and sharing in the dividends. The day-to-day affairs of the corporation were handled by paid managers. The corporation supported hunting and fishing by its shareholders by providing camp sites on corporation land, but the corporation focus was not hunting or fishing activities.

The Sitnasuak corporation was a major feature of the contemporary Nome economy and polity. But its membership and history were radically different from that of a traditional Inupiat society, and significantly different from the Nome subcommunities described for King Island and Wales.

SUBCOMMUNITIES IN NOME

The Sitnasuak situation notwithstanding, subcommunities were a feature of social and economic life in Nome in 1985. As discussed above, subcommunities of people from King Island and Wales were relatively large and distinct within the community as a whole.

Anecdotal examples suggest that second and third generations were less likely to maintain subcommunity ties than first-generation immigrants. Immigrants' children, whose natal communities often would be Nome, married across subcommunity and cultural boundaries. The longer subcommunity members lived in Nome, the more the boundaries between subcommunities seemed to blur -- except for King Island. Although King Island's presence in Nome is as old as Nome itself, that subcommunity has remained distinct. Subcommunities were a way for immigrants to continue in the comfortable traditional ways of the Inupiat, while their
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children gradually adopted new strategies of survival and developed new friends and allies.

The research design did not anticipate the Sitnasuak situation. Considerable time and effort was spent attempting to draw a significant sample from a subcommunity of original Nome Inupiat; researchers ultimately decided they had not done so. With the King Island subcommunity dropping out, and the Diomede subcommunity so small, only the St. Lawrence Island subcommunity sample contained significant numbers of households. But researchers had no other subcommunities with which to compare the St. Lawrence Island households. So there ended the attempts at subcommunity analysis.
This study was designed to document the extent of hunting, fishing, and gathering areas for Nome. Even though the sample was relatively small (N=46), the households surveyed covered a relatively large area for subsistence activities, a far larger area than residents of other communities in the region where the Division of Subsistence has mapped subsistence using similar methods. When hunting moose, for example, residents of Nome used twice the area reported by Shishmaref residents (Sobelman 1985), and three times the area reported by Brevig Mission residents (Magdanz and Olanna 1986). Small mammal harvest areas, while larger than moose areas for all three communities, were again much larger for Nome than for Shishmaref or Brevig Mission. Salmon harvest areas were smaller for all communities, but again, Nome’s areas were far more extensive.

In Shishmaref, Brevig Mission, and Golovin, community residents harvested on lands within the watersheds which surrounded the communities. Specifically, residents of the small communities did not harvest in watersheds that drained past other communities. This resembles the traditional Inupiat territories reported for the Seward Peninsula. But for Nome residents, considerable moose hunting, fresh water fishing, small mammal harvesting, and even plant gathering occurred in watersheds far removed from Nome. Moose, for example, were hunted in the Ruzitrin watershed (overlapping Brevig Mission hunting areas) and
Fish River watershed (overlapping Golovin and White Mountain hunting areas).

It was not hard to understand why people ranged so far. First, the local habitat is sparse: a windy plain crossed by short, shallow streams where willows are the dominant vegetation, bordered on the south by a nearly featureless sandy beach and on the north by mountains. Richer habitat lies to the east, north, and west: sheltered lagoons, spruce forests, inland lakes, and substantial rivers. Second, the local population was large: almost 4,000 residents in 1985, compared with about 150 in 1880 (Petroff 1884:11). The local habitat could never provide enough wild resources to support a subsistence-oriented community the size of Nome. People had to range widely. Third, the original Inupiat inhabitants of the Nome area, who must have known and recognized the boundaries to their territory, were gone.

To protect the wild resources immediately adjacent Nome from overharvest, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game restricted seasons, harvests, and areas. Nome's moose season is only two weeks long, compared with six or eight months for neighboring communities. Nome families are required to obtain subsistence salmon permits, which limit them to 250 or fewer salmon per year. Nome is the only community in northwest Alaska where permits and harvest limits have been applied to subsistence fisheries.

People used several strategies to surmount the competition and the restrictions. Some harvesters ranged further into the country, aided by Nome's extensive road system. Some harvesters
traveled to nearby small communities, where competition and restrictions were less, to hunt, fish or gather. Some established camps which exerted some degree of territorial control over local areas, such as Fort Davis on the Nome River.

A UNIQUE COMMUNITY

At the conclusion of the Nome River study (Magdanz and Olanna 1984b), researchers wondered where the original Inupiat claimants to Nome's territory hunted, fished, and gathered. This study answered that question in an unexpected way. Almost none of Nome's current residents could claim the local area as ancestral. The absence of ancestral claims made it easier for Natives from adjacent areas to establish camps in the Nome area.

In several ways, Nome was fundamentally different from the other communities in Northwest Alaska. First, it was larger than any community that had ever existed in the region. Second, roads made long-distance travel in summer and fall relatively easy. Third, a large and highly transient population (perhaps 30 percent) co-existed with a relatively stable population. Fourth, the original local Inupiat inhabitants were no longer a significant component of its population, which left an "empty" territory into which Inupiat immigrants from neighboring areas could move and establish themselves. Fifth, more than half the people born in other communities in the region continued to harvest near their natal communities. This combination of factors resulted in residents of Nome using a much larger area for
hunting, fishing, and gathering than residents of other communities in the region.
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APPENDIX ONE
RESOURCE CATEGORIES FOR MAP DATA

Twelve different resource categories will be mapped, using two sheets of clear inking film on a USGS base map assembled from the Teller, Bendeleben, Nome, and Solomon 1:250,000 scale quadrangle maps. The research question for each category is the same:

WHERE HAVE YOU OR PEOPLE IN YOUR HOUSE HARVESTED SINCE YOU BEGAN LIVING IN NOME?

Informants will draw colored lines on the film to surround harvesting areas, and small triangles to indicate camp locations.

SHEET ONE

1. MOOSE.
2. SALMON: pink (humpies), chum (dogs), coho (silvers), sockeye (reds), and chinook (kings).
3. MARINE FISH: dolly varden (trout), herring, tomcod, blue cod, capelin, flounder, sculpin, and other fish caught in the ocean. NOT salmon. NOT shellfish.
4. WATERFowl: ducks, geese, seagulls, sukes, murrex, cormorants, and other waterfowl, including egg gathering locations.
5. PLANTS: all species of berries, plants, and roots used for food or medicine.
6. SEALS: bearded (ugruk), spotted, ringed, and ribbon.
7. FRESH WATER FISH: dolly varden (trout), grayling, northern pike, whitefish, and other fish caught in fresh water (rivers, streams, lakes and lagoons). NOT salmon.

8. SHELLFISH: crabs, clams, mussels, other marine invertebrates.

9. SMALL GAME: rabbits, ptarmigan, fox, ground squirrel, muskrat, otter, mink, wolverine, wolf. Either hunting or trapping.

10. BEAR: brown, black or polar.

11. FUEL AND STRUCTURAL MATERIALS: driftwood, spruce, willows, alder, sod, stone, clay, gravel, and other similar materials for burning or building.

12. WALRUS.
APPENDIX TWO

SURVEY

We are studying why people hunt, fish, and gather in certain places. People who were born in different towns and villages seem to have different ways of hunting, fishing, and gathering.

WHEN I SAY HOME, WHAT PLACE DO YOU THINK OF? ______________________

WHERE WERE YOU BORN? _____________________________________________

WHERE WERE YOUR PARENTS BORN? MOTHER? ___________________________

WHERE WAS YOUR (HUSBAND/WIFE) BORN? ______________________________

WHERE WERE (HIS/HER) PARENTS BORN? MOTHER? _______________________

WHERE WERE (HIS/HER) PARENTS BORN? FATHER? ________________________

WHAT YEAR DID YOU BEGIN LIVING IN NOME? ___________________________

SINCE YOU BEGAN LIVING IN NOME, WHAT OTHER VILLAGES HAVE YOU VISITED TO HUNT, TO FISH, OR TO GATHER?

_________________________ ___________________________ _______________________

_________________________ ___________________________ _______________________

_________________________ ___________________________ _______________________

_________________________ ___________________________ _______________________

_________________________ ___________________________ _______________________

_________________________ ___________________________ _______________________
SOME PEOPLE HAVE CAMPS IN THE COUNTRY WHERE THEY STAY WHILE HUNTING, FISHING, OR GATHERING. HAS YOUR FAMILY USED A CAMP LIKE THAT SINCE YOU BEGAN LIVING IN NOME?

(1) YES  (0) NO

Transportation affects where people go. Cars and snowmachines make it easier to go into the country. Boats make it easier to travel along the coast.

WHAT EQUIPMENT HAS YOUR FAMILY USED FOR HUNTING, FISHING, OR GATHERING SINCE YOU BEGAN LIVING IN NOME?

SNOWMACHINE  DOGTEAM  CAR
BOAT  3-WHEELER OR 4-WHEELER  SKIS
SNOWSHOES  AIRPLANE

Some studies suggest that Native and non-Natives have different hunting fishing and gathering patterns.

DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF TO BE:

ESKIMO?  WHITE?  INDIAN  OTHER?

Do you have any questions about our interview today?

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA CODES -- SHEET TWO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR. WT. FISH:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELLFISH:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL GAME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALRUS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>