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Alaska is home to 226 federally recognized Native tribes. In addition, approximately 200 village-based Native corporations and twelve Native regional corporations own over forty million acres of land and have assets valued in the billions of dollars as a result of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (“ANCSA”).² The political and economic force of Alaska Natives is large. Yet, from the Treaty of Cession with Russia in 1867 to the most recent Alaska
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Supreme Court ruling relating to Alaska Natives, federal and state policies affecting Alaska’s Native people have vacillated wildly. The second edition of *Alaska Natives and American Laws* does a magnificent job of tracing the history of federal and state treatment of Alaska’s indigenous people. Authors David Case and David Voluck have performed a valuable service to Alaska Natives, the legal community, and the general public by detailing the complex law that defines the legal status of Alaska Natives, their governments, and other institutions.

The treatise provides a much-needed objective view of the legal and political history of federal relations with Alaska Natives. In so doing it debunks revisionist “melting pot theories” that would deny the right of Native self-governance and Native subsistence rights under federal law. Such views are alive and well in Alaska today among liberals and conservatives alike. They advocate assimilation policies prevalent in the nineteenth century and again during the era of Indian termination when Congress eliminated the political and governmental status of roughly one hundred Indian tribes in the 1950s. Some features of ANCSA are rooted in those policies, which have greatly hindered Native rights to govern land and to hunt and fish consistent with custom and tradition. At the same time, this treatise reveals a modern trend that relies in part on the federal trust responsibility in providing services to Natives and on treaty substitutes to protect Native land and rights to hunt and fish. One of the finest attributes of Case and Voluck’s work is the objective manner in which a tremendous amount of material is presented.

An introductory chapter of some thirty-five pages provides a nice overview of the material covered later in the book and acquaints the reader with the complex and inconsistent treatment Alaska Natives have received from the federal government. The following nine chapters consume over 500 pages and are structured in accord with four major themes: 1) Native claims to land; 2) human services; 3) subsistence; and 4) self-government. The thematic organization works well, and the detailed table of contents provides easy access to readers seeking information on issues ranging from the establishment of reindeer reserves to IRS provisions related to “net operating losses.” A significant formatting improvement from the 1984 edition is the use of footnotes rather than end-of-chapter notes, which eliminates the need to constantly flip back and forth.

David Case authored the first edition of this book when the
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settlement of Native aboriginal land claims had been in effect for only thirteen years. The settlement was remarkable for its use of State-chartered corporations as the vehicle for disbursements of land and money to extinguish tribal land claims. ANCSA was touted as a grand experiment and break with federal policy that had traditionally emphasized set-asides of tribal lands for use and occupation by tribes. To that end, Congress provided in section 2(b) of ANCSA that

   the settlement should be accomplished rapidly, with certainty, and conformity with the real economic and social needs of Natives, without litigation, with maximum participation by Natives in decisions affecting their rights and property, without establishing any permanent racially defined institutions or privileges, or obligations . . . without adding to the categories of property and institutions enjoying special tax privileges . . . .

As the first edition made plain, despite this sweeping policy statement, ANCSA left open more questions than it answered. What are the rights of tribal governments? Did tribal governments exist in Alaska? What about Alaska Native hunting and fishing rights? Would social services continue to be delivered to Alaska Natives based on their status as Natives after passage of ANCSA? What would happen with Native townsite lands and the Native allotment program? In addition to providing a rich and detailed legal history of Alaska Natives and American laws, the updated version brings readers and researchers up to date on all these issues and more.

For example, Case and Voluck carefully outline litigation over the “Indian country” dispute that had simmered long before ANCSA became law and which heated up in the 1980s. While the Act revoked all but one reservation in Alaska, it said nothing about whether Native tribes lost governmental control over land owned by the tribes themselves or by Native corporations surrounding villages. The policy statement in section 2(b) of ANCSA was relied on by the Supreme Court in the landmark case of Alaska v. Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government to hold that 1.8 million acres owned by the Venetie tribal government did not constitute “Indian country” within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1151. The Court asserted that ANCSA’s primary purpose was “to effect Native self-determination and to end paternalism in federal Indian relations.”

Yet, as Alaska Natives and American Laws makes
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7. See, eg., id. at 534.
clear, every Congress has amended ANCSA, and Congress has
certified continued Native eligibility for social programs designed
to benefit members of Indian tribes. In fact, the general statement
of policy is belied by the subsequent treatment of ANCSA corpo-
rations, corporate lands and Native individuals. Nevertheless,
tribal governments are now considered “sovereigns without territo-
rial reach.”

The chapter on sovereignty also provides a detailed
explanation of recent landmark Alaska Supreme Court decisions
affirming the existence of federally recognized tribes and their ju-
risdiction over members, notwithstanding the Venetie decision.

Case and Voluck also detail ANCSA’s complex formula for
distribution of land and money to regional and village corporations
and the daunting task of organizing the corporations faced by Na-
tive leaders. The authors document the most significant litigation
growing out of ANCSA—covering topics from the determination
of surface and subsurface estates to shareholder insurance policies.
Especially interesting and useful is the review of the significant
structural changes to ANCSA, such as the continuation of the pro-
visions barring the sale of Native corporation stock and the exten-
sive revisions to the “land bank” provisions, which make many of
the protections that reservation trust lands enjoy applicable to un-
developed Native corporation lands. The huge benefits to Native
corporations created by changes to the federal income tax code in
1986 are detailed, along with the many other changes—technical
and otherwise—made to ANCSA nearly every year. The authors
certainly make a valid point when they state: “These federal en-
actments indicate that the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is
an experiment that is still evolving.”

The first edition of the book devoted nineteen pages to subsis-
tence hunting and fishing rights after ANCSA. The new edition
continues the practice of repeating verbatim some of the history in
its thirty-five-page treatment of the topic. There is a concise ex-
planation of how aboriginal hunting and fishing rights were re-
placed by the rural priority for subsistence uses in Title VIII of the
Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act ("ANILCA")
in 1980. The authors then accurately untangle the tortured course
of Alaska’s attempt to maintain its end of the bargain to provide a
rural priority on state lands and waters. The Alaska Supreme
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Court’s rejection of the rural priority\textsuperscript{12} and the legislature’s subsequent open hostility to the rural preference provided by ANILCA are succinctly laid out. The recently concluded “Katie John” litigation\textsuperscript{13} is covered with respect to the federal government’s application of the subsistence priority for fish and game to federal reserved waters. However, a discussion of the litigation and controversy over whether the federal government actually possessed authority to engage in on-the-ground management of subsistence activities on the public lands is not included. That litigation over the federal government’s authority to administer a subsistence program reveals not so much a difficult legal issue as the political tension and dynamic at play within State government with respect to subsistence.\textsuperscript{14}

Anyone interested in individual rights to Native allotments, Native townsite lands, or health and social services will find a detailed legal history and current exposition of statutes and case law. Federal laws regarding public lands, Native education statutes, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and international treaties are among the many other topics covered in this truly comprehensive treatise. A fascinating chapter details the development of modern Alaska Native non-profit organizations and advocacy groups.

Alaska Natives are likely subject to more federal statutes, regulations, administrative rulings and court decisions than any other indigenous group in the United States. Case and Voluck have provided a wonderful resource for all Alaskans and a treatise that should be on the shelf of every lawyer who practices in Alaska.
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\textsuperscript{12} McDowell v. State, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989)(holding that preference to rural residents for taking subsistence fish and game violated Alaska Constitution); Madison v. Alaska Dep’t. of Fish & Game, 696 P.2d 168 (Alaska 1985)(holding a regulation establishing rural eligibility criterion unauthorized by statute).
\textsuperscript{13} John v. United States, 247 F.3d 1032 (9th Cir. 2001).
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