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The purpose of this paper is to describe the mission of the National Park Service in the State of Alaska and explain how carrying out this mission translates to the long-term preservation of Alaska’s prehistoric and historic cultural resources. Viewed from an international perspective, the National Park Service’s success in preserving the legacy of the past in Alaska contributes to the wider goal of saving the ancient cultural heritage of all of Beringia; a vast intercontinental region of intense common interest to both Russia and the United States. Sometimes the job of the National Park Service is not well understood either by the people of the United States or by its international partners. First and foremost, the mission of the National of the National Park Service is stewardship; stewardship of the natural and cultural resources in its charge. That primary mission is the same in Alaska as it is elsewhere in the National Park Service.

The State of Alaska contains 15 national parks and preserves, plus the Alagnak Wild River and two Affiliated Areas (Figure 1). Affiliated Areas are park areas that are associated with and assisted by the National Park Service; but whose lands are not under direct National Park Service ownership. One of these special units, the Inupiat Heritage Center, is located in Barrow, Alaska and it is owned and managed by the North Slope Borough. Cooperatively linked to the New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park in New Bedford, Massachusetts; the Inupiat Heritage Center was established to tell the story of Eskimo participation in the history of commercial whaling. The second Affiliated Area in Alaska is the Aleutian World War II National Historic Area in Unalaska, Alaska. Its lands remain the property of the Uunalaska Native Corporation and this unit in the far-flung Aleutian Islands interprets both the culture of the Aleut people and the story of World War II in Alaska (Figure 2).

Overall, Alaska’s parks enclose 219,000 square kilometers of land; a number that represents two-thirds of the entire land holdings of the National Park Service. Of the 15 national parks and preserves in Alaska, four have been specially designated for eventual inclusion in the Beringian Heritage International Park; a park of intercontinental scope that is now being jointly planned by Russia and the United States. These existing “Beringian” parks; all in northwest Alaska; include Bering Land Bridge National Preserve, Cape Krusenstern National Monument, Kobuk Valley National Park, and Noatak National Preserve. Together, these “Beringian” parks cover 47,234 square kilometers; nearly one quarter the total land area encompassed by all of Alaska’s national park lands.

The Management Policies of the National Park Service make it clear that the Service is first and foremost the steward of the many cultural resources that populate its park lands. Section 5.3.1 of these policies, the section which defines cultural resources stewardship, states:

The National Park Service will employ the most effective concepts, techniques, and equipment to protect cultural resources against theft, fire, vandalism, overuse,
What exactly is meant by the act of “stewardship”? The modern English word “steward” has its origin in the Anglo Saxon language of Early Medieval England. The Old English word “stweard” of the Late Medieval Period was built out of the combination of two earlier Anglo Saxon words (Gove 1971:2240). The first of these words was “stig” which once referred to the large wooden halls used by Anglo Saxon nobles or leading men. The second word of the combination is “weard” which became “ward” in Late Medieval Old English and refers to a person who guards. Thus, in its original use the word “steward” translated to “guardian of the hall”. Early stewards actually served as estate managers on behalf of their nobles or lords; and interestingly, the English word for “manage” has its origin in early Italian (maneggiare) where the word first meant “to treat with care” (Gove 1971:1372).

Today, the word “steward” is defined as “one called to exercise responsible care over possessions entrusted to him” (Gove 1971:2240) and the act of “stewardship” itself is defined as the “careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one’s care” (Merriam-Webster Incorporated 1999:1154).”

What stewardship then means in the context of the United States National Park Service is the careful and responsible management of the cultural and natural resources entrusted to its protection. And cultural resource stewardship is simply a subset of this general mission: The careful and responsible management of the cultural resources entrusted to the National Park Service.

Why is stewardship of the past worth doing? Why should we expend time, effort, and money on the preservation of our cultural legacy for the benefit future generations? What good does it accomplish? First, and foremost, it gives us our orientation as a people to the future. As the European mystery writer Nicolas Freeling observed, “the future does not exist except in the fabric of the past” (1966:138).” The American historian, Arthur Schlesinger explained and elaborated on this important purpose when he wrote, “History is to a nation rather as memory to an individual. As an individual deprived of memory becomes disoriented and lost, . . . , so a nation denied it past will be disabled in dealing with its present and future (As quoted in Tiller 2003:4).” Similarly, Vissarion Belinsky, the great nineteenth century Russian writer and social critic, observed, “we interrogate our past for an explanation of our present and a hint of our future (Belinsky [1846] as quoted in Figes 2002:131).”

But why must we preserve the physical remains of our past; is it not sufficient to capture the stories in books? The reason is that the authentic remnants of our cultural legacy give us an irreplaceable tangible link to our past that cannot be replaced by a book or an article. As de Teel Patterson Tiller, the National Park Service’s Acting Associate Director for Cultural Resources recently observed, “We preserve these places, . . . , these objects and collections because they impart the larger stories and truths about who we are as individuals, who we are as a people, and who we are as a nation—where we have been
and (importantly) where we are going (Tiller 2003:2).” These authentic places and objects are material touchstones to a past that we can directly learn from and experience for ourselves (Tiller 2003:1). These physical manifestations serve as material anchors to our past and reference points to our future that cannot be easily erased or eliminated. We can see them, touch them, connect with them in such a way that we can know the past actually happened—that it was “really real” as children often put it. Each generation can learn from the ruins, the buildings, and the objects of the past; these are the landmarks that link us over time and space and give meaning and orientation to our lives. The physical legacy of the past allows us more than a passive and abstract connection to our cultural heritage; it openly invites an interactive relationship that gives each of us the opportunity “interrogate” our past, as Vissarion Belinsky put it in 1846, and obtain a “hint of our future”.

The need for the preservation of an authentic past to help orient the people of the United States was first realized in national legislation with the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431-433 [1988], June 8, 1904, ch. 3060, 34 Stat. 225). Interestingly, support for this law came from citizens who sought to stem the rising tide of looting and unscrupulous collecting by both private individuals and scientific institutions (Shelton and Fox 1994:13). This law was actively promoted by President Theodore Roosevelt who during his many terms in office laid the foundations for both cultural and natural resource stewardship in the United States. The Antiquities Act was the first major legislation in the history of the nation to make the protection of cultural sites a matter of national policy. It has two key provisions:

- One, the law gives authority and direction to the Federal government to protect “any historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or object of antiquity” located on public lands.

- Two, the law gives authority to the President of the United States to specifically establish national monuments for the care of lands that are of historic or scientific interest.

Some of the first units in the National Park Service were designated under the authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906, including Sitka National Historical Park in Alaska (Figure 3). This small park was originally established as a monument in 1912 to commemorate Tlingit Indian culture and the last major battle between the Russians and the Tlingit people.

The Antiquities Act of 1906 lies at the root of the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq. [1988], Aug. 25, 1916, ch.408, 39 Stat. 535); the national legislation that actually created the National Park Service as a Federal agency and defined its central mission. As is clearly evident from the language of the most important section of the Organic Act, the core mission of the National Park Service is stewardship: “The National Park Service must manage park resources and values in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” Today’s Management Policies (National Park Service 2001) of the National Park Service
give further guidance as to what this provision of the Organic Act means in the present-day world.

- “The ‘fundamental purpose’ of the national park system, . . . . begins with a mandate to conserve park resources and values (National Park Service 2001: 12).”

- “The fundamental purpose of all the parks also includes providing for the enjoyment of park resources and values by the people of the United States. The ‘enjoyment’ that is contemplated by the statute is broad: it is the enjoyment of all the people of the United States, not just those who visit parks, and so includes enjoyment both by people who directly experience parks and those who appreciate them from afar (p. 12).”

- “Congress, recognizing that the enjoyment by future generations of the national parks can be ensured only if the superb quality of park resources and values is left unimpaired, has provided that when there is a conflict between conserving resources and values and providing for the enjoyment of them, conservation is to be predominant (p. 12).”

The National Park Service’s role as the nation’s chief advocate and steward for the past was further elaborated with the passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq. [1988], Aug. 21, 1935, ch. 593, 49 Stat. 666). This act of Congress made the preservation of important historic sites a nation-wide goal with the words, “. . . . it is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.”

The Historic Preservation Act of 1935 assigned the role of overseeing the implementation of the act to the Secretary of the Interior and gave the National Park Service the job of doing the actual work on behalf of the Secretary (Shelton and Fox 1994:15). Some of the key aspects of this new assignment of the National Park Service included the following:

- To carry out an active program of inventory, evaluation, registration, and preservation treatment (including education) for the nation’s important cultural sites (Figure 4).

- To provide technical advice and assistance to other Federal agencies, states, local communities, associations, and individuals for the purpose of protecting and preserving the cultural heritage of the United States.

One major and long-lasting outcome of the Historic Preservation Act of 1935 was the creation of the National Historic Landmark Program. Under the authority of this program the National Park Service monitors the preservation status of a category of highly significant historic properties known as National Historic Landmarks; also, the National Park Service offers preservation advice and assistance to the owners of these important
though the lands under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service contain many National Historical Landmarks, the majority of these highly significant sites occur on land controlled by other Federal agencies, the states, local governments, Native Americans, and private citizens.

National Historic Landmarks are designated by the Secretary of the Interior, with the express approval of the affected land owners, upon the recommendation of the National Park Service. There are over 2000 National Historic Landmarks in the United States today. Alaska currently has 48 landmarks; ranging from the Holy Assumption Russian Orthodox Church in Kenai, Alaska (Figure 5) to Ipiutak National Historic Landmark in Point Hope, Alaska; the ancient village of the mysterious Eskimo people who are popularly known as the “Magicians of Ipiutak” (Figure 6). Local communities and private owners of National Historic Landmarks are offered many incentives, from monetary grants to tax reductions, to encourage them to serve as good stewards of the nationally significant properties under their control.

The application of the legislative mandates of both the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 and the Historic Sites Act of 1935 were specifically reaffirmed for the state of Alaska with the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act in 1980 (16 U.S.C 3101 et seq. [1988], Dec. 2 1980, 94 Stat. 2371, Public Law 96-487). “ANILCA”, as the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act is commonly called, added 11 new park areas to the existing four Alaskan parks and the creation of these new park areas extended the protection afforded cultural and natural resources through the National Park Service Organic Act to a vast area of present-day Alaska (176, 447 sq. km) (Shelton and Fox 1994:44-48).

The reaffirmation of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 in an Alaskan context can be found in Section 1318 of ANILCA. This section of the act directs the National Park Service to provide technical advice and assistance in cultural resource preservation to recognized Alaska Native Corporations and groups. Since the enactment of ANILCA the National Park Service has provided assistance and training in preservation planning, museum management, historical architecture, archeology, ethnography, and cultural resource interpretation to a wide assortment of Alaska Native corporations and organizations who have sought to become good stewards of their own cultural heritage.

Though its provisions are for the most part not specific to the operation of the National Park Service, the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq. [1966], 80 Stat. 915, Public Law 89-665) still plays a major role in guiding the Service’s management of cultural resources (Shelton and Fox 1994: 17-19). This law makes historic preservation a responsibility of the entire Federal government of the United States and requires each government agency to carry out its respective duties “in a spirit of stewardship” with regard to the proper care of the nation’s prehistoric and historic sites. Every Federal agency, irrespective of its main mission, is also charged with the task of taking responsibility for the historic properties under its control. Under the Historic Preservation Act every agency must establish its own preservation program to identify, evaluate, register, and protect significant resources. However, the National Park Service,
unlike other Federal agencies, is assigned a unique responsibility by the Historic Preservation Act; it is directed to maintain a National Register of Historic Places; essentially a central registry of all the important sites located within the United States.

Perhaps the most important provision of the National Preservation Act of 1966 is the section that requires Federal agencies to consider the effect of their official activities on significant cultural resources. In brief, the law inserts consideration of cultural resources into the planning process of every Federal agency; from the National Park Service to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; from the Department of Commerce to the United States Coast Guard. Moreover, the law is very innovative in that it requires Federal agencies to conduct the cultural resource portion of the planning process in consultation and in cooperation with states, local governments, Native American tribes, citizen groups, and where appropriate; even with other nations.

The legislation summarized above is what gives shape and direction to the everyday operations of the National Park Service in Alaska. As has been repeatedly emphasized the primary job the National Park Service in Alaska is resource stewardship. To carry out this stewardship responsibility in the cultural resource realm, the National Park Service has strategically distributed funds and staff throughout the organizational structure of the Alaska Region. In order to make sense of these staff allocations, it is important to outline the basics of the National Park Service’s organization in Alaska. In overall charge is the Regional Director who works for the Director of the National Park Service in Washington D.C. The Regional Director, in turn, directly supervises the superintendents of the various Alaska parks; and it is important to stress, that in the dispersed command structure of the National Park Service, the individual park superintendents are given a great deal of responsibility as well as a healthy dose of independence in running their respective parks.

The National Park Service in Alaska Region employs a wide variety of cultural resource specialists. Represented within the professional staff ranks of the National Park Service are archeologists, ethnographers, historical architects, historical landscape architects, historians, museum curators, and technical support personnel such as computer mapping specialists.

Each of the ten separate park headquarters offices in Alaska has between one and five permanent cultural resources staff specialists to serve park area cultural resource management needs. These park cultural resource specialists answer directly to the park superintendent or other senior park official who sets their goals and priorities. Because no single park office can contain a full complement of specialists in all fields, parks can turn to the Alaska Support Office of the National Park Service in Anchorage, Alaska for additional technical support. The Alaska Support Office is organized into disciplinary teams and the Cultural Resources Team contains twenty-four permanent professional staff members with a wide variety of cultural resource expertise. Of these twenty-four positions, nineteen are primarily devoted to providing technical support to the park areas. The remaining five staff positions are largely assigned to the task of supplying technical advice and assistance to the National Park Service’s “outside” clients who seek help with
historic preservation under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 or Section 1318 of ANILCA (Figure 7). These clients include other Federal agencies, the State of Alaska, Alaska Native corporations and groups, local communities, and citizen-based historic preservation associations. It should be mentioned, however, that increasingly park-based cultural resource staffs are also beginning to provide direct technical assistance to neighboring Native groups and communities when time and resources allow.

In the majority of cases, Alaska Support Office staff or park staffs actually do the required cultural resource work, but in cases where unique expertise or additional personnel are needed to accomplish a job other sources are used. Cooperative partnerships with universities, educational institutions, museums, and Alaska Native groups are often employed. The National Park Service also uses contracts and temporary hire to get the cultural resource work done. Much of research that has been carried out over the years in support of the Shared Beringian Heritage Program has been accomplished through cooperative agreements with such institutions as the University of Alaska, the Smithsonian Institution’s Arctic Studies Center, and the Bering Straits Native Corporation.

In Alaska, as in the rest of the United States, the National Park Service recognizes and manages five basic types of cultural resources (National Park Service 2001: 55-60). These five fundamental categories are listed and defined as follows:

- **Archeological Site:** Physical evidence of past human occupation or activity (the National Park Service recognizes two basic subcategories; prehistoric and historic archeological sites).

- **Cultural landscape:** A geographic area associated with a historic event, activity, or person; or that exhibits other cultural or aesthetic values (this category includes designed, vernacular, and ethnographic landscapes). Cultural landscapes encompass both cultural and natural resources as well as any wildlife or domestic animals that have historic associations with the landscapes.

- **Ethnographic Resource:** A site, structure, object, landscape, or natural feature of traditional importance to a contemporary cultural group.

- **Museum Object:** A material thing possessing scientific, historical, cultural, or aesthetic values (usually movable by nature or design).

- **Structure:** A constructed work created to serve some human activity (usually immovable by nature or design [buildings, bridges, earthworks, roads, rock cairns, etc.]; prehistoric or historic).

These cultural resource types are not mutually exclusive and commonly co-occur or overlap with one another. For instance, an archeological site can form part of a cultural landscape, and this landscape may in turn be cherished as an important ethnographic resource by a nearby Native group. It is well to keep in mind that the same physical
features may embody different resource values when viewed from different historical and cultural perspectives. Thus, a ruined and roofless cabin may never be recorded as a structure by an historical architect; but this same dilapidated cabin and its associated historic trash might delight an archeologist who sees it as an archeological site.

To fulfill its stewardship role in the care for these various resource types the National Park Service engages in four fundamental activities: inventory, evaluation, registration, and treatment. These activity areas are defined below.

- **Inventory:** Inventory consists of locating the resource, describing the resource, and identifying the resource (as to type, character, age, etc.).

- **Evaluation:** Evaluation of the resource involves an assessment of its significance and its condition (i.e. state of preservation). The significance of a cultural resource is evaluated by applying the formal criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (the official registry established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966). Significant cultural resources are those that meet one or more the following criteria (National Park Service 1997:2).

  A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of United States' history.

  B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in the history of the United States.

  C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

  D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Sites that meet the above criteria must also meet the test of “integrity” to be considered truly significant. Integrity refers to “the ability of a (cultural) property to convey its significance (National Park Service 1997:44).” In brief, to be significant a cultural resource must possess the essential physical features, attributes, and associations that are necessary to its identity as a recognizably important cultural property. For example, historic structures that have been re-located or isolated from their original historic settings are generally thought to have lost their integrity.
• **Registration:** Registration refers to the official recognition of cultural resources that have been found to be significant and therefore eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Sites that meet the criteria are nominated for inclusion on the National Register. Placement or listing on the National Register of Historic Places is the final act of “Registration”.

Sites on the National Register of Historic Places that exhibit exceptional value in illustrating the cultural heritage of the United States are designated as National Historic Landmarks by the Secretary of the Interior (only three percent of the sites on the National Register of Historic Places have “Landmark” status).

• **Treatment:** The term “treatment” includes all the management actions that might be taken to preserve and interpret a significant cultural resource. It is important to note that the National Park Service normally only expends staff time and funds for the care of cultural resources that are already listed on or have been determined potentially eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Treatment actions can include such diverse activities as adaptive re-use of historic structures, stabilization, research, museum conservation, law enforcement protection, and interpretive exhibition (Figures 8 and 9).

With rare exceptions, research in the National Park Service is not undertaken for its own sake (National Park Service 2001:48-49). Almost all the research conducted by the National Park Service can be best described as applied research tailored to help the agency carry out its stewardship responsibilities. Investigations are made to find unrecorded archeological sites, to better document the historic use of a structure, or to discover what kinds of paint or wood was employed by the builders of an early building that is scheduled for preservation treatment. Consumptive research that uses up or otherwise destroys significant cultural resources is permitted only when there is a compelling justification for the work in terms of overall preservation goals. With few exceptions, full-scale archeological excavations, for instance, are reserved for sites that are threatened by natural or human forces and are in imminent danger of destruction. In such cases, the research is specifically designed to retrieve as much data as possible from the site prior to its loss. This type of archeological treatment is usually viewed as a last recourse and is termed “data recovery” because the purpose of the research is to collect the most valuable information about a particular archeological site before it is gone. When archeological data recovery is properly conducted, what made the site important is then preserved for posterity in reports and in curated museum specimens.

It would be a mistake, however, to believe that the National Park Service’s applied research program does not pursue major questions about Alaska’s cultural heritage. Though National Park Service research is conducted in primary service to cultural resource stewardship, that does not mean that the research cannot address interesting and serious questions about the past. It can and does. The National Park Service recognizes that it must understand the resources in its charge and interpret their meaning to the public if it is to fulfill its legislative mission as defined by the Organic Act of 1916 and other legislation that directs the National Park Service in its job. For example, the
threatened loss of an important historic Inupiat reindeer herding village to erosion by the sea gave stimulus and focus to a wide range of studies in archeology, ethnography, and in historical architecture. These studies were funded by the Shared Beringian Heritage Program and they were carried out to document the social fabric of the village, its architecture, its role as a base for sea mammal hunting and reindeer herding, and the village's place in the overall history of the Inupiat people of the Seward Peninsula. The work was conducted in full collaboration with the local Inupiat elders and gave the National Park Service a welcome window of opportunity to gather invaluable information on the traditional way of life followed in and around Bering Land Bridge National Preserve (Figure 10). Results of the scholarly research were eventually published in a popular book targeted toward the general public and also presented in two video cassettes that were distributed throughout northwest Alaska (Schaaf and Smith 1996).

The National Park Service recognizes that the significance of cultural resources lies in the stories they have to tell and it is the job of the National Park Service to make these stories known to the public. Cultural resources can have little worth as signposts to our past and future if we cannot make sense of what these sites and properties have to tell us. Research is an essential component of good cultural resource stewardship in the National Park Service, but it is not an end in itself; it is best thought of as the servant rather than as the master of responsible cultural resource management.

The laws that founded the National Park Service and guide its work today in Alaska made resource stewardship the primary mission of the Service. Charged with the job of being a good steward means that the National Park Service operations in Alaska place emphasis on the protection and preservation of cultural resources. The National Park Service is in full agreement with the observations of Ida Ruchina, President of Red Cross Chukotka and Director of Chukotka’s Project Hope. In her speech at the Beringia Days Conference in 2002 she reminded the audience that “you cannot manage what you cannot measure” (Ruchina 2002). Her speech was about the welfare of children and rural development, but her words also apply equally to the world of cultural resources. Sharing the same position on the importance of hard data as Ida Ruchina, the National Park Service puts first emphasis on the inventory of the cultural resources in its care; the need to know what cultural resources are on the land, where they are located, and how many of each type are present. In Alaska’s vastness, this job of inventory may take decades, but it must be done. Also of great importance to good stewardship is proper evaluation of the cultural resources that have been found in the course of inventory; evaluation reveals which cultural properties are significant and merit allocations of staff and funds to their long-term protection and preservation. Once a site has been thoroughly inventoried and evaluated, the next step in responsible cultural resource management is registration; the formal process which gives official recognition to a site’s or property’s comparative importance in the world and thereby enhances its visibility in the government’s planning and decision-making process. The fourth and final step in an effective program of resource management is treatment. Treatment refers to all those management actions that must be taken, often repeatedly over time, to ensure the long-term preservation of a significant resource so it remains available to those future generations who may also wish to “interrogate” their past, as Belinsky advocated, in
order to get a sense of their own future. Inherent as an essential action under treatment is interpretation or education; for unless a resource is understood and appreciated by the public, both the cultural resource itself and the story it has to tell will be lost to the years.

The basic mission of the National Park Service in Alaska is that of a good steward. In the realm of cultural resources, its stewardship responsibilities extend to the Alaskan parklands and also out to the wider public that looks to the National Park Service for advice and assistance in cultural resource management for lands outside the boundaries of the parks. In either case the basic job description of the National Park Service is the same; it is charged with good cultural resource stewardship; that is, the careful and responsible management of the cultural resources entrusted to its care so that they remain unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Bibliography

Figes, Orlando

Freeling, Nicholas

Gove, Philip Babcock (Editor)

Merriam-Webster Incorporated

National Park Service

Ruchina, Ida  

Schaaf, Jeanne and Thetus Smith (Editors)  

Shelton, Napier and Lissa Fox  

Tiller, de Teel Patterson  

**Captions for Figures**

Figure 1—National Parks of Alaska

Figure 2—The Aerology Building in Unalaska, Alaska. This building served as the United States Air Force’s main weather station on the Island of Unalaska in the Aleutian Island chain during World War II.

Figure 3—“Russian Bishop’s House”; built in 1842-44 in Sitka, Alaska; Sitka National Historical Park.

Figure 4—Left: Photograph of Roy Fure’s Cabin (1926) in Katmai National Park together with a set of formal maps showing its setting in the landscape. Right: Photograph of the Church of the Holy Ascension (1894), a National Historic Landmark in Unalaska, Alaska, together with an architectural section drawing of the same structure. Both photographs and drawings are at the standard called for by the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) established by the Historic Sites Act of 1935.

Figure 5—Holy Assumption Russian Orthodox Church (1894-95) in Kenai, Alaska; a National Historic Landmark.
Figure 6—Map of Ipiutak National Historic Landmark in Point Hope, Alaska

Figure 7—Example of National Park Service assistance to Alaska Native groups; maps and drawings of Chief Kashake’s House (1895), a historic Tlingit Clan House, in Saxman, Alaska.

Figure 8—Examples of preservation treatment. The top two photographs show the Goldberg Cigar Store (1898), Skagway, Alaska; before (left) and during (right) stabilization and rehabilitation. The photograph at the bottom left shows the Russian Orthodox School (1897) after architectural rehabilitation, Sitka National Historical Park. The photograph on the lower right is of the Railroad Depot (1898) after architectural rehabilitation, Skagway, Alaska; both the Goldberg Cigar Store and the Railroad Depot are in Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park.

Figure 9—Historic American Building Survey (HABS) drawing of the village of Anaktuvuk Pass as it appeared in the 1950s. This type of documentation is a form of preservation treatment. Anaktuvuk Pass is a Nunamiut village located within the boundaries of Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve.

Figure 10—Gideon Barr, Inupiat hunter and reindeer herder, at the location of his historic home village of Ublasaun in Bering Land Bridge National Preserve. Gideon Barr helped the National Park Service preserve the story of this threatened site through documentation of its archeology, ethnohistory, and architecture.