (33%) of the respondent descriptors of ‘special places,’ using words including: remote, peaceful, calm, spiritual. These qualities emphasise the ‘invisible’ aspects of the spiritual landscape. One quarter (25%) of the special place qualities noted the view commenting also on invisible aspects of the emotion evoked from their visual perceptions. Scenic qualities were previously noted in responses to how respondents described Castle Hill and the National Park, both being outdoor and natural areas. Characteristics displayed in interviews included the aesthetic beauty of the view and an awareness of the spiritual ‘feeling’ when connected to that place. This connection between visible and invisible is considered by Thrower and Glacken (1969) who note the deficiency of not:

seeing the mysterious relationships between the emotions of the mind and the phenomena of the external world (p 47).

They refer to Francois Rene Chateaubriand, born in 1768, whose work:

intensifies these attitudes of nature interpretation, not scientific concepts, but nature as a unique spatial phenomenon, capable of evoking thought, feeling, even inducing an understanding of the mysteries of creation (in Thrower and Glacken 1969:47).

Such sentiments can be recognised as the ‘lived experience of religion’ involving all the senses as Buttimer (2006) describes:

Sight, sound, smell, touch and taste are celebrated liturgically as God-given gifts enabling humans to recognize the sacred in their lived everyday environments (p 198).

If considered in a wide spiritual sense, it is not surprising then that Sitkans, living in Alaska’s remote wilderness display affinity to nature and use words during perception interviews that embody spiritual concepts.
In Sitka, there is a natural sense of beauty and natural sense of wonder that all the settlers, inhabitants and long-timers displayed from Andrews (1922) and Salisbury (1962) to contemporary residents in perception interviews. While many Alaskans do not attend church, a recent survey noted 80% believe in God or a universal spirit (US Religious Landscape Survey 2008). Archbishop Schwietz emphasises this as God in nature belief to explain lower church attendance:

Many participate in subsistence and outdoor activities on weekends instead...It doesn't mean their faith is weaker... just they're not as serious about attending weekly worship. People tend to believe in God and say belief in God is strengthened by beauty of the state (O’Malley 2008:2).

Interestingly, the two respondents that did not have a ‘special place,’ were both short term Sitka residents, each living there for under a year. Perhaps if they remained longer in Sitka, their responses might more closely align to the longer term residents and their affinity for their natural surroundings. Perhaps they would leave if this does not occur. Reflecting on what makes a place special to respondents heightens a need to consider spiritual values in place discussions. In New Zealand, the Department of Conservation (DOC) acknowledges a gap in how cultural and spiritual values are represented in their conservancy efforts (L Hoather, DOC staff, pers comms, Wellington, 14 November 2008). Land planning and management decisions may benefit from such spiritual value considerations.

6.5.3 SUMMARY

This section has provided a point of view from Sitka’s residents to give a local frame of reference to landmarks, tourist attractions, sense experiences and places that are special to individual residents. Resident contradictions regarding Totem Park reflected the place’s historic conflict, while the ‘heart of the city is resoundingly St Michael’s Cathedral in the eyes of its residents. Apart from the landmark Mt Edgecumbe, the top ‘must see’ sites are sacred places making the landscape references (key Sitkan landmarks) and tourist attractions of significant importance to all residents’ perceptions. Surprisingly no special planning or proactive management existed for these places as “sacred places” apart from the subjective historic designations discussed in Chapter 5. Resident perceptions add colour to previous spatial explanation discussions, but are limited when making generalisations. Two accounts by women travellers to Sitka in the late 1800s illustrate this caution. Eliza Ruhamah Scidmore travelled to Sitka in 1885 having an experience “quite like an explorer penetrating
unknown lands,” where she emphasises the “sublime benign nature of the scenery and identified strongly with wilderness explorers,” (Grinnell et al. 1995:3). An alternate perception is by Septima Collis travelling in 1890 emphasising emptiness and isolation, with Sitka being ‘so intolerable’ (Grinnell et al. 1995). During research in Sitka, attendance at a Pioneers’ Picnic with 25 “old-timers,” (Sitka residents for more than 20 years) showed a will and character resembling a spirit of the Siberian promyshlenniki. Overall impressions of Sitkan residents were captured as being pioneers. The natural and spiritual beauty of Sitka has been noted by several observers over the years. Salisbury (1962) discusses the spirit of nature by describing the beauty of his environment in Sitka, noting:

the spirit of nature enters into one’s being and fills one with feelings which cannot be expressed (p 99).

His sentiment around the feelings for which he cannot find the words are similar to some of the feelings that were expressed by respondents describing their special place.

6.6 Summary

This chapter has focused upon the spatial patterns in Sitka’s spiritual landscape. Although the body of knowledge on places of worship and spiritual landscapes is sparse, this exploration has illustrated the richness of these landscapes to enhance cross-cultural understanding. The comprehensive approach has led to explanations that offer a deeper understanding of influences that shaped the landscape including how geomentalities influence the physical form of the landscape and sacred places. The Sitka National Cemetery for example displayed consistent American symbolism through military patriotism and displayed a standardised maintenance and management regime markedly different to any other Sitkan burial ground. Siting explanations were enhanced with understanding gleaned from previous chapters. A blending of economic and location theory explanations for siting alongside socio-political, historic and geom mentality rationale yields a more comprehensive reading.

261 'Promyshlenik' is a term that means frontiersman, advance guard, the fur hunters of the lonely Siberian Taiga…born out of the days when Tsar Ivan the Terrible in the 16th century set out to restore order…along the Caspian…to cease robbing English merchants trying to ascend the Volga…, resenting this enforcement of the peace, crossed the Urals into Siberia under the hitman Yermak Timofiev in search of a land where they could enjoy their brand of freedom…Yermak died in 1584 but his men kept his promise in a conquest march unparalleled in the history of the white race for speed and completeness. In fifty years they cut and slashed their way across Asia and in 1636 stood at last on Pacific shores, where they founded an outpost and named it Okhotsk. In one lifetime a continent had become Russian. In 40 years more, all of what is now Siberia had passed under the dominance of the promyshleniki, as the conquerors came to be called, (Chevigny 1943: p15-16).
Sitka’s colonial past is most prominently evidenced with *St Michael’s Cathedral* not only being spatially located in the centre of the city, but also central in the minds of residents as ‘the heart of the city,’ and a ‘must-see’ tourist attraction. The level of investment by the state and federal governments to preserve Sitka’s Russian past is evidenced in the restoration of the Russian Bishop’s House, home to the consecrated and operational *Chapel of Annunciation*. Post-colonial evidence is found throughout the city with Russian heritage reflected in Orthodoxy design. Finnish shipbuilding influenced built forms preserved due to their important contribution to Sitkan and American history. Spatial patterns for places of worship and cemeteries resemble other colonial experiences (e.g., locations near sites of power, traditional denominations occupying established areas and featuring traditional architectural forms).

The city’s growth and development was influenced both by the topography and economic/location theory. Cemetery site selection revealed the importance of physical environment (Darden 1972) to shape landscape (e.g., muskegs), while the remote location and limited buildable land area influenced the growth in places of worship established (e.g., along two main arterials from the city centre). While location criteria supported traditional cemetery siting (Darden 1972), the socio-historic and political approaches complemented explanations (e.g., segregation of Presbyterian practices) and geomentality offered a deeper view to link form and cultural meaning regarding different cemetery styles.

In some ways, Sitka’s spiritual landscape has developed in line with other locations. Historic cemeteries established in 19th century were denomination-based (e.g., separate places for the Russian Orthodox and Lutheran settlers), and post-transfer became race-based (Boorstin 1965, Christopher 1995, Harris 1982). However, its smaller size likely affected the adoption of other trends (e.g., American park-like burial grounds) likely due to the small population rather than Sitka’s remoteness. Power relationships linked to denomination (e.g., American government and Presbyterians), wider global trends (e.g., growth in denominations, increase in secular beliefs) and the reaffirmation of the increasing role of faith as a key action in politics (e.g., establishment of cemeteries, community focused policies) are patterns found in Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape that perpetuate discriminatory practices and separation between cultures.
The inventory of homelands, places of worship and cemeteries in Sitka is the first complete collection of its kind and may be used for future planning purposes and further academic study. In reflecting upon Sitka’s sacred places, there are distinctions that offer unique dimensions to enhancing cultural understanding. Churches are observable current visible sacred places (e.g., they are subject to the most change, as with a decline in supporters). Cemeteries are the most lasting in the landscape (subject to encroachment) and due to their historic nature, reflect attitudes toward form at ‘a point in time,’ that may or may not reflect geomentality (e.g., Tlingit practices). Homelands/historic sites are more ‘invisible’ in the landscape, but have strongest alignment to the invisible (geomentality). The sacred places in Sitka could be considered still more deeply in future study (e.g., looking at land values, compare ownership according to denomination, or the process of establishing/maintaining and managing sacred places overall).

The form and function of places of worship and death in Sitka’s landscape reveal much about attitudes and beliefs of those who create them, manage them and preserve/designate them. The evolution of these places, the persistence of certain dimensions (e.g., palimpsest in historic church buildings or segregation by race or denomination), or the development of new sacred places provide valuable markers of societal and cultural beliefs that are rich in meaning. The role of agents influencing and shaping the landscape (e.g., those in power in RAC, the early missionaries, the military), and their position of power and influence must be recognised, appreciated and tempered with a broad understanding of the consequences of action/inaction. The American government’s choice of heritage designations for example, reflects the “political manipulations” of memories (Silverman & Small eds. 2002:5). Past actions are questioned in light of the ongoing separation in spatial siting and recognition of place. Government decisions should not be made with sparse knowledge of the beliefs that underlie a particular sacred place or the inherent cultural belief systems. The alternative is congruence between individual agent perceptions and conceptions of the world within land management and planning, where the “reflective practitioner learns to relate beliefs to practice,” (Leung 1989:203). If unaware of cross-cultural beliefs, definitions of sacredness and prior inequity perpetuated through history (dualities), our societies are destined to perpetuate bias/inequity and narrow understanding. Multi-cultural approaches and enhanced understanding can lead to broadening of definitions, concepts and practices that better reflect diversity in our societies in the policies and planning regimes of sacred places. Future management of sacred places is discussed further in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION AND FUTURE APPLICATIONS

Geographers need to grapple more frequently with larger-scale questions...and make explicit the implications of geographical work for the discussions that are shaping public and intellectual agendas (Murphy 2006:1).

This research has showcased spiritual landscape as a valuable study area for cultural geographers. In this study, Sitka’s spiritual landscape has been shown to embody insights into culture-land relationships that enhance understanding of intercultural land conflicts, with findings expanding cultural geographer contributions to contemporary debates. Answering the research question provided an opportunity to add to the cultural geographic knowledge about sacred places, spiritual landscapes and provided new spiritual and geographic dimensions to prior Sitka historic works. Results merit ongoing study in this rich subject area. This work demonstrated how a comprehensive approach, including socio-political analysis, palimpsest, social construction, and a refined geomentality theory, serve as potent explanatory frameworks to explain the spiritual landscape. Built upon well grounded theoretical and practical contexts within the cultural geography discipline, the comprehensive approach extends the scope of previous works that seldom use a combined method to interpret landscape and infrequently focus on spiritual landscapes (Buttimer 2006, Tong and Kong 2000, Park 1994). The combination incorporates past culture and the environment interactions in a physical sense, with interpretations of how a culture is inscribed to create a cultural landscape (Sauer 1963[1925]), and later inner workings of culture such as symbolic dimensions like mapping and iconography (Cosgrove 2008, Cosgrove and Duncan 1988, Duncan and Duncan 1988). Cultural attitudes towards land, place and space (Tuan 1974, 1976a, 1976b; Yoon 1980a, 1984, 1991) are also combined with socio-political and economic structures as influencers shaping Sitka’s contemporary spiritual landscape. Results enhance understanding of place and cross-cultural influencers, yet spiritual landscapes remain largely untapped in cultural geography with numerous topic areas worthy of further investigation. Study objects like myths, songs and building functions aid understanding of cultural cosmologies and invisible links to deeper interpretations. Such cosmologies focus geomentality as a conceptual framework clarifying cultural ideas and beliefs regarding the environment. Geomentality serves as a platform and powerful comparative framework when examining geospatial behaviours and values important for deeper meaning underpinning contemporary inter-cultural land conflicts.
Research findings were set out beginning in Chapter 3 with the analysis of Sitka’s spiritual landscape and the chronology of culture group relations that affected the development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape. The periodisation of influences by Tlingit (pre 1794), Russian (1794-1867) and American (1867 to present) cultures were compared and contrasted by exploring intent and motive of settlement. The importance of the environment in shaping the landscape was highlighted across each group where common settlement factors included abundance of natural resources, strategic locational advantage and access. Economic drivers also featured in settlement rationale. With mixing of cultures, inter-racial social constructions revealed prejudice across groups and patterns of colonial settlement history that persist in today’s landscape. Cultural influences affected the hybridisation of Tlingit and Russian cultures and assimilation policies of later American settlers. Strong state-religion/spiritual links were found in all culture groups influencing the establishment of places of worship and cemeteries. Dualities stemming from historic relationships provide context to better understand inter-cultural dynamics in modern times. Absence of this historic context may limit understanding of the importance of the ‘Cry Ceremony’ to ‘put away’ two centuries of grief following the Battle of 1804. Past intercultural conflicts should not be underestimated as they shape contemporary relationships.

To broaden the historic development of Sitka’s spiritual landscape, Chapter 4 focused on revealing geomentalities of the three main culture groups in Sitka, disaggregating beliefs and behaviours from the visible landscape. The chapter expanded geomentality as an explanatory framework defining data collection upon cosmological beliefs to reveal lasting cultural attitudes toward the land as found in creation myths, proverbs and religious texts. Tlingit geomentality revealed a priority for heritage (shagóon) and associated ties to ancestral homelands, mutual regard for nature and a strong sense of guardianship over the environment. Traditional Russian geomentality valued Mother Earth and exhibited a coexistence with nature reflecting the vast geographic homeland and sense of collective that contrast American emphasis on the individual. Judeo-Christian beliefs underpin American geomentality as shown in the nation’s founding documents and religious texts. The ‘Fall from Grace’ resulted in a ‘curse’ over the earth setting an adversarial relationship context between humans and the environment. Divergent perspectives across groups meant conceptual sacred notions in American geomentality contrasted place-centred sacredness of the Tlingit geomentality, and different views of time (e.g., linear and circular, respectively) that influence geo-spatial behaviour.
Geomentality provided an important lens to view actions, beliefs and shaping of landscape to enhance interpretations of the spatial patterns in Sitka’s landscape presented in subsequent chapters.

The investigation of Tlingit Tribe and Clan House names and place naming in Chapter 5 revealed how cultural geomentalities are reflected in naming and how power and ideology influenced naming preferences and geospatial behaviours across groups. European hegemony over larger feature naming contrasted the smaller features place naming typical of traditional Tlingit subsistence production. Tlingit naming favoured nature and continuously present names, while European naming honoured past nation-builders (e.g., mayors, councillors) to commemorate individuals. The streetscape investigation revealed Sitka’s European and American heritage with government’s naming and designation process perpetuating cultural differences topographically and spatially (e.g., spatial segregation of ‘Indian Village’ lately named ‘Katlian District’). The role of government featured in the spatial analysis of Sitka’s spiritual landscape in Chapter 6.

In Chapter 6, the form and function of sacred places revealed much about cultural attitudes and beliefs of those establishing and managing them. While Sitka’s growth and development acted as a major catalyst for establishing places of worship and adding new cemeteries, topography and economic/location theory contributed to understand siting of specific places. The evolution of places revealed changing segregation patterns in cemeteries, from denomination and race to spatial separation within the same cemetery, and a move toward memorial ‘park-like’ grounds over time. Finally, palimpsest in historic church buildings preserved Sitka’s colonial past. The Russian influence dominates the centre of town with St Michael’s Russian Cathedral remaining the ‘heart of the city,’ and significant state and federal investment preserving the Russian Bishop’s House, both designated as national heritage sites.

The role of government in owning and managing sacred places in the spiritual landscape revealed historic and power relationships reinforced in physical buildings and spatial orientations of sacred places. In Sitka, government and religion links existed; from Tlingit shaman involvement in siting homelands, to Russia’s Imperial objectives for the Russian American Company and Orthodox Church, to American government endorsed Presbyterian mission efforts to assimilate the Natives through education. Greater awareness by public officials regarding their influence in locating,
designating, and managing sacred places is needed. This study of Sitka’s spiritual landscape refutes the statement by the Singaporean Community Development Minister who suggests:

The state does not ascribe meanings to places, including religious places…it is not for the state to do so (in Kong 1993:40).

Sacred places are shaped by the influences of government. Greater attention is necessary to understand how behaviour of officials can perpetuate power imbalances or unnecessarily influence deeper racial messages that are conveyed when limited analysis of cultural importance impacts decision-making (e.g., absence of Tlingit designations, siting of Tlingit street names in cul-de-sac areas, no naming or signage at the Alaska Native Brotherhood Cemetery). The management of the spiritual landscape has cultural, political and economic dimensions and the role of government in managing these continues.

This study has produced a number of significant original contributions to cultural geography, spiritual landscapes, geom mentality and understanding of Sitka, Alaska. The first significant contribution is for those interested in deeper insights into cultural attitudes toward the land, such as assisting government decision-making, discussions regarding future use, designations or siting of new sacred places. The comprehensive approach is particularly relevant when making cross-cultural comparisons. Investigating both visible and invisible aspects linking cosmological and spatial beliefs (through geom mentality) provides a foundation for diverse parties prior to land discussions. Complementing economic and political perspectives, cultural beliefs and values are reflected in a tangible manner. Diversity can enhance outcomes as former Prime Minister Helen Clark stated at the Pacific Vision Conference in July 1999:

New Zealand will be a stronger nation if we can all contribute to it knowing of our respective cultures and backgrounds and bringing our unique contributions to New Zealand life.

This research provides a framework to enhance understanding across cultures. Articulating and celebrating the diversity of cultures need not reflect merely one dominant culture. Postcolonial dualisms no longer serve our multi-cultural global society. Binary answers cannot apply to multi-cultural dilemmas, nor do they inspire creative solutions. This comprehensive cultural geographic approach addresses the ‘spatial values’ gap identified by Hills (2002) in prior applications of the successful value orientation theory applied to cross-cultural business ventures. More deeply understanding cultural spatial beliefs has potential to broaden views of places and land conflicts in a
Future utility of geomentality as a systematic way of exploring a culture’s relationship to the land provides a second contribution. It makes an excellent tool for cross-cultural comparisons with future applications existing at three levels: a tool in its own right to better understand the inner workings of ‘one’ culture (e.g., the exploration of the Tlingit geomentality); an explanatory framework that contributes to cross-cultural understanding (links between Russian and Tlingit nature attitudes as synergies explaining a qualitatively different colonial relationship); and at an individual level, to understand how beliefs and behaviours are perpetuated through their unconscious nature. Drawing a parallel to oft cited ‘decolonisation of the mind,’ there is a corresponding ‘decolonisation of government’ necessary to alter systems and processes that do not adequately represent, protect or apply cross-cultural interests in existing Western policy and planning frameworks and structures. Through geomentality, this study has illustrated the importance of pausing to interpret beliefs and behaviours alongside material expressions to reveal deeper cultural understanding. Cosmological beliefs are often not apparent or observable if one knows not what to look for. Those in positions that manage or act in the public interest can benefit by understanding geomentality as it relates to different cultures in our society, particularly in strategic policy and planning areas (e.g., Treaty Settlements), and service delivery (e.g., health, housing, conservation and education) where multicultural clientele have different worldviews. Contestability of landscape means officials need to be equipped with the best tools to efficiently and effectively manage public resources and distribution channels. Geomentality is a framework to better understand cultural drivers and offer greater cultural prominence when making land decisions.

A third contribution highlights spiritual landscape as an important study topic. Such landscapes inherently link visible and invisible aspects to tie together spatial and cosmological beliefs. Geospatial behaviours can be examined through material expressions in these landscapes (e.g., places of worship, burial sites, homelands/historic sites) and through cultural geomentalities. Providing a geographic interpretation upon ‘spatial variability’ (Murphy 2006:10) engages cultural geographers in contemporary debates offering meaningful contribution. Spiritual landscapes are rich to explore changing roles of government and power relationships (e.g., ‘support for’ particular denominations to more generic ‘support for all religions’). Spiritual landscapes are subject to
various government controls and illustrate its different roles (e.g., land use, an *own and manage* focus for public lands and central areas, and *regulatory* in residential areas). Governments have a role in protecting the ‘public good’ and make decisions with social consequences over the shape and extent of sacred places. This study reveals more attention is necessary for this important landscape at various government levels. Regulation, for example has not yet been applied to technological places of worship (e.g., televangelists and internet services) where flow-on societal impacts are unavoidable.

A fourth contribution of this study is understanding *Sitka’s* spiritual landscape. The inventory of homelands, places of worship and cemeteries in Sitka is the first complete collection of its kind and may be used for future planning purposes and/or further academic study. This work contributes to the understanding of Sitka’s *contemporary* landscape, explaining spatial patterns through a range of lenses and combining the cross-cultural approach to complement previous studies focused on history or single cultures. Resident attitudes toward sacred places enhanced understanding of the role of such places that continue in Sitka’s identity (e.g., St Michael’s Cathedral). The analysis of Sitka’s sacred places revealed that places of worship were most readily identifiable in the spiritual landscape, though subject to the greatest change, compared to longer lasting burial sites and deeper historic ancestral ties in ‘homelands’ sites. These differences in sacred places are areas worthy of greater exploration and comparison across other locations in more general terms where common traits in sacred places may assist governments in effectively managing and designating (protecting) such places.

The fifth and final area of contribution is for future government action. Government decision-making to allocate limited physical resources in our communities is an area under constant pressure from interest groups. Policy development in the spiritual landscape has largely been reactionary. Looking to Sitka, those specific areas now under care and protection of the federal or state government (Castle Hill, Sitka National Park, Old Sitka) were originally part of the Tlingit spiritual landscape, yet in the contemporary landscape, each is preserved and secured with an American ‘national historic designation.’ Growing understanding of deeper associations to land for indigenous cultures combined with resurgence in traditional practices may over time enhance preservation of the Tlingit sacred landscape on grounds of *cultural significance* alone. Again, the government will determine criteria for establishing (defining) and maintaining sacred places, and care is required not
to perpetuate historic inequities. Spiritual landscapes represent those areas deemed most sacred and valued to culture groups. They provide a good starting point for celebrating cultural diversity. Given those aspects of Sitka’s spiritual landscape that are held to be ‘significant’ and represent its heritage, residents must consider: Does the spiritual landscape reveal the unique heritage that recognises each contributing culture as diverse and equally important? For the local and state government, a question remains regarding existing policies, planning frameworks, and naming practices: Do current practices provide for a celebration of diverse cultures, on equal terms? Perhaps Sitka’s observed spiritual landscape reflects its identity, but perhaps additional steps could be taken to celebrate its wider heritage.

Working together, cultural groups find ways to manage difficult dilemmas. Governor Knowles illustrated the importance of collective community efforts at the repatriation event the Journey Home held in Sitka (Photo 71) on 8 July 2000:

> Today we renew in ourselves our sense of community and interdependence…One of the deceased we honour today will remain here, in a home she never knew she had…[among Sitkans who] have opened their arms and their hearts and will shelter this unknown Alaskan as one of their own. This unidentified Alaskan’s story instils in each of us a lasting sense of positive cooperation. Our unknown sister embodies the spirit and teamwork which crosses all social lines. In her anonymity, this departed Alaskan has left us a gift of harmony.

Given the importance of place and heritage within the Tlingit culture, this special action provides a positive end to this exploration into Sitka’s spiritual landscape. The future is open to doing things differently and doing them better. This sentiment is symbolised in the Bicentennial Pole by artist Duane Pasco, representing the history of 200 years of Pacific Northwest Coast Native culture (Photo 72). At the top of the pole, the contemporary Native must weigh old and new values with two staffs:

> In the left hand…richly carved, symbolizing the abundant cultural heritage of the past…the right hand is bare, yet to be carved (National Park Service 1979:27).

The present challenge for academics, government officials, businesses and society, is to bridge the cultural gaps that restrain human progress and limit the power of collective endeavour while honouring and celebrating a diverse cultural heritage. This study has shown how cultural geographers can contribute to contemporary land discussions through culture-environment insights, understanding the importance of spatial variability, the role of power in political and government processes and how meaning is woven into landscape over time. This work raises awareness regarding the utility of exploring spiritual landscapes and enhances understanding across cultures considering attitudes that continue to shape our environment. In Sitka, this exploration of the
spiritual landscape has revealed a rich history that celebrates Tlingit, Russian and American cultural heritage. The cross-cultural compass presented in this research can be used to continue the spiritual landscape journey. There is much gratitude for Sitka, Sheey At'iká and Novo Arkhangel’sk, the Paris of the Pacific, with its multi-cultural heritage. This special place and its people have provided a significant and unique first step forward – opening a world of possibility for future spiritual landscape study:

Gunalchéesh – Спасибо – Thank you.

Photo #71
Repatriation Ceremony, Sheldon Jackson College
The Journey Home

Source: Alexander 2000

Photo #72 - Bicentennial Pole at Sitka National Park

Source: Alexander 2000
APPENDICES
Title: Spiritual Frames of Mind: Exploring the evolution of select sacred places in the Pacific

To: Tribal Elders and Interviewees

My name is Jordan Alexander. I am a student at The University of Auckland enrolled for a PhD Degree in the Department of Geography. I am conducting this research for my thesis on cross-cultural frames of mind toward sacred places in New Zealand, Canada, the United States and Japan.

Sacred places include landscapes of worship, such as churches and landscapes of afterlife, such as cemeteries. I want to examine the rationale for locating sacred places. The reasoning should reflect religious and socio-political beliefs and values of the time. Looking at the evolution of such sites, including present day attitudes through interviews, should enhance our understanding of sacred places. I have chosen this field because of my interest in cross-cultural relations and my desire to develop an appreciation for different cultural attitudes toward sacred places, such as those found in different cultures within the same country.

You are invited to participate in my research and I would appreciate any assistance you can offer me. As part of my thesis I am conducting a case study on your community and want to look at different attitudes to and the evolution of sacred places since the time of first explorer contact. I am interested in your personal attachment or perspective on particular places and any information you have regarding the location rationale.

I would like to interview you, however you are under no obligation to be interviewed. Interviews would take about an hour. I would prefer to audio tape the interview but this would only be done with your consent. Taping could be turned off at any time or you can withdraw information for up to a month following the interview.
If you do wish to be interviewed, please fill in a Consent Form and phone me to arrange a suitable interview time. All information you provide in an interview is confidential and your name will not be used.

Thank you very much for your time and help in making this study possible. If you have any queries or wish to know more please phone me at 644 971 4142 or fax me at 644 971 7379, or email me at j.alexander@paradise.net.nz
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The Head of Department is:
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For any queries regarding ethical concerns please contact:
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CONSENT FORM

This consent form will be held for a period of six years.

Title: Spiritual Frames of Mind: Exploring the evolution of select sacred places in the Pacific

Researcher: Jordan Marijana Alexander

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered.

I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information traceable to me at any time up to one month following this interview without giving a reason.

- I agree to take part in this research.
- I understand that the interview will be audio taped.

Signed:
Name (please print):
Date:

## Appendix 2: List of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Interview Yr</th>
<th>Living in Sitka</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Type: Perception</th>
<th>In Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hixie Arnoldt</td>
<td>Former nurse</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28 June, 2 July</td>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorrie Farrell</td>
<td>Retired School Teacher</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert (Bob) Sam</td>
<td>Sitka Tribe of Alaska265</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 July, 5 July</td>
<td>&gt; 20 years</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob DeArmond</td>
<td>Writer (historian, reporter)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 July</td>
<td>over 30 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Ashby</td>
<td>Former Navy, Docks, NPS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 July</td>
<td>45-50 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Gorges</td>
<td>Clergy (Catholic Priest)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 July</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sarvilla</td>
<td>Former Nurse</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 July</td>
<td>&gt;30 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Zabinko</td>
<td>Clergy association (Orthodox)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kanosh</td>
<td>Elder/Healer/Tourism266</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr James (Jim) Davis267</td>
<td>Former Professor (history)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Kleinert</td>
<td>Groundskeeper, Model builder</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone, 5 July</td>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundskeeper</td>
<td>National Cemetery</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 July</td>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Brandt</td>
<td>Historian, NPS (Lutheran)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 July</td>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil Truit</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Elder</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone, 5 July</td>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name withheld</td>
<td>Elder (Presbyterian)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 July</td>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Williams</td>
<td>SCPD Planning Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 July</td>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big John</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 July</td>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richard Pierce</td>
<td>Professor (Russian historian)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>June 2004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale DeArmond</td>
<td>Artist (woodcuts, engraving)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lee</td>
<td>Retiree (Tourist)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 July</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Nichols</td>
<td>Government (Tourist)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 July</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopclerk</td>
<td>Student from St Petersburg</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

263 Ages under 25 code=1, age 25-50 code=2; age over 50 code=3.
264 Although most interviewees are Americans, culture group is recorded as in New Zealand with indigenous Māori and settlers, or here as Tlingit or Settlers.
265 Tribal NAGPRA Coordinator (sacred places specialist)
266 David Kanosh was identified to me at the Pioneers Picnic as a ‘spiritual healer,’ and ‘shaman,’ though during our interview David did not claim to be either. He discussed his shaman lineage as mentioned earlier in this manuscript.
267 Jim’s great great uncle was Jefferson Davis who came to Sitka for the transfer.
Appendix 3: Topic Guide for Unstructured Interviews with Elders

Origin of Landscape and Sacred Places
1. Landscape/Town
   a. Why did people first settle here? Note all stories of origin of settlement.
   b. When did people first settle here?
   c. Where (specifically) in the area were first structures?
   d. Where were areas for worship, burial etc? Why? (e.g., where were prayers performed pre-hunt?)
   e. Natural places (e.g., trees, water, place for chief’s residence, etc.) – where were they? Why were they sacred?
   f. Who honoured the landscape/places?
   g. When (e.g., springtime)?

2. “Built” Sacred Places
   a. Built places (e.g., churches, cemeteries, etc.) where were they?
   b. What was/were the siting criteria?
   c. Place names, origin, changes over time?
   d. Why were they sacred? (e.g., rites of passage, ceremonies performed there)
   e. Who built them?
   f. What materials were used and why? Architectural style?
   g. What is the site’s orientation, aspect and access? Form?
   h. When was the site developed?
   i. What were the current/previous functions?

Landscape Development (over time)
3. Landscape
   a. How have patterns changed over time? (e.g., totems naturally deteriorate)
   b. Who changed them?
   c. Who managed churches, cemeteries, landscape?

4. Sacred Places
   a. How sacred places changed? (why, where, when)
   b. Who changed the places? (e.g., politics, colonisation)
   c. If built structures, were original materials replaced? With what? Why? By whom?

Cosmologies
5. Interviewee views
   a. What are the interviewee’s beliefs regarding: origin, worship, afterlife, toward nature and environment?
   b. Any supporting documentation available (e.g., myths, religious texts, maps)

Present Day
6. Sacred Place Planning and Management
   a. What is the current planning (e.g., zoning) and designation (e.g., UNESCO)? Any changes over time?
   b. Who manages the site? Note changes over time.
   c. Current functions? (e.g., Battle Hill, flag changing, historical, political)
Appendix 4: Interview Guide for Environmental Perception Interviews with Residents

Thank you for participating. First provide an overview of what I am doing (i.e., research for thesis), how results will be assembled, anonymity of findings, and availability of findings.

1 Start with warm up questions:
   a. How long have you lived in xx?
   b. Where did you live before?
   c. Why did you move here?
   d. What do you do in Sitka (work background)?
   e. Do you have other family living here or nearby?

   *probe: What they like and dislike about living there?*

2 Imagine you have just met a tourist who has asked you to draw a map of (study location) to assist them to walk from one side of the town to the other (e.g., from the ferry terminal etc.). Would you draw me a map of xxx for the tourist.

   *probe: Key places the tourist should visit – respondent should draw in any landmarks/buildings areas of interest that you think the tourist should visit and explain why the tourist should visit them. What is special about those places/landmarks/buildings, role they play within the community, if any e.g., a church that is a meeting place for the community.*

   (If the respondent doesn’t want to draw the map then they could describe verbally xxx).

3 I am obviously not a resident here. If I told you I am in xx (study location) for 2 weeks, where would you say I, or a tourist, should visit?

   *probe three places*

4 I will be asking you to give me 3 adjectives to describe a place – for example, if I asked you to describe a cat with 3 adjectives, you may say “warm, soft and cuddly” or for an elephant “big, gray and wrinkly.” Can you tell me three adjectives to describe the following places:

   *probe 3 sacred places I want to find out about (e.g., church, mountain); and probe answers given to 2.2 above*

5 Thinking about Sitka (study location), if you could only pick one thing for each of the following, what would it be:

   a. the ‘best view’ in Sitka
   b. the ‘best sound’ in Sitka
   c. the ‘best smell’ in Sitka
d. the ‘best taste’ in Sitka

e. the ‘best feel (touch)’ in Sitka

6 Thinking about xx (study location), is there one place that is “your place” – somewhere you would consider “a special place” where you go to be alone or be with people, your favourite spot, somewhere you may go to recharge your batteries or to relax

If yes, then ask “please describe that place for me”
*Probe: location, surrounding environment, how you found it, why it is special to you, how you feel when you are there, has it always been special to you or was there an event that has made it special i.e., where met partner etc. Would you consider it a spiritual place…*

(I may have to amend the filter question to remove choice of yes/no - ‘where is your place’ etc.)

7 I am also planning research in Sitka, the Queen Charlottes, New Zealand and Japan (also use other local communities e.g., Masset and Old Masset which are neighbouring communities, or Sgan Gwaii and Skidegate etc.). Have you ever visited any of these places?

If yes:
- a. probe what they enjoyed “most” about the place;
- b. what were your 3 favourite places;
- c. what are 3 adjectives to describe the people there;
- d. what are 3 adjectives to describe (ask about specific sacred places I am after)

If no:
- a. probe what they would like to see there if they were to visit

8 Thank you

- a. ask if follow up is possible (phone number or address)?
- b. do they want copy of findings?
- c. Compensation/gift
- d. My contact details
Appendix 5: The Song Composed by Baranov on the Northwest Coast of America (1799)

Russian wit plunged in adventure,
Has scattered free men across the seas,
To seek new lands, for trade and profits,
For the good of the fatherland, for the honour of the Tsar. (repeat)

God the Almighty is helping us here,
Supporting Russian courage everywhere,
As soon as we discovered the land, we quickly settled it,
A very important strip of the mainland.

Forming society and companies,
We don’t need the muse of the Russians,
We need but learn the simple rules of nature,
And to follow its laws.

To erect buildings in parts of the New World;
The Russian is moving, Nootka is his goal,
Savage people of barbarous natures,
Have now become our friends.

Peter the Great! If you could only awake,
You would see, that you made no mistake,
Suspecting land nearby, knowing great advantage,
Your offspring found it, and settled there.

The Argonauts were drawn by glitter,
The Golden Fleece they tried to find;
It have been to their fatherland’s advantage,
Had they only known about this land.

Here exists no Golden Fleece,
But precious gold is flowing to us.
Were it not for intruders – our European friends –
We should be richly rewarded for our risks.

The Tower of Sukharev beautifies Moscow,
The Bell and Tsar’s Cannon astonish all;
There are wonders aplenty, as the bell tower of Ivan the Great,
But they could be no use to us.

Honor and glory brought us here,
Brotherly friendship unites us,
Let us build and expand,
This so useful for Russia American land.

Here though there is the wildest nature,
Bloodthirsty customs of the natives,
But the advantages important, and needed by the country –
Make labour and loneliness bearable.

In the New World, in the lands of midnight,
We stand among mighty people.
The tribes make peace, respecting bravery,
Take hear, friends – we are the Russians.

Neither rank nor riches are important to us,
All we need is harmonious friendship,
All that we have created, all of our efforts,
Will be valued by patriots in times to come.
### Appendix 6: Topographic Feature Naming – Data Table

**Highlights apply to immediate ‘Sitka’ surrounds**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Soapstone Pt</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sounds Tlingit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Surge Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Bay is not named on other maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Cross Sound</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Other (British)</td>
<td>Other (after Holy Cross Day)</td>
<td>Named after Holy Cross Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cape Cross</td>
<td>Cape Bingham</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American (after Tlingit and Other (British))</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>After Holy Cross Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>YAKOBI ISLAND</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L #4</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Possibly Vasili “Yakov” Chichagov, as Russian Island of Yakov would be Yakovi, transliterated could be Yakobi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Icy Strait</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Icy Cape was named by Cook 1778, “encumbered with ice Eskimo word</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


269 Source Library of Congress materials in Meeting of Frontiers: http://international.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?intldl/intfront:@field+(NUMBER+@band(g4370+m#000029)), accessed 03.03.2007.

270 Built category includes settlement features.

271 Small = rocks, streams; Medium = rivers, inlets, small islands; or Large = lakes, mountains, large islands, main centres.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CHICHAGOF ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Chichagof Island. Capt. Lisianski. 1805. For Russian Admiral Vasili Yakov Chichagov, Russian Arctic explorer (Orth 1971).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lisianski Strait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Yuri Fyodorovich Lisiansky (also spelled as Urey Lisiansky) He commanded sloop-of-war Neva 1803-1806 and took part in the first Russian circumnavigation of the earth. Lisianski Island, Hawaii was discovered by him, a peninsula off Baranov Island, a bay, a strait, a river, and a cape in North America, (Pierce 1984; Khlebnikov 1994 [1861], and also <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yuri_Lisyansky">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yuri_Lisyansky</a> (14.02.2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lisianski Inlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Takanis Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Only Takanis found was: “A small bay on the southwest coast of Yakobi Island in the Alexander Archipelago off the coast of Alaska...Takanis Bay (navy ship) was commissioned on 15 April 1944, Capt. A. R. Brady in command. She was used to transport returning veterans until she was decommissioned in 1946, re-classified and struck from the Navy list in 1959,” <a href="http://www.answers.com/topic">http://www.answers.com/topic</a>, accessed 14.02.2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chatham Strait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Chatham Strait. Capt. Vancouver. 1794. For the Earl of Chatham, William Pitt Chatham. –Orth (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Koui Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Tlingit Indian name first published in 1848 by Russian cartographers (Orth 1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kupreanof Kapranoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Kupreanof Island. Lt. Woronkofski. 1837.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>(sic) Island</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ilin Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hill Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hogan Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Herbert Graves Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Portlock Hbr</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Black Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tenakee Inlet</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Klag Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ford Arm</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American Location</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Slocum Arm</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Khaz Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Khaz Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Moser Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Emmons Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

272 From the Statewide Library Electronic Doorway (SLED) at Sled.alaska.edu/akfaq/akoffpri.html (3/2/2007) where it cites Kupreianov’s (sic) tenure commencing in 1835. SLED also notes the spelling of Russian names which are transliterated in the modified Library of Congress system used by Richard A Pierce in Russian America a biographical dictionary, Limestone Press 1990.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Patterson Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Ushk Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T Assumed Tlingit in origin since on traditional Tlingit Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Poison Cove</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T Sounds Tlingit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Klokachef Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Suloia Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian Nature</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Fish Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T Assumed Tlingit in origin since on traditional Tlingit Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Deep Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T Assumed Tlingit in origin since on traditional Tlingit Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Salisbury Sound</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Peril Strait</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Catherine Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Partofshikof Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>KRUZOF Island</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Shelikof Bay</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Halleck Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>Assumed Tlingit in origin since on traditional Tlingit Use Map. Thornton (2008:114) cites Robert Davis' poem referring to “the Halleck Harbor shaman.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Krestof Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>Russian for cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Port Krestof</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>Russian for cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Nakwasina Sound</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td>T Assumed Tlingit in origin since on traditional Tlingit Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Katlian Bay</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Alice Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Aleutski Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Aleutkina Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Battery Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Beaver Lake</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Beardslee Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People See Beardslee Street below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Blue Lake</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Camp Coogan Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People? Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Cannon Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Cascade Creek</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Cape Edgcumbe</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Other (British)</td>
<td>People After Saint Lazarius Variations: Cabo del Engano, Cape Edgcombe, Cape Edjcumbe, Cape Edjcumbe, Cape Saint Lazaria, Cape Saint Lazarus, Cape Trubitsina, Mys Svataya Lazarya, Mys Trubissina, Sitka Point, Trubitsin Point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Charcoal Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Deep Cove</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature T As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Dove Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Eastern Anchorage</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Native Language</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Herring Cove</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Necker Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Tenakee Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Hoonah</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Port Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Port Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Port Frederick</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Port Malmsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Port Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Raven Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Ring Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Rodman Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Shelikof Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People RAC employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Sitka Channel</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Location T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Stakine/Stakeen River</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Location T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Sitkoh Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Location T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Tebenko Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People Captain in 1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Thimblebery Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Thimblebery Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Thimblebery Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information:

- The word Tenakee is from the Tlingit word "tinaghu," meaning "Coppery Shield Bay." This refers to three copper shields, highly prized by the Tlingits, that were lost in a storm. Early prospectors and fishermen came to the site to wait out the winters and enjoy the natural hot springs in Tenakee.

- Assumed Tlingit in origin since on traditional Tlingit Use Map.

- Based on Tlingit.

- Based on Tlingit name meaning "Great River," (Orth 1971).

- Captain in 1850s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Galankin Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Guertin Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Granite Creek</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Halibut Point</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Harris Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Heart Lake</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Herring Cove</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Hoggatt Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People?</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Lituja Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>La Perouse in 1786 came from the Sandwich Islands (Hawaii) to the Mt St Elias area sponsored by Louis XVI. La Perouse named the harbour at 58 degrees the Port of France, but on the maps is noted by its Native name Lituja Bay. For three weeks he stayed with the inhabitants commenting on their preference for iron objects, recognising their well developed spiritual achievements and skill in art. He commented on the terrible filth of huts and uncleanliness of natives in the settlements he visited. Likely to be summer camps, the huts were closed on the windward side only, (Krause 1979[1885]:18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Marshall Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Morne Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Neva Strait</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Other (ship)</td>
<td>After the sloop-of-war Neva commanded by Urey Lisiansky 1803-1806.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>No Name Creek</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>No Thoroughfare Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Old Sitka Rocks</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>Kasiana Islands</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>Rockwell Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>Sawmill Cove</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>Siginaka Islands</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Starrigavan Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>New Archangel - Sitka</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

274 Shortly after transfer, William S Dodge, Customs Agent, complains to headquarters that the official seal of the Customs Service used the name ‘New Archangel’ instead of Sitka (DeArmond 1995).
Kolosh live is called Shit’ka or Shitiika; T’ka or Tiika comes from the word At’ika – “on the seaside.” Thus, Shit’ka or Sitkha signifies “place on the seaside of the island” called Shig by the Kolosh.” (Khlebnikov 1994 [1861]:29).

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td><strong>Middle Island</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td><strong>Silver Bay</strong>&lt;sup&gt;275&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td><strong>Sitka Sound</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td><strong>Deep Inlet</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td><strong>Redoubt Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Russian Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td><strong>Redoubt Lake</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Russian Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td><strong>Biorka Island</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Russian People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td><strong>W Crawfish Inlet</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td><strong>Crawfish Inlet</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td><strong>Necker Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>American Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td><strong>Small Arm</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td><strong>Great Arm</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td><strong>Whale Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td><strong>Sandy Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td><strong>Snepe Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td><strong>Redfish Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td><strong>Branch Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td><strong>Larch Bay</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tlingit Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td><strong>Cape Ommaney</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>275</sup> May 1873, Major J Stewart and A H Prince locate Stewart lode claim at the head of Silver Bay.

<sup>276</sup> Capt Entienne Marchand of the French ship ‘Solide’ called Sitka Bay “Tchinkitinay” as it was known to the natives, (Andrews 1922:14).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Pacific Ocean</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Other (Portugal) Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Mitchell Rock</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Turning Island</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Japan Island (Yaponsky Island)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Yaponsky was named, “as the place to keep captive Japanese whom [Resanoff] expected to capture through his expedition against the lower Kuril Islands in 1806,” (Andrews 1922:93). Created a Navy reserve by President (1890) Wharf completed in 1900. Coal bunker built 1904; Navy to build wireless station 1907 (DeArmond 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Mt Edgecombe</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Other (British)</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Long-dormant volcano located on Kruzof Island. Probably named after Mount Egedcumb, Plymouth Harbor, England (Orth 1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Warm Springs Bay</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Whiting Harbour</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

277 Cited in Shiels 1967:158 from Inventory by Russians to America of existing holdings for Treaty purchase.

278 Variations: Gora Edzhkomb, Mount Saint Hyacinthe, Mount Saint Lazaria, Mount San Jacinto, Mount Egedcumb, Svataya Lazarya. / Named: on May 2 1778 by Cook probably after Mt Egedcumb at the entrance of Plymouth Harbor, England, but possibly after George, the first Earl of Egedcumb. The name was adopted by Vancouver. This feature was also called Montana de San Jacinto or Saint Jacinto Mountain on August 16, 1775 by Don Juan de la Bodega y Quadra, in honor of the saint whose day it was. It was called Gora Svataya Lazarya or Saint Lazarus Mountain by Lt. Sarichev in 1826. This mountain was climbed in July 1805 by Capt. U.T. Lisanski, IRN. Originally published in Cook’s Log, page 460, volume 9, number 3 (1986) at http://www.captaincookson.org/cssu4138.htm, accessed 03.03.2007.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sealing Cove Harbour</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANB Harbour</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds Tlingit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crescent Harbour</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomson Harbour</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Island</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Probably named after Harbor Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sitka Channel</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds Tlingit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Love Island</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neva Island</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Other (Ship)</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Line Island</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Channel</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Mountain</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical Feature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7: Streetscape Naming – Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sitka City Walking Tour and Road System map (Caputo 2008[1998])</th>
<th>Included in Greater Sitka Chamber of Commerce Map (1991)</th>
<th>My Street Location Category (zone 0-5)</th>
<th>Culture Represented: (Tlingit, Russian, American, or Other)</th>
<th>Classification: Nature, Location, People, Other</th>
<th>Sacred Sites Located on this Street</th>
<th>Spiritual Link</th>
<th>Street Naming Explanation (<em>probably</em> when I provide my own explanation, otherwise based on recorded data as reported)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>150. Eagle Way*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Probably used initially as a street name that captured the new American possession. Note also a Tlingit moiety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>156. Race*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>This street (connects American Street and Barracks Street behind Old Harbor Books and the American Legion building (DeArmond 1995:201). It is not shown on either map used for this study, however the name is referred to in the index of the 1991 Chamber of Commerce map. The street was sign posted at least since 1917 and referred to in deeds prior to the George Race family arriving in the 1920s, so it is unlikely the name origin lies here. DeArmond’s research into the street origin noted property deeds that referred to the street as Beehive Street and Alberstone Alley (with Alberstone being a saloon owner, photographer and Sitka hotel operator from 1875) 1995:201). The street is not currently sign posted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>151. Etolin Way*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other (Finnish)</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Yes, Lutheran church</td>
<td>After Finnish governor of Russian American Company (RAC) – for details see comments below for #14. Etolin Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>158. Sheldon-Jackson Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>SJC Chapel</td>
<td>Yes, SJ Chapel, Presbyterian Mission</td>
<td>Dr Sheldon Jackson, appointed Special Agent of Education for Alaska 1885; to build new museum of concrete in 1895, (DeArmond 1993:218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. American</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Probably named after the recent acquisition of Alaska by founding fathers (e.g., no streets were named prior). For years the street was known as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

279 The streets with an asterisk could not be located on the 1991 map nor did they appear on the Caputo (1998/2007) street map. Similarly, streets named in the 1998/2007 Caputo street map directory that could not be located are also noted with an asterisk in this table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Barlow</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td>No further information found on Barlow. Assumed to be a surname.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Barracks</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Location of building</td>
<td>Probably after the Russian barracks located in town for RAC employees to board in. DeArmond notes that the street was formerly known as “Garrison,” and that some of the name changes were simply due to the draftsmen putting different names on the maps (1995:75).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location of building</td>
<td>Presbyterian Mission</td>
<td>This is the street leading to SJ College which it is named after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Jeff Davis</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Former minister</td>
<td>Probably after General Jefferson C Davis commanded Alaska Department post-transfer (Dr J Davis 2000, interview, Sitka, 10 July). Formerly (early 1900s) the street was known as ‘Cemetery Road’ (DeArmond 1993:264). DeArmond refers to the road as “Davis Road,” established in 1868 by the General to haul wood from the Indian River valley, later used as the main access road to the SJ Institute and Mission school (1995:60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Bishop’s House Chapel; Pioneer House Chapel; St Michael’s Cathedral, St Peter’s By-the-Sea Episcopal Church; Sitka Lutheran Church ELCA; Sheldon Jackson College Chapel</td>
<td>Likely after President Lincoln. First street to be paved in Sitka (1943) by the Territorial Construction Company. Repaved in 1952 when it was also widened which required the move of the rock wall at the Pioneers’ Home back 6 feet and the Moose Hall to be moved (DeArmond 1993:93). In 1870, the Council by resolution, changed Lincoln Street (or part of it) to Davis Street to honour General JC Davis who was in command of the troops in Alaska from 1867. The confusion between names continued for “at least a couple of decades,” with property conveyances referring to Davis St (aka Lincoln Street) and vice versa (DeArmond 1995:199). Lincoln Street has remained the heart of the CBD since Russian times and is the street most frequently visited by tourists. Was formerly known as “Governor’s Walk,” (Andrews 1922:54, 80; and 1867 model by Jim Davis). Ricketts (2006:24) notes Bishop Rowe...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Observatory  ✓  St  1  American  Location (of building)  Correspondence referring to Beach Road (now Lincoln).
Formerly known as Cemetery Street, Johnson Street, Union Street and Russian Cemetery Road. Named after the magnetic observatory and seismological station was built near the cemetery by the US Coast & Geodetic Survey. It runs over what was called Graveyard Hollow, the land between the two Russian cemeteries (DeArmond 1995:67, 190). I’m not sure if DeArmond was referring to the Lutheran cemetery as one of the two “Russian” cemeteries.

9. Seward  ✓  St  1  American  People  Responsible for negotiating purchase of Alaska territory from Russia. Toured Sitka in 1869 and gave address at Lutheran Church (DeArmond 1993:255).

10. Lake  ✓  St  1  American  Nature  Church of the Nazarene  Probably after Swan Lake, initially named by the Russians (check).

11. Marine  ✓  St  1  American  Location  Unitarian Universalists Assoc; Russian Orthodox Cemetery;  Probably named after the location of the street running parallel to the harbour (marine aspect). DeArmond notes this street was probably just created by the draftsmen on the map (1995:75).

12. Harbor Drive  ✓  1  American  Location  Probably named after the location near the harbour, or possibly the view toward Harbor Mountain.

Not on this map  149. Cathedral Way  1  Russian  Location  Cathedral  See also Kostrometinoff below.

Street not on this map  160. Maksoutoff280  1  Russian  People  Prince Dmitri P. Maksutov who in 1859, came to Sitka working for RAC Governor Furuhjelm. In March 1864 he was appointed governor and was the last Russian governor. He died in St Petersburg in 1889. http://www.answers.com/topic, accessed 14.02.2008.

13. Baranov  ✓  1  Russian  People  Russian trader and general manager of the Russian-American Fur Company late 1700s

14. Etolin  ✓  1  Other (Finnish)  People  St Gregory Catholic Church  Formerly the Bishops Walk  Arvid Adolf Etholen, b. 9 Jan 1799 in Finland, d. 29 March 1876. RAC employee, Governor of the colonies 1838-1845; then RAC board member 1847-1859, (Sitka Historical Society 1977281).

---

280 Appears as a main street running south from Harbour Drive to point (peninsula) east of Castle Hill promontory, however does not appear on the Caputo map (1998/2007).

281 The Society (1977) noted that Richard Pierce historian claimed the street was named “from a lady who was named after Etolin Island.”
### Table of Street Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjutant for the governor of the Russian American colonies 1834. Governor of the colonies 1838-1845. Member of the board of the Russian-American Company in St. Petersburg, Russia 1847-1859.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeArmond notes that this street for many years was referred to as “The Bishop’s Walk,” (1995:190). Pierce says the street was named in a roundabout way…for a woman who was named for the island which was named for the Russian officer Etholen, (1973:26).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Finn Alley  
*Finn Ally (sic)*  
1 Other (Finnish) People  
A short one-way street named after several Finnish fishermen who built their homes along the alley-two where built by Jack Yrjanna; one by Gus Savella; and one was built by Andy Koskela. (Sitka Historical Society 1977).

16. Princess  
*Way*  
1 Russian People Lutheran Cemetery  
See also Maksoutoff, after Princess who is buried in Lutheran cemetery off this street.

17. Erler  
*St*  
1 Russian People  
DeArmond suggests the street was named for the Erler Hotel, named after Catherine (Katie), born in Austria and came to the US in 1881, arriving in Sitka around 1900 where she worked as a cook. The hotel disappeared in the Swan Creek urban renewal project (1995:196).

18. Monastery  
*St*  
1 Russian (English translation of Russian word) Location Jehovah’s Witnesses Hall  
DeArmond believes this street was supposed to be called Bishop Street (1995:189).

19. Oja  
*St & Oja Way*  
1 Other (Finnish) People  
“Oja” is Finnish meaning ‘ditch.’ Street named after Frank Oja, owner of a transfer business, later operated by his son George Oja, (Sitka Historical Society 1977).

20. Katlian  
*St*  
1 Tlingit People  
Former policeman, Chief Katleen d.1924 (DeArmond 1993:220).

21. Kogwantan  
*Back St*  
1 Tlingit People  
Note spelling and reference to ‘Back Street’ – for more detail on Kogwantan see Tlingit clan names section.

22. Tlingit  
*Way*  
1 Tlingit People  
Note racial connotations as with ‘Russian town’

---

282 According to the Sitka Historical Society (1977) Oja Street is located off Lake Street to Monastery Street and is interrupted by the school playground. It continues off of Baranof Street to Park Street.

283 Back Street was listed separately from Kogwantan Street in the directory of the 1991 map, however both names were identified on the map as referring to the same street (i.e., Kogwantan/Back Street).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Metlakatla St 1</td>
<td>Tlingit People</td>
<td>Indigenous naming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Crabapple Dr 2</td>
<td>American Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>DeGroff St 2</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>Named after Edward deGroff, mercantile business owner 1886; member of Sitka School Committee 1900-01, President Chichagoff Mining Company 1907; US Commissioner between 1900-1908, died 1910 (DeArmond 1993). He is also known for his photographs of Sitka and other areas in Alaska. His grave is in Sitka National Cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Geotedic (sic) Geodetic 2</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>Probably named after US Navy’s coast and geodetic survey steamer/team that conducted survey work there in late 1890s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Hemlock 2</td>
<td>American Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Hollywood 2</td>
<td>American Location</td>
<td>John Michael, City Councillor 1924, 1926, 1942, on school board, died 1955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Merrill St 2</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>Elbridge Warren Merrill, 30 yr resident; photographer, first official custodian of Sitka National Memorial 1910; memorial plaque affixed to bolder – Park Service bulldozes and goes into ditch, now located off road by National Park (Chaney, Betts et al. 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>O’Cain Ave 2</td>
<td>American People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Otter 2</td>
<td>American Nature</td>
<td>Possibly after the animal for which the Russians came to hunt in America, or possibly after the Hudson’s Bay Co steamer that arrived in Sitka 1868 (DeArmond 1993:239).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Park St 2</td>
<td>American Location</td>
<td>Possibly after the nearby public park area – it doesn’t appear that there is any ‘person’ after which this street is named and it is too distant from the National Park boundary for the name to be associated with that feature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

284 John Brady Drive and Brady Street are in separate locations therefore I considered them as referring to different streets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>St</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Probably after the mountain referred to as Arrowhead; but possibly after the shore boat ARROWHEAD launched in 1951 (DeArmond 1993:188) that did the run between town and Japonski base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Possibly after the mountain referred to as Arrowhead; but possibly after the shore boat ARROWHEAD launched in 1951 (DeArmond 1993:188) that did the run between town and Japonski base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>DeArmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Probably after Robert W elected to School Board from 1907, Postmaster 1910, Mayor 1920, deputy Collector of Customs 1923, died 1940; Mrs Elizabeth on school board 1922, Postmaster 1922; though his son, Robert N was also elected city to council 1938, 1950, is author of books on Sitka’s history (1999, 1995); and his wife Dale DeArmond, Artist (both interviewed for this work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Hirst</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sitka Church of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After Bernard, US Navy, originally from England, merchant buying seal pelts, married Miss Lily Sloan, Tlingit, d.1966 and buried in the ‘military cemetery’ as it was known at the time (DeArmond 1995:197).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Kincaid (sic)</td>
<td>Kinkead St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>John H Kinkead: First US Postmaster From 1867 And Later First Governor of the District of Ak after Organic Act 1884. USC&amp;GS names Mt Kinkead of the Pyramid Range also. d.1904 (DeArmond (1993:222) also notes his Mayoral role in 1870.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Lakeview</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Osprey</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other (vessel)</td>
<td>Possibly after the animal, but probably after the HMS OSPREY that arrived from Victoria in reasons to the plea from residents for protection from the Indians (sic) in 1879 (DeArmond 1993:239).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Shennent (sic) in directory; Shennet (sic) on map</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Street name approved by Assembly in 1978. Likely after J Earl Shennett, former councillor and mayor between 1950 to 1960; became US Commissioner 1956, d.1962 and is buried in the Moose plot of the City Cemetery (DeArmond 1993:222).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Brady</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>Rev John G Brady, b.1848 NY, orphan, Yale educated, d.1918; arrived Sitka 1878 with a commission from Presbyterian Board of Missions “to preach the Gospel in the vicinity of Sitka” Later became a merchant, first US Commissioner 1884-1889; operator of sawmill; and Governor of District of Alaska 1897-1906.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Cascade</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Peterson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>While several Peterson’s were involved in the city council (George H in 1942 and John H in 1923-1925), it is probable that the street was named after Charles M Peterson who was also elected as Mayor in 1946 as well as serving as councillor in 1937 and the Public Utilities Board in 1940 (DeArmond 1993:241).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Biorka</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Olga</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Other (vessel)</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. New Archangel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People (saint)</td>
<td>After Russian Novo Arkhangel’sk, name given to Russian settlement in Sitka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Indian River Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>ANB Cemetery</td>
<td>The “famous Indian River Road, a continuation of the Governor’s Walk of the Russians and often called Lover’s Lane,” — Called Kolosh Ryeka, the river of the Kolosh, what the Russians called the Tlingit (Andrews 1922:98).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Siginaka</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Way</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Sirstad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street not named on this map</td>
<td>152. Gibson Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>159. 2nd St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Austin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Presbyterian mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Charles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. A Street</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Moller</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Dan H, Foreman Civilian Conservation Corps for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 59. Charteris | ✓ | St | 3 | American | People | Dr William C and Ruth, former Councilor and mayor d.1968 |
| 60. Dodge Circle | ✓ | 3 | American | People | Probably after first Customs officer for Alaska, William Sumner who arrived in 1867 (DeArmond 1993:203). |
| 63. Johnston | Not on this map | 3 | American | People | Probably after the physician and first “town” mayor, Dr J W Johnson (DeArmond 1995:111), though DeArmond suggests Johnson could be a new street name (1995:201) which suggests he was not aware of Johnson Street’s naming. |
| 64. Kimsham | ✓ | St | 3 | American | People | Assembly of God; United Methodist Church of Sitka Kimsham is Chinese word “gold mountain,” (DeArmond 1993) |
| 65. Mills | ✓ | 3 | American | People | Either Waldo (City Councillor 1921,1922); or William Parker (elected to school board for nine years intermittently between 1905-1925, Pioneers' Home Board 1913 and Chair Sitka Red Cross 1924), DeArmond 1993:229. |
| 66. Tilson | ✓ | St | 3 | American | People | Grace (Evangelical) Lutheran Church Probably after Thomas Tilson Jr (rather than Alfred). Thomas Jr was b. Norway, and partners to form Sitka Mercantile Co 1930; was president Chamber of Commerce, fmr. mayor, d.1955 (Sitka Historical Society 1977). DeArmond (1993:266) also notes Thomas Tilson Jr’s election to School Board 1924, to City Council 1936, 1937, to Mayor 1939, 1940, First Commander Coast Guard |

---

286 Sitka was incorporated to become a Municipality of the second class – the first election in Alaska where women could vote – it was held 4 November 1913 (DeArmond 1995:111).
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67. Wachusetts</td>
<td>✓ Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other (vessel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Wortman Loop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Burkhart Drive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Harvest</td>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Jarvis</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Lance Drive</td>
<td>✓ Dr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Oceanview</td>
<td>✓ Ocean View (sic)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Peter Simpson</td>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tsimshian</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Price</td>
<td>✓ St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wachusetts**

Probably named after the USS *Wachusetts*, a 1032-ton *Iroquois* class screw sloop of war, commissioned in 1862, she was flagship of a special "Flying Squadron" sent to search for Confederate Navy raiders in the Caribbean, then the South Atlantic, the East Indies and Asiatic waters. In May 1880, she transferred to the Pacific, where she remained active until decommissioning in 1885 (http://history.navy.mil/photos/sh-usn/usnsh-w/wachust.htm 3/3/2007). She arrived in Sitka in July 1881 and left October 1882 (DeArmond 1993:270). “Wachusett is a Natick Indian (sic) word which means “near the mountain,”” (DeArmond 1995:205).

**Wortman Loop**

Probably after Charles E, former councillor and mayor during the 1930s, trustee of Pioneers’ home 1933, d.1963 (DeArmond 1993:272).

**Burkhart Drive**

Possibly after Ena Lillian, a resident in Sitka since 1913, d.1964, (DeArmond 1993:195).

**Harvest**

Sounds American

**Jarvis**

David H Jarvis, named Collector of Customs 1902 (DeArmond 1993:219).

**Lance Drive**

Sounds American

**Oceanview**

Sounds American

**Peter Simpson**

Peter Simpson was considered a Father of the Alaska Native Brotherhood, migrating to Sitka after spending time in Metlakatla village in British Columbia. He was a boatbuilder, who launched the WILLIAM for Rudolph Walton in 1909 and enlarged the boat shed in 1908, d1947 (DeArmond 1993:257). See also Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1994:49) photo with Sheldon Jackson, and commentary (pp665-676).

**Price**

DeArmond (1993:232) notes the municipal Government of Sitka approves the names Haley Avenue, Beardslee Way, Price Street and Jarvis Street 7/11/1976. Haley Ave was not used for a street name, but may have referred to the Hayley mines at Silver Bay owned by Baranov Mining Company 1928, or to Nicolas Haley, elected recorder by Sitka miners 1879 (in DeArmond
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Wolf Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Possibly named after Arthur P., who operated the Sitka Packing Company cannery in 1921 and 1922 (DeArmond 1993:272) or after the animal, however, given the different spelling of Wolff on the Chamber of Commerce map, the former explanation is most likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Edgecumbe Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Street probably named after the mountain which was named by Captain Cook after the mountain in England (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Bahrt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Probably after Henry Lauritz, Jr, deputy marshal, and then city clerk in the early 1920s, d.1941 (DeArmond 1993:190).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Gavan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>From the Russian Starrigavan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Verstovia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Probably after the mountain “southwest of downtown Sitka on Baranov Island which, according USGS maps, is really an unnamed peak. Mount Verstovia was originally named Gora Verstovia with Verstovia’s etymology coming from Vers — a Russian unit of distance equivalent .66 miles. Mount Verstovia is colloquially known as Mt Arrowhead,” <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mount_Verstovia">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mount_Verstovia</a> (4.3.2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Kostrometinoff</td>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Priest It is probable this street is named after the Kostrometinoff family who first came to Sitka in 1849 with John S working for RAC and the American Ice Company. George, who served as translator since 1884 for governors, judges, marshals etc. with his fluent Russian, English and knowledge of several native languages, was also a grocery and hardware store owner late 1870s, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was appointed Special Deputy Marshal 1897, and
ordained as Priest\textsuperscript{287} in ROC 1912; later, Peter J.
was elected to City Council 1928, was Mayor
1932 through 1936, d.1941 (DeArmond
1993:223). See also Cathedral Way explanation as
the current location of this street does not
resemble the earlier reference (aka Cathedral
Way) after the family that lived on it for many
years.

84. Shelikof Drive 3 Russian People
RAC employee
85. Chirikov Drive ✓ 3 Russian People
RAC employee
86. Davidoff ✓ St 3 Russian People
Sounds Russian
87. Vitskari Not on this
map 3 Russian People
Sounds Russian
88. Furuhelm ✓ 3 Other
(Finnish) People
Johan Hampus b 11 March 1821 in Finland d.
1909. Employed by RAC as Governor over
Russian colonies 1858 through 1863\textsuperscript{288}, (Sitka
Historical Society 1977 in
(http://www.genealogia.fi/place/index.htm,
accessed 05.03.2007))\textsuperscript{289}. Listed as Ivan Vasilevich
Furugelm (originally Johan Hampus Furuhelm
(Finnish) in sled.alaska.edu/akfaq/akoffpri.html
3.2.2007).
89. Nakwasina Not illustrated
on this map 3 Tingit People
Indigenous naming
90. Andrew P Hope Kaagusht’ei Missing on this
map 3 Tingit People
After “long time Sitka city councilman and
legislator,” (DeArmond 1995:91).
91. Charlie Joseph Kaal. atk’ Missing on this
map 3 Tingit People
Tlingit local resident
92. Rudolph Walton Kawootk’ Not on this
map 3 Tingit People
Tlingit local resident
Not on this map 157. Schuler Drive 4 American People
Sounds Jewish, possibly influence in new
subdivision
93. Halibut Point Road ✓ 4 American Nature
Road leading to Halibut Point, probably named
after place called Halibut Point. Grading and
surface started 1936 from Swan Lake to Halibut
Point, lots on HPR declared war surplus in 1947,

\textsuperscript{287} “When George Kostrometinoff died in 1915 he was buried in a concrete crypt beneath the floor of St Michael’s Cathedral. When the cathedral was rebuilt after the 1966 fire, the crypt was relocated outside the foundation of the new structure,” (DeArmond 1995:191).

\textsuperscript{288} Between 1859-1863 according to sled.alaska.edu/akfaq/akoffpri.html (3.2.2007).

\textsuperscript{289} The Society (1977) provides conflicting notes regarding Furuhelm, that “in 1935, the US Forest Service names Mount Furuhelm “for Ivan Vasilevitch Furuhelm, mining engineer and Governor of Russian America, 1859-1863.” Though a discrepancy in the first names exists, the reference to Furuhelm is consistent and is sufficient clarity for the purposes of this analysis.
<p>| 96. Darrin Drive | ✓ | 4 | American | People | Sounds American |
| 97. Darrin Way | Missing on this map | 4 | American | People | Sounds American |
| 98. Emmons | ✓ | St | American | People | 1887 Lieut. George Thornton Emmons (Navy) b 1852 Maryland, d.1945; studied Tlingit culture, writer, collector for American Museum of Natural History in NY; rep of Dept of the Interior for World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago 1893. He recommended to Pres Roosevelt to establish forest reserve in Alexander Archipelago. His book on Tlingit was finished by F de Laguna and published in 1991 by University of Washington Press. |
| 99. Hanlon | ✓ | 4 | American | People | Possibly after John G Hanlon originally coxswain on JAMESTOWN in 1879, served as deputy US Marshall many years; but probably after W R Hanlon, mayor in 1925, also ed. and pub of The Sitka Sun and Chief of Police |
| 100. Kincroft Way | ✓ | 4 | American | People | Sounds American |
| 102. Nicole Drive | ✓ | 4 | American | People | Sounds American |
| 103. Patterson Way | ✓ | 4 | American | People | C&amp;G Survey ship begins summer survey work 1891 – or could be after Dave Patterson, elected to Public Utilities Board 1962 (DeArmond 1993:240). |
| 105. Sand Dollar | ✓ | 4 | American | Nature | Sounds American |
| 106. Sharon | ✓ | 4 | American | People | Sounds American |
| 107. Somer | ✓ | 4 | American | People | Possibly after Sommers, Ernest who was elected to the school board in 1949 (DeArmond 1993:260). |
| 108. Brightman | ✓ | 4 | American | People | Possibly after James L Sr, councillor in 1930, or |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Cedar Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Granite Creek</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Green Lake Road</td>
<td>✓ Not on this map</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>Harbor Mtn Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Islander Drive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Jamestown Drive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other (vessel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Knutson Drive</td>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Nelson Logging Road</td>
<td>✓ On map, street not listed in directory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Rand</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Remington</td>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek Blvd</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

James L Jr councillor in 1945 and partner in radio station KBW 1047, or Miss Marie Louise, City Librarian d.1987 (DeArmond 1993:194).

Harbor Mountain Road was constructed during World War II to provide access for building a lookout and other military installations at the top of the mountain, (http://www.fs.fed.us/r10/tongass/recreation/rec_f acilities/sitkatrails.html 4.3.2007)

Harbor Mountain Road was constructed during World War II to provide access for building a lookout and other military installations at the top of the mountain.

Possibly after Larry, elected to the Assembly in 1976 and 1980 (DeArmond 1993:238).

Probably after Clarence Rands (though it is Rand (no ‘s’) Street) who was responsible for retail sales at the Columbia Lumber Co mill in 1938 as the street is located in zone 4. Clarence also served as councillor between 1943-1945, and his wife Hopewell was the first woman elected to council in 1946 (DeArmond 1993:246).

Sawmill Creek was surveyed as a possible pulp mill site in 1948 (after flooding washed away the power plant in 1936 and knocked out generators in 1942). Prior to this, in 1809, Ivan Vasiliev, the Russian navigator called the stream “Reka Medvyzhya” or Bear River. Medvejie Lake and the Medvejie Lake valley is nestled between Bear Mountain and Cupola Peak where the transliteration of the Russian ‘bear’ is retained in the American context. Tebenkof showed this name on a 1850 map, where he also put a sawmill. When the Coast and Geodetic Survey redrew the map, they renamed it Sawmill Creek (according to DeArmond 1995:202-203). The road, started in
Memorial Park Cemetery

1921, was mostly paid for by the Alaska Road Commission (2500) with a contribution (500) from the City. The gravel surface was paved eventually in the late 1950s, no doubt to help support the building of the pulp mill by the Japanese group, Alaska Lumber & Pulp Company who commenced operations in the mid-1950s through to 1993. DeArmond’s reference is to Sawmill Creek Road, not Boulevard as recorded on the Caputo map, (DeArmond 1993:251).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>Seaview Heights</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Shotgun Alley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Shuler Drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Sunset Drive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>Valhalla Drive</td>
<td>✓ Dr</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>Viking Way</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>Walton Circle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>Witz Lane</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Jacob’s Circle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>Bahovec</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>Chubaroff</td>
<td>✓ Ln</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>Kuhnle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>Anna Drive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>Kainulainen</td>
<td>✓ Dr</td>
<td>Other (Finnish)</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DeArmond’s reference is to Sawmill Creek Road, not Boulevard as recorded on the Caputo map, (DeArmond 1993:251).

Dr Robert arrived as Chief Medical Officer 1949, elected to school board 1959, 1961, 1963 and 1968, President of school board 1962, d.1971 (DeArmond 1993:257).

Possibly from Old Norse Valhöll, "Hall of the slain" as a ‘heaven equivalent’ or the home for those slain gloriously in battle. Those who do not get to Valhalla end up in the home of the dead (Hel), a place beneath the underworld. Valhalla is a 19th century English mistranslation of the singular Valňóll, (http://answers.com 4.3.2007)

Illustrates Nordic influence in Sitka

After Robert, and his wife, born in Germany, opened Witz Brewery in 1894, and in 1899 built a two storey dance hall, billiard parlor, bar and bowing alley building; d. 1915 (DeArmond 1995:7-8). Witz Hall on Baranov Street was razed in 1929 (DeArmond 1993:272).

POSSIBLY after Mark Jacobs Sr, Tlingit leader and former Grand President of the ANB d.1977 (DeArmond 1993:162)

I, listed as sailmaker 1879 (DeArmond 1993:197).

Named for Gerald (Jerry) D, former firefighter in Sitka, wounded in the Russian Orthodox Church.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>134. Mikele</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Sounds Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135. Bernson (sic)</td>
<td>✓ Benson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>After Tlingit master carver who designed totem pole in totem square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. Hope</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Andrew, b. 1896, elected Councillor between 1924 and 1952. Elected to Alaska House of Reps various years between 1994-1960; introduced a bill to permit Natives to enter the Pioneers’ Home 1950; Boatbuilder, d. 1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. Airport Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. Admiralty</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. Alice Loop</td>
<td>✓ Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. Lifesaver Drive</td>
<td>✓ Lifesaver Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>(near hospital and search and rescue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. Palmer Drive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. Seward290</td>
<td>✓ Ave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>See Seward Street for origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. Tongass</td>
<td>✓ Dr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Sounds American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. Galena Avenue</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146. Kruzof</td>
<td>✓ Dr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Probably named after Kruzof Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147. Lazaria</td>
<td>✓ Dr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>Not on this map</td>
<td>Toivo Circle291</td>
<td>Other (Finnish)</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Toivo is a Finnish male name (toivo = hope). Named for Toivo M Anderson, (1910-1991), who pioneered salmon trolling at Fairweather Grounds 150 miles north of Sitka. Resided in Pelican at Lisianski Inlet, moved later to Sitka. (<a href="http://www.genealogia.fi/place/streetake.htm">http://www.genealogia.fi/place/streetake.htm</a> accessed 10.10.2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

290 Two streets in Sitka are named Seward, the first is Seward Street in the CBD, the second is Seward Avenue on Japonski Island.
291 Toivo Circle is added to this data table for completeness. It is the 161th street in Sitka. It is identified in the analysis for Sitka’s Finnish influence (6 streets in total) however is not further analysed as it was only identified as a new street during final manuscript revisions on 10 October 2009 (post oral examination).
Appendix 8: Palimpsest at Historic/Homelands Spiritual Sites in July 2000 – Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic or Homeland Site</th>
<th>Old Sitka State Historic Site</th>
<th>Sheet’ka Kwáan Naa Kahida Tribal Community House (+ Katlian District)</th>
<th>Castle Hill (American Flag Raising Site)</th>
<th>Sitka National Historic Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>6 miles north of present Sitka settlement on Starrigavan Bay</td>
<td>Katlian St, Central Sitka, NNW entrance to harbour</td>
<td>Central Sitka, at entrance to harbour</td>
<td>Area at the mouth of Indian River in the present Park boundary (106 Metlakatla Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Site Use</strong></td>
<td>National Historic Site as of 1966; State owned and managed.</td>
<td>Sheet’ka Kwáan Naa Kahida dedicated on 24 May 1997 as the Community Clan House, or “The House for the People of Sitka,” (Field research 2000)</td>
<td>National Historical site designation for “American Flag Raising Site” 1966 (annual ceremony 18 Oct)</td>
<td>1972 re-designated a National Historical Park. The Kiks.ádi Fort site had been on Register in 1966. Federal ownership. Park management has moved from Federal to local Sitka tribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naming Sequencing</strong></td>
<td>Gájaa Héen</td>
<td>Indian Village</td>
<td>Noow Tlein</td>
<td>Shaaseiyi.Aan (Jamestown Bay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkhangel’sk Mikhailovskaya</td>
<td>Native Village</td>
<td>Russian Castle (Krause 1885)</td>
<td>Shis’k’l Noow (fort site in Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ranche</td>
<td>Russian Town</td>
<td>Lover’s Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katlian District</td>
<td>Baranov’s Castle</td>
<td>Totem Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Use Recorded</strong></td>
<td>former Kiks.ádi summer village (Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:64)</td>
<td>historic evidence of shell middens placing Tlingit there thousands of years</td>
<td>Former Kiks.ádi village Noow Tlein (to 1804) (big fort)</td>
<td>“Indian River is called Kaasdahéen by the natives and originally belonged to the Kiks.ádi clan…the native village of Sitka extended from the mouth of the river to Jamestown Bay….the village there was Shaaseiyi.aan,” (George Lewis #55, in Goldschmidt and Haas 1998:64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Alteration</strong></td>
<td>NEGOTIATED: First Russian settlement in 1794 Arkhangel’sk Mikhailovskaya Exchanged goods for permission to use site.</td>
<td>CONFLICT: Battle between Kiks.ádi and Russians in 1804, Tlingit physically leave area with Survival March of 1804.</td>
<td>CONFLICT: Battle between Kiks.ádi and Russians in 1804, Russians build new settlement at Novo Arhangel’sk (Castle Hill) with Governor’s House and palisade.</td>
<td>CONFLICT: Site of Tlingit “Fort of young saplings,” used for defence against Russians in Battle of 1804. Fort razed by Russians during 1804 battle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

292 The entrance has two large ornately carved doors with the remainder of the building a quite plain wooden structure. Photos 5-9 show the interior features made of wood and concrete, which include the central firepit and smokehole, circular seating, ornate carvings, and a range of Native artwork and historic photographs. Functions of the House include death and marriage ceremonies, dancing, etc. Tlingit elder (Name withheld, Interview 15, Sitka, 06 July 2000) said the last potlatch was in January 2000.

293 In 1890 President Benjamin Harrison established a 50 acre park at the mouth of Indian River. President Taft made it into Sitka National Monument in 1910. Increased government and public attention meant investment to improve road and walking access, and curb erosion, Chaney, et al. (1995:119-122).

294 DeArmond (1993:86) referring to the first cadastral survey in 1941 by the US Land Office.
Second & Subsequent Alterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFLICT:</th>
<th>NEGOTIATED:</th>
<th>NEGOTIATED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1802 Tlingit massacre of Russian settlers.</td>
<td>Kiks.ádi return and co-locate with the Russians.</td>
<td>Governor’s house burns 1894, built new Baranov ’s Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian memorials placed at Old Sitka and Park site between 1804 and 1850 (Tikhmenev 1979:136)</td>
<td>Krause (1885:106) estimates ~1822 when spatially divided into the ‘Indian Village.’</td>
<td>Flag changing at Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naa Kahida site:</td>
<td>1867 - Use of Russian buildings for US government; repair stockade in 1876 (DeArmond 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• first building Governor’s House in the 1880s which was later used as a Navy hospital in 1908</td>
<td>1936 Custom House burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bureau of Indian Affairs school was erected on the site in 1927</td>
<td>New concrete federal building for City Hall (DeArmond 1995:76-78).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School razed in 1985 and the space used as a parking lot until the “city relinquished the lot to the Sitka Tribe of Alaska,” to put up a new building as a cultural centre.</td>
<td>Now flags only on hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

295 The 1850 Teben'kov chart of Sitka Sound represents a distinct vertical symbol which suggests this map feature may represent either the actual Russian grave site or a monument to the Russian sailors killed in 1804...the 1818 Golovnin chart of Sitka Sound which shows a vertical symbol labelled “Pamyatniki” [monument or memorial] at the site of the 1802 battle at Old Sitka,” (Chaney, et al. 1995:126). Tikhmenev (1978:136) also states, “There is no indication that the gravesite at Old Sitka was marked at the time of the burial and it is unlikely that the location of the interment would have been known to the returning Russians in 1804...It appears that monuments commemorating the loss of Russian lives at both the 1802 and 1804 battle sites were placed at the locations of these battles sometime between 1804 and 1850. It is almost certain that the monument at Old Sitka did not mark an actual burial site and probably the one at the mouth of Indian River did not mark an actual grave site either...the location indicated as the Russian “gravesite” in 1958 was shown by excavation to be a memorial and not a burial site and the disposition of the bodies of the Russians who died in the 1804 battle remains historically undocumented.”

296 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment Order</th>
<th>Study Site #</th>
<th>Name of Resting Place</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Establishment Date</th>
<th>Sample Tombstone Dates</th>
<th>Access Road (M/R)*</th>
<th>Largest Size</th>
<th>Size Estimate</th>
<th>Parking Lot**</th>
<th>Burial Category (S,M,L)</th>
<th>Approx # Burials</th>
<th>Development Zone</th>
<th>City Zoning</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Surrounding Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Cemetery (incl Trinity Cemetery)</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox</td>
<td>Erler Street (to N)</td>
<td>1836+</td>
<td>1848, 1897, 1894,</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;5acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>~500+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R1 &amp; R2</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Residential &amp; other cem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lutheran Cemetery</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>Princess Way</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;2acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>~60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>other cemeteries, residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Presbyterian Cemetery</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek Rd + Sisters Lane</td>
<td>late 1880s</td>
<td>1908, 1910, 1924, 1932</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt;1acre</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>~60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>other cemeteries surround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ANB (Indian River Road/Tlingit) Cemetery</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Indian River Road</td>
<td>late 1880s</td>
<td>1902, 1909, 1947, 1988</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;4acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>~300-500+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>safety academy, residences adjacent, forest behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sitka National Cemetery</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek Rd</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>late 1930s to present</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3acres</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>other cemeteries, park/forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old City Cemetery</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Only access via Pioneers or Moose Cemetery</td>
<td>post WW2</td>
<td>1948, 1959,</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;4acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>~120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Lies b/w Pioneer and Moose Cem, Residences &amp; Park/forest (Gavan Head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moose Cemetery</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Baranov St/Geodetic Way (exit to S)</td>
<td>late 1930s</td>
<td>1939, 1940, 1945, 1951</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>~3acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>~200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>other cemeteries, forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pioneers (Home) Cemetery</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>End of Arrowhead St</td>
<td>post 1934</td>
<td>1970s thru 1940s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1.5acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>~108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>residential homes, Old City Cem, forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sitka Memorial (Park) Cemetery</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek Rd + Sisters Lane</td>
<td>1981*</td>
<td>1983, 1990s to present</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;4.5acres</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>~300+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>other cemeteries, park/forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* M=Main road (Halibut Point Road, Sawmill Creek Road or Lincoln); R= residential street.
** L = Large with space for > 20 cars.
*** S/M/L = S (small < 100 burials); M (medium 100-300 burials); L (Large > 300 burials).
## Appendix 10: Palimpsest at Places of Worship Spiritual Sites in July 2000 – Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiritual Landscape:</th>
<th>St Michael’s Russian Orthodox Cathedral</th>
<th>Russian Bishop’s House</th>
<th>Sitka Lutheran Church</th>
<th>St Peter’s Episcopal Church By-the-Sea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>“Sits in the middle of Lincoln Street, with traffic parting around it. It has always been in the middle of the street.” 297</td>
<td>Lincoln Street</td>
<td>Lincoln Street between Russian Cathedral and Castle Hill Site</td>
<td>611 Lincoln Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership and Management</strong></td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church in America (private)</td>
<td>National Park Service (managed locally by STA)</td>
<td>Originally Lutheran mission of Finland; Now Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (private)</td>
<td>National Episcopal Church, Diocese of Alaska (private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Use Recorded</strong></td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Bishop’s residence, school, orphanage</td>
<td>Dedicated in 1843, first Lutheran Church on the West Coast of North America</td>
<td>Church (cornerstone laid in 1899) and See House post 1903 (Ricketts 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Alteration</strong></td>
<td>Burned down by fire in Jan 1966</td>
<td>NPS purchased in 1972 and restoration (took 16 years) was only alteration</td>
<td>Church building was torn down in 1888298 as, “the building fell into decay,” (Maakestad ed, 1967:10). Worship in homes and public buildings until 1942 (Field Research 2000).</td>
<td>1996 Project to restore Church and later See House (structural upgrades and deficiencies) completed as at 2008299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


298 “In the summer of 1888, US Judge LaFayette-Dawson, considering the edifice to have become a public nuisance…and ordered the removal of the building…at the same time the lot to be fenced in with suitable material…obtained from the torn down building,” (article from Brandt Collection, NPS, on-site research 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Site #</th>
<th>Name of Place of Worship*</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Development Zone</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Street (M/R) #</th>
<th>Building Material</th>
<th>Establishment Date</th>
<th>Est Category</th>
<th>FW/Region</th>
<th>Parking (S,M,L) ***</th>
<th>Direction Facing</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>First Baptist Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>Halibut Point Rd 514</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1955/1959</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(First) Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek Hwy 505</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1945/1950</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Church of the Nazarene</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>Lake Rd 305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood/stone</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Testament Lighthouse Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek Rd 2507</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Residential - R1LDMH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>St Michael's Cathedral</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Orthodoxy</td>
<td>Lincoln (Box 697)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St Peter's By-The-Sea Episcopal Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>Lincoln (POB 1130) 611</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood/stone</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S slight incline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist Church (&amp; School)</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>Halibut Point Rd 1613</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sheldon Jackson Chapel</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>Lincoln St 801</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>e1887</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sitka Lutheran Church - ELCA</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>Lincoln St 224</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>e1843/b1942/1967</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Trinity Baptist Church CBA</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>Halibut Point Rd 1904</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1MH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NE slight incline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Mormons</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek/Shotgun</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Residential - R1LDMH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Victory Christian Fellowship &amp; Bible Training</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Halibut Point Rd 1007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>brick</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Sawmill Creek Rd 405</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>early 1900s</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pioneer House Chapel</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S slight incline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bishop's House Chapel</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Orthodoxy</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>S slight incline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sitka Assembly of God</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>Kimsham 214</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1st in 1942; b1954; c1960s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grace (Evangelical) Lutheran Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>Tilson (&amp; Kimsham) 304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>reloc-1984</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>St Gregory Catholic Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Etolin Street 606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>e1885/b1922/b1973</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S slight incline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Sitka Church of God) Sitka Christian Centre</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>Hirst 502</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>United Methodist Church of Sitka</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Kimsham 303</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>slight incline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>United Penecostal Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Penecostal</td>
<td>Cascade Creek Rd 101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1MH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Edgecumbe Dr 1113</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential - R1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>on hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jehovah's Witnesses Kingdom Hall</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Independent (Jehovah)</td>
<td>Monastery 519</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unitarian Universalists Association</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Independent*</td>
<td>Marine 408</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential - R2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Names of Places of Worship in **bold** are on the National Historic Register.
** M=Main road (Halibut Point Road, Sawmill Creek Road or Lincoln); R= residential street.
*** E/W/R/E = Established E (before WW2, more than 55years ago); W (post-war 30-55yrs); R (recent < 30yrs)
**** S/M/L = S (small < 10 car parks); M (medium 10-20 car parks); L (Large > 20 car parks).
***** Direction facing N (north), S (south), W (west) or E (east).

**Denominations without a separate physical place of worship visible in landscape (n=6) including:**
The Baha'i Faith (Study classes & devotional meetings); Christian Science; Eckankar; Quaker; and Lifeword Ministries.
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