The media have often been related to nation-state building and the generation of national sentiment, but because few ethnic minorities can afford to maintain their own media systems, they generally remain relatively powerless. Indigenous land claims, legal settlements that guarantee territorial sovereignty to an ethnic group, are one way of consolidating self-rule and accumulating capital to create a media system. The Inupiat, an indigenous population of the North American Arctic, have successfully settled land claims suits, allowing them a great deal of political and economic independence. They have also developed their own television and print media, encouraging the maintenance of their culture and addressing their concerns in their own language. In contrast, the Samis, an indigenous population of Sweden, have not had the same success in land claims settlements, and have not been free to develop a high level of economic and political autonomy. Hence, the Samis do not run their own media; a brief weekly television show broadcasts news of interest to Samis but few are employed by the station, and a state-run magazine for them prints articles in Swedish, rather than their own language. It is clear that Inupiat devolution—the process of acquiring self government—is at a more advanced stage than Sami devolution because of the land claims variable. (Thirty-one references are included.) (JC)
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ABSTRACT

Existing theory and research on development communication favors a statist view, but ethnic cultural minorities can and have made use of development communication outside the traditional concept of the nation-state. Development communication for these groups both emerges from and results in greater levels of self-determination. Such media systems are prohibitively expensive for most ethnic minorities, and in many cases their host state forbids minority control of media. Using the Inupiats of Alaska and the Samis of Sweden, it is shown that an indigenous people need both an economic and political capability to develop their own media. A crucial factor in this regard is a favorable settlement of land claims disputes, a settlement that deeds economic and political sovereignty over traditional land to the indigenous inhabitants. Sovereignty over their lands creates a climate in which ethnic minorities can develop an indigenous media system, consolidate self-rule, and promote indigenous nationalism.
Indigenous Self-Determination and Media Development: 
The Land Claims Variable

Much has been said about the uses of mass media in nation-state building, most of it concentrating on the ability of mass media to generate a nationalistic sentiment (e.g. Deutsch, Schramm, de Sola Poole). Media is related to statehood and nationhood, although they are very different things. Those who have addressed the issue of self-determination and media have usually done it in a statist manner; they have ignored the cultural autonomies that exist within states in favor of political imbalances that exist between states (e.g. Schiller, Smythe, Hettne). Yet ethnic minorities are increasingly demanding self-rule, spurred on by what Louis Snyder calls "the aspiration of a people who believe themselves to be united to rule themselves and not to be controlled by others."1 Snyder feels that three factors have led to the increased desire for self-determination on the part of ethnic minorities: modernization, the impact of World Wars I and II, and better communication.2


2Ibid.
Communication is an integral symbiotic factor in the growth of ethnic self-determination: it leads to it and emanates from it. Ethnic minorities which acquire political self-determination enable themselves to consolidate an economic base and to maintain a media system. Managing a media system is very expensive, and few ethnic minorities can accumulate the capital necessary to control one themselves. The alternative is a media system owned and managed by the state, but made available to the minority. Such a situation wrests real control away from the indigenous people. Indigenous land claims, legal settlements that guarantee territorial sovereignty to an ethnic group, are one way of consolidating self-rule and accumulating capital to create a media system. With a media system in place, an ethnic minority can then go about the business of running a state and building nationalism. The importance of self-determination in media development can be determined through a comparison of two minority cultures, the Inupiat of Alaska and the Sami of Sweden. These two peoples form a useful comparison because of the similarity of their material culture (nomadic, shamanic), of their geography (polar), and of their host states (affluent Western industrial powers).

The process of acquiring self-government is called devolution, although the term is not commonly used in the United States. The literature on devolution comes mostly out of Western Europe, where states are constantly striking a balance between majority and minority wishes.3 Due to its cultural diversity, Great Britain is noted for a particularly high level of

devolution (including the Welsh, Scots and Irish), but Spain and Canada have also been sites of ethnic nationalistic referenda.\textsuperscript{4} There is no reason, however, why devolution should not be applied in the USA. D. Ronen includes North America as one of the areas of "ethnic self-determination," what he considers the dominant form of self-determination since the 1960s.\textsuperscript{5} There is every indication that the process is occurring in the U.S. as well, although it goes on relatively unnoticed by communication scholars.

An argument could be made that devolution is a kind of political deconstruction. Derrida shows that literature can be taken apart, and that in its fragmentation meaning is assigned. Fragmentation is the essence of devolution -- meaning is in particulars if it is anywhere at all.\textsuperscript{6} Just as meaning falls apart in deconstruction, political systems fall apart in devolution. This can be seen as another element of postmodernism, the sweeping intellectual and popular reaction against modernism. Jonathan Arac's essay on the relationship of postmodernism and politics states that postmodernism is "notable for its international and interdisciplinary


\textsuperscript{6}Deconstruction, of course, postulates that there is no center, no final meaning. Devolution finds political meaning in ethnic tribes. Deconstruction and devolution are similar in process but not in product.
extent. The phenomenon has been related to deconstruction, religion, physics, and to the growth of a new dark age. In the case of postmodern politics, the term "anti-modernism" may even be appropriate; either way, postmodern politics embody a rejection of traditional ways of doing things. Through the process of devolution, minority groups attain increasing levels of self-determination until they finally function as a state. The Inupiat have, for all practical purposes, developed into a state.

A useful definition of "state" can be found in Hedley Bull’s *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Bull describes states as:

independent political communities, each of which possesses a government and asserts sovereignty in relation to a particular portion of the earth's surface and a particular segment of the human population. On the one hand, states assert, in relation to this territory and population, what may be called internal sovereignty, which means supremacy over all other authorities within that territory and population. On the other hand, they assert what may be called external sovereignty, by


8 Arac. Ibid.


which is meant not supremacy but independence of outside authorities.12

Sovereignty, then, is a characteristic property of a state, while sovereignty may or may not be related to nationalism. For most indigenous peoples, sovereignty means freedom from outside authority. Sovereignty means territory. The Inupiat have been successful in delineating territory within Alaska through land claims and through the establishment of a Western-type political organ, the North Slope Borough. They have not been successful at consolidating the entire North American Arctic through the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, a group designed to unify Inuits across the globe irrespective of their host states.13 The Samis have not been successful at formally establishing a territory at all, as will be shown. Prior to the favorable settlement of a land claims suit, an indigenous people has neither the political power nor the economic capability of establishing a media system of their own. With the favorable settlement of such a suit, they are free to and capable of establishing such a system; this further consolidates their self-rule and allows for the promotion of ethnic nationalism. The Inupiat land claims suit was successful, whereas the Sami suit was not. What accounts for the differences, and how have they both deployed mass media given their level of self-determination?


13The ICC has received United Nations Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) status, however.
Self-determination has meant for the Inupiat the freedom and capability to institute an indigenous media system. The Inupiat have been able to attain this high level of self-determination as a result of many interlocking phenomena. First, the laissez-faire attitude of the Alaskan state and the U.S. federal governments resulted in Inupiat economic autonomy. Second, the discovery and exploitation of natural resources resulted in an economic power base. Finally, U.S. treaties with Native Americans allowed them, in principle, a great deal of political independence. Paradoxically, the more the government ignored the Inupiat, the more they were able to develop.

While the economy of the United States is not truly a laissez-faire economy, it is closer to being so than most other world economies. This liberal philosophy is not confined to just the economy; it applies to political as well as to economic institutions. In the case of arctic Alaska, laissez-faire attitudes left the Natives relatively free to feast or famine, so to speak. Compared to the policy of the Swedish government, this seems to be a policy of indifference.

A laissez-faire attitude has manifested itself in several ways in arctic Alaska. The State of Alaska allowed industry to develop in the arctic at whatever rate industry desired to grow; it was not extensively controlled. The state government for the most part remained uninvolved in arctic affairs. It was only with the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA),
a legal movement designed to get indigenous control over the land, that the state and federal government began to get involved in the finances of the Native Alaskans. In court, the 'nupiat won the right to tax the land and the oil.

While the state embodied a laissez-faire attitude, the Inupiat as embodied in the North Slope Borough (NSB), the regional government established by the Inupiats, have opted for a more planned economy. Revenue from ANCSA and the oil taxes has not been given directly to individuals, but held in trust through the village and regional corporations (e.g. ASRC, the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation). The goal of these corporations has been to increase the quality of life of the indigenous people while increasing corporation revenue. This has meant the growth of hospitals, schools and media services. The economy is now closely tied to the indigenous government.

The rest of the state acknowledges the extensive power that the Inupiat wield through their regional corporation and the government of the North Slope Borough. Because it has the power to form its own laws and its own tax base, the borough is free to act independently. With power and money accumulating in the Arctic, many southern Alaskans and members of the legislature now desire much more political and economic control over the North Slope Borough. Inupiat leaders feel that "hands off" was a policy only long as there was nothing desirable to put southern hands on.

---

14Interview with Tom Shackle, North Slope Borough Video Production Manager, Barrow, Alaska, June 20, 1984.
Self-determination was attained through a compromise of traditional and Western politics. Citizens of the North Slope voted on a home-rule charter that had been drafted by borough leaders. The charter was ratified, which substantiated the power of the Inupiat tribal-state. According to Thomas Morehouse:

Home-rule status provided a general grant of power to the borough, giving it all powers of home rule not prohibited by law or the charter itself. Significantly, on the North Slope, home rule enhanced the feeling of self-determination. In the words of a borough legal expert "home rule makes the people feel like they are their own source of law."\(^{15}\)

This high level of Inupiat autonomy stems from the important difference between tribal government and the government of the North Slope Borough. A tribal government is the traditional government, just as it was before the coming of the Southerners. The North Slope Borough, formally chartered within the Southerner's rules, accepts Southern political forms while traditional tribal government does not. It marries the ancient concept of tribe to the modern concept of state. Its authority cannot be easily challenged by Juneau.

The oil taxation revenue gathered from the Alaskan Pipeline has made the North Slope Borough more financially independent than other Native governments within the state of Alaska. The pipeline produces 1.5 billion

barrels every day, which is about 20% of all U.S. production.16 By 1978, the per capita worth of the borough was $1,180,000; that makes it very wealthy compared with an average of $47,342 for the rest of the state.17 This has given the borough sufficient financial security to support cultural and linguistic projects; the borough is one of the few places in Alaska where Native cultural projects receive ample funding.

The Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the North Slope Borough Government are responsible for the indigenous electronic media found in the arctic. Money held in trust by ASRC and taxed from oil by the NSB have bought the Inupiat a viable media system. The ASRC established and maintains a cable television facility that regularly telecasts Inupiat language and Inupiat cultural programming. Originally, the Inupiat TV production facility, which includes a television studio, portable production equipment and professional editing equipment, was maintained by the ASRC. When the facility did not generate profits in line with the ASRC’s charge, the facility was sold to the borough government. It is paid for, then, by revenues from the taxed land acquired through land claims. One regular show, UKKAQATIGILAKUUT (“Let’s Talk With...”), is a half-hour Inupiat-language interview show featuring village elders; there are others like it. There is also a privately-owned radio station in Barrow, and it also broadcasts Inupiat language programming. Since all of these media facilities are owned by


Inupiats, they directly address Inupiat concerns. They are helping to instil the sense of a national culture among the residents of the North Slope, adding to the devolutionary process.

Devolution can also go from state-to-state, resulting in what Snyder calls "macro-nationalism." In addition to its autonomy within Alaska and the United States, the Inupiat have a measure of international autonomy. The goal of many Inupiat leaders and the Inuit in Canada and Greenland is to share a pan-arctic nation-state. Through the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, which the borough was instrumental in founding, freedom of travel between the three member countries has been encouraged, and the ICC has issued Inuit passports just as a state would. The goal of a pan-arctic state remains elusive, however, due to resistance from the southern states that claim territory in arctic lands. The ICC also sponsors media, including Inuit Arctic Policy Review magazine and networked television coverage of ICC conventions and meetings.

Using media, the borough has gone beyond national politics to form international political alliances with Greenland and Canada, receiving United Nations recognition as an NGO (non-governmental organization) in the process. It has brought grievances with national policies to the international arena, particularly on matters of oil extraction and environmental safety.


It has also argued internationally on behalf of Inuit whaling rights to the International Whaling Commission; mayor Eugene Brower spent several weeks in Argentina in the Spring of 1984 protesting the quotas put on subsistence whalers.\(^{21}\) They have also joined the World Council of Indigenous Peoples, to indicate their "solidarity with the struggles of other Native peoples throughout the world to achieve self-determination and the free exercise of their rights."\(^{22}\) In addition to the statewide network of Alaskan Natives (AFN) in which the North Slope has been instrumental, they are also seeking a complete alliance of arctic peoples by carrying on discussions with the Samis.\(^{23}\)

Inupiat media has been a result of taxes or commercial ventures. The Alaskan Federation of Natives (AFN -- a group that instigated ANCSA and unifies all Alaskan Natives) has been responsible for some media, too, though in a different way from the ASRC and NSB; it addresses the needs of all Alaskan Natives, so it must be more generalized. Chief among the AFN media outlets is the privately owned *Tundra Times*, a weekly newspaper for all Alaskan Natives. The *Times* is published in English because of the many cultures it addresses. Sponsorship is through advertising and subscription. It is owned privately by Natives, and has become a very vocal organ on their behalf. It was instrumental in Alaskan Native devolution, helping to bring

\(^{21}\)Interview with Bud Seagrams, Acting Mayor of the North Slope Borough, Barrow, Alaska, June 22, 1984.


about ANCSA. Tundra Times is the parent of Inupiat self-determination and of all Inupiat media.

Devolution in Alaska has made its enemies along the way. Inupiat self-determination is generally resented by the state government. The borough's formal Native government is separate from state government; except for ten federal crimes, the Borough can make laws and enforce them as it sees fit. This makes state politicians sensitive to the devolution issue. William Clark, the Secretary of the Interior, stated in a 1984 address that "it's clear we can have only one state here, and that is the state of Alaska." Alaskan Governor Bill Sheffield had always resisted the Natives' attempts to form what he called "mini-nations." His supporters felt that the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act meant Natives had relinquished all of their territorial base, and that without a territorial base there could be no autonomy. Deputy Undersecretary Bill Horn stated that, "there is no such thing as a non-territorial sovereignty." The Alaska Federation of Natives took the position that ownership of the land is not the only prerequisite to


27 Ibid., p. 9.
jurisdiction over it. They felt that Natives still had authority over the land, and therefore had a legitimate claim to governmental powers.28

While the Southerners tended to use southern media, Native frustration was vented in the Native press. John L. Heffle, president of the Association of Interior Eskimos, spoke for the devolutionary position in the August 8, 1984 *Tundra Times*. In that letter, Heffle argues that:

> The state has no inherent jurisdiction over Indian affairs within the confines of tribes who have sovereignty and are a government within a government...the chief and tribal councils had only the good of the people in mind and were a conscientious and dedicated group. We do not need outside influence to subject us to ill treatment nor do the non-Natives attempt to understand the age old customs and a way of life foreign to them. If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and if only one person was contrary, man would be no more justified in silencing that one than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing us all.29

Interestingly, Heffle's last sentence quotes J. S. Mill, the champion of utilitarian liberalism. For at least this Alaskan Native, the issue of self-determination was related to such liberties as freedom of speech.

The Inupiat have been very successful, but areas of Alaska and the Arctic that have relied on tribal government instead of tribal state have


29 *Heffle, op. cit., pp. 7, 14.*

16
been somewhat less fortunate in the realization of self-determination. The differentiating factor has been entitlement to the land, and since land means wealth, Inuits without land tend to be poor and media powerless. The Canadian Inuits, for example, have found it difficult to receive governmental support, particularly in cultural matters. The ICC has supported the Canadian Inuits’ efforts toward self-determination. Canadian executive members of the ICC place responsibility for this problem on the Canadian Inuits’ lack of an economic base: “While Greenland has a home rule political structure with independent revenue sources, and Alaska has a general claims settlement, Canada is nowhere near such a situation.” Apart from one single operation in Québec, the Canadian Inuits have no independently financed organizations.

Why did Inupiat statehood come about? The borough’s rapid accumulation of capital is the chief factor contributing to its political autonomy and its cultural longevity. A small measure of autonomy preceded the accumulation, obviously; it was the freedom to politically incorporate that allowed the Borough to establish its tax base, as a result of Alaskan laissez-faire politics. Media was integral to the process. The Tundra Times was used to bring about a favorable land claims settlement, and after capital

---


32 Ibid.
began accumulating media flourished. *Tundra Times* endures but is joined by other media brought about through the land claim it engineered.

**Sami Self-Determination and Media**

The Samis have not devolved as successfully as the Inupiat. Close ties with the Swedish state have kept the Samis from establishing much self-determination. There are, however, some indications of devolution among the Swedish Samis. Sami media tend to be owned and managed by the Swedish state, not by the Samis.

Just as Inupiat land claims meant the financial and political autonomy necessary to indigenize the media system, the failure of Sami land claims has meant media has not been indigenized. A legal turning point in Sami self-determination was the Taxed Mountains case, which occurred just a few years after ANCSA. The Samis claimed indigenous rights to some silver-rich mountain areas, claiming that they had traditionally been Sami lands, but the Swedish courts twice settled against their claims.33 The ability of the Samis to indigenize was severely crippled.

Why did Sami land claims fail whereas Inupiat land claims succeeded? The Swedish state desired to be closely involved in Samiland, resulting in Sami economic dependency. The discovery and exploitation of natural resources led to a heated legal battle, and the Swedish government has not

---

granted any special self-rule status to the Samis on the basis that they would also have to award it to other minority groups. The Swedish state clearly regards the Samis as citizens of exactly equal status as others, with little binding consideration given to the Samis' historical control of Samiland.

While the initial force guiding Southern development of the Alaskan Arctic was a laissez-faire political-economy, the initial force guiding Southern development of Samiland was social darwinism, at least according to many Sami leaders. Social darwinism is the application of the "survival of the fittest" concept to human social situations; it is most often used to justify the elimination of one culture by another, "stronger" culture. Tomas Cramer, the Sami counsel, suggests that social darwinism dominated 19th Century development of Samiland, a proposition Professor Gunnar Eriksson explored at length. He concluded that social darwinism on the part of the Swedish government inhibited Sami land claims.

For Eriksson, the first evidence of Swedish social darwinism appears in 1886, when Swedish Supreme court judge Knut Olivercrona stated in his legal capacity that he "was satisfied to see the superior agricultural Swedish culture winning over Sami culture which he was convinced was obstructing the advance of a superior civilization." According to a Riksdag special committee on the legislation confronting Olivercrona,

...the possession of the land, as taken by the Lapps, was not by its nature such that it contained all the

authority belonging to the concept of the right of ownership, but only that required by the limited needs of nomadic life...From the beginning, then, the Lapp's right to the land has never been such that it has stood in the way of simultaneous establishment of (a right of) ownership in modern civilization's meaning of the word.35

Olivercrona's views, and the general sentiment of the Riksdag during the Reindeer Grazing Act legislation, became important a century later in the Taxed Mountains case. As legal counsel to the Samis, Cramer submitted Olivercrona's statements in his court presentation, hoping to prove that previous legislation had been based on the social darwinian principle and expecting the court to reinterpret the old legislation. After losing the case, Cramer felt that the Supreme Court ignored the social darwinian evidence. In so doing, he asserts, they essentially endorsed Olivercrona's position by refusing to reconsider it. Cramer feels the chief philosophical motivation behind Swedish colonialism, social darwinism, remains unrecognized.36 The lack of Sami land claims, the lack of any self-determination, was the result.

Instead of trying to eliminate Sami culture, the Riksdag's current stated policy is to try to preserve it. Indeed, the Riksdag has established many Sami organizations and even Sami media. In implementing this attitude, however, the Riksdag has kept financial control and ownership of Sami land

35Ibid., p. 98.

away from the Samis. Whether or not the new Swedish philosophy is more beneficial to the Samis depends on one's orientation. The Samis have the same voting rights as any other Swede; they are fully privileged citizens of the state. Many Sami leaders, however, would prefer not to be a member of the state. They could point out that Samis were colonized into being members of Sweden -- it was not an act of their own free will. Sami leaders say that Swedish treatment of them has gone from darwinian to paternalism.

Swedish "paternalism" has meant for the Samis that their cultural, political, and economic activities have always found enthusiastic support in the Riksdag, but also that this support has limits. The Samis are not free to develop a high level of economic and political autonomy. Rolf Sjolin feels that Samis have been unsuccessful in Swedish politics for three reasons. First, the Samis have not done well in the representative system of Swedish politics, since they do not have adequate numbers to elect their own officials or exert much clout. Second, legislation like the Reindeer Grazing Act accorded different status to Samis who herded and those who did not. This differential status lasted into the 20th Century, and prevented local Sami political unification. Third, because the Samis are spread throughout Samiland, the pragmatic concerns of transportation and communication make substantive political networking difficult.37 These three factors preclude the possibility of the Samis establishing a Western political entity like the NSB.

Without economic self-determination, the Swedish government pays for Sami media and, hence, retains final control over it. Sami language radio broadcasts are limited to a few minutes a day on the state broadcasting company, Sveriges Radio. A brief weekly show, SAMENYTT (SAMEMAGASIN) broadcasts news of interest to Samis. The founding father of Sami radio was a Swede, not a Sami, and only a few Samis are employed in radio, whereas Inupiat media employ many Inupiats. A Swedish Sami magazine, Samefolket, is also paid for by the state, and it prints its articles in Swedish, not Sami.38

Money alone would not buy the Samis an indigenous broadcasting medium due to the structure of the Swedish radio and television industry, but Sweden is a “free” country and significant capital could produce a wholly indigenous newspaper. Control over natural resources produced this capability for the Inupiat, and a lack of control over them denies it to the Samis. Samiland does not lack for resources according to Arthur Spencer:

> With the highest standard of living in the world and the second largest consumption of energy per head, Sweden must exploit all her resources to the full for the benefit of all her people. These include the riches of Swedish Lapland. Their development inevitably and increasingly harms the Lapps.39

---

38 Occasionally, however, some poetry in Samefolket is published in Sami.

Currently, the natural resources of Samiland are being controlled by the state; philosophically, the ownership of the resources is shared by all Swedes. Sami leaders attempted through the courts to secure the rights to the resources of their area, but with little success. Without control over natural resources, the Samis lack an economic power base through which to support political and cultural autonomy. As in arctic Alaska, cultural autonomy is a product of economic autonomy.

Cultural Empowerment and Land Claims

The development of natural resources presents something of a double bind for an indigenous people. Although industrial development brings an economic power base to an area, it also brings in Southerners and Southern technology. It can be hazardous to the ecological environment as well as to the cultural environment. The Inupiat opted to accept Southern economic intrusion in favor of their own economic and political power base. The Samis, on the other hand, have not had a choice; they have encountered centuries of Southern economic intervention, but have not profited from it as directly as have the Inupiat.

The principal reason why Inupiat devolution is at a more advanced stage than Sami devolution is that the Inupiat have gained economic and political control over the land, which accorded them a significant power base. Control of the land has meant territorial control for the Inupiat. Land means

---

power for this indigenous people, accumulating power for them in two ways: first, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act set up regional corporations through the sale of tribal lands, which set up an economic power base; second, creation of the North Slope Borough made tribal control of the land legally territorial and expanded the economic power base further through land use taxation. Neither a settlement over tribal lands nor a tax base have arrived for the Samis. The Inupiat have used the capital generated from land control to establish, among other things, modern media systems; these systems in turn help consolidate control over the land.

The reason that the Inupiat fought for ANCSA was economic: they wanted to ensure that individuals had the option of a traditional subsistence life. Subsistence living is not just the dominant characteristic of Inupiat economic life; it actually permeates the entire Inupiat culture. ANCSA accepted many aspects of Western economic systems just as it attempted to preserve the option of a subsistence economy. While it created capital, it did not otherwise expand the Inupiat power base. A political power base came through the establishment of a territorial base, which came through the establishment of the North Slope Borough. That territorial base led, primarily through taxation, to the accumulation of more capital.

Media like the Tundra Times mobilized Native government, and the North Slope Borough in turn invested heavily in media projects to vitalize the Inupiat culture. In the cultural arena, as in politics and economics, the Inupiat do battle in Western armor. Media such as magazines, books, television and radio are all Western in origin, but the borough uses these forms to promote the Inupiaq language, to give village elders a lasting ear,
and to caution about the hazards of modern technology. An example of this irony is one television commercial produced by the borough's teleproduction facility that urges children, in Inupiaq, to turn off the television.41

Inupiat media urge Natives to stay current on political affairs affecting them; an example is that during 1984 almost every Native press and transmitter discussed the year 1991, the year when ANCSA stock is available for public sale.42 Alaska Native News, Arctic Policy Review, and Tundra Times run regular articles about it. Cultural programming enhances feelings of tribalism, regionalism, and ethnicity; in short, it enhances nationalism. Nationalism leads to a greater desire for political autonomy and self-determination, renewing the interest of the elite in strengthening media ties, as in the ICC's Communication Commission. Inupiat leaders now believe that they cannot be a political and economic island, that the days of the Arctic being isolated from the rest of the world have ended for the present. The Inupiat have entered into a compromise; some economic, political, and cultural forms have been given up to preserve others. Western culture transforms Inupiat culture, but much of Inupiat culture remains. Neither can the Samis be an island; because they lack control over the land, electing to be an island is not an option for them.

Many parts of the world have looked to the Inupiat use of media as an inspiration and a model for their own endeavors. The Inupiat approach to

41Shackle, op. cit.

42"1991: The Challenge that Must Be Met," special supplement to the Tundra Times, September 26, 1984 is one of the most recent examples of this.
media has gained reknown in many developing countries: Tom Shackle said that he has had several representatives of Third World countries, particularly African countries, inspecting his facility for a reference. The North Slope Borough shares many problems and solutions with the developing world, and more connections with it seem likely.

The Inupiat have combined the resources of land, power, and capital to indigenize a media system. That system, in turn, has aided in the maintenance of those resources, and has helped develop a sense of tribal identity for the Inupiat people. The Samis, by contrast, have not gained a significant economic power base, and consequently cannot afford to extensively pursue a media system. The media they have is owned and run by representatives of the state. The rest of the world can profit from studying Inupiat use of power and media, and not just to see how minority cultures can exploit media systems to their cultural advantage.

A battle wages between the dominant cultures of the world and the minority cultures which, through the mechanizations of international politics, have become linked with them. It is not a battle with bloodshed, but it is a battle with weapons: symbolically, it is a combat between arrows and nuclear armaments. The weapons used by the minority cultures are alternately old and new. The Inupiat and the Samis wear armor wrought from their indigenous cultural traditions, but their shields and arrows are often of dominant cultural design. These "modern" weapons are creations of the dominant culture that are turned back against it by the minority cultures

43Shackle. op. cit
that it contains; they include Western economic practices, Western political systems, and Western mass media technology. Success in the battle is hardly assured to the indigenous warriors. One factor, however, seems to tip the strategic scale in their favor if they can attain it, a factor that is as important in cultural battles as it is in literal warfare. That factor is control over the land.
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