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Traditional Tlingit Law & Governance  
and Contemporary Sealaska Corporate Governance:  
4 Core Values and a Jurisprudence of Transformation  

Micah S. McNeil¹  

I. INTRODUCTION  

This paper will give historical insight into the Tlingit Nation’s governance and showcase how their government has changed over time. This paper will then talk about the unique form of governance adapted through the Sealaska Corporation and its various associate organizations. The Tlingit governmental structure was clan-based throughout its history but has evolved to a regional corporate and tribal government structure because of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). Fundamental to Tlingit law and governance is holding to core values while embracing a jurisprudence of change and transformation. Though, I focus on the four core values of the Tlingit, *Wooch.Yax* (Balance) is foundational to understanding Tlingit law and governance and remains a key core value at the Sealaska Corporation in the contemporary era.  

II. OVERVIEW: A ROADMAP FOR OUR JOURNEY  

First, I will discuss the traditional Tlingit law and governance at the time of first contact with Europeans. I will then discuss the transitionary period between the traditional tribal law and governance of the Tlingit Nation to the birth of the Sealaska Corporation through the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). Sealaska is an Alaska Native Regional Corporation comprising the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian Nations. Next, I will give an overview of the  
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contemporary governance of the Sealaska Corporation. I will then discuss how the Tlingit people are still applying Tlingit law, and values through the Sealaska Corporation. I will do so by reviewing the four core Tlingit values of *Haa Aami* (Our Land), *Haa Latsen* (Our Strength & Leadership), *Haa Shuká* (Past, Present, and Future Generations), and *Wooch.Yax* (Balance) and how the Sealaska Corporation incorporates them today. I will also compare the Tlingit clan governance structure with the current Sealaska corporate governance model and discuss the similarities and differences between the two. Finally, there are some issues that Sealaska and the Tlingit need to resolve, for which I will offer practical solutions.

Historically, the Tlingit form of governance was centralized in the clan. Yet, the large number of clans in the various Tlingit regions – otherwise known as *kwaans* - created a decentralized form of governance in the aggregate. Today the governance of the Tlingit has transitioned to a regional form of governance through Sealaska and the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (CCTHITA). However, similar to the ancient clan structure, the Tlingit also maintain a decentralized form of governance through Sealaska, the various Native village and urban corporations, as well as the organizations Sealaska is associated with.

III. **Historic Tlingit Law and Governance**

A. Traditional Tlingit Spiritual Beliefs: Yéil

To understand Tlingit law and governance, it is important to recognize the traditional spiritual beliefs of the Tlingit. The Tlingit historically believed in a Supreme Being named Yéil. Yéil was embodied in Raven, inferred to be Creator. Yéil created everything in the world and could also do anything. According to the Tlingit, Yéil existed before He was born and dwells in a place called *Naasshagiyéil*, which is in the interior of America. Yéil loves people but sometimes gets angry with them. However, Yéil has a Son who often intervenes with His Father on behalf of the people and delivers them from His Father’s anger. The Son of Yéil also gives provision for the people.

Traditionally, Yéil’s words and deeds were the dogmas of the Tlingit’s rules of life and faith. The Tlingit would say, “Just as Yéil lived and acted, so do we.” One could infer from this statement that traditional Tlingit law originated
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in a supernatural source and was born in part out of their relationship with the Creator. This is similar to the Cherokee, who did not distinguish between their religious and natural laws, as they believed their laws were divine and came from a divine source.⁹

The statement “Just as Yéil lived and acted, so do we” could indicate that performance law has played an important role in Tlingit law and governance, both historically and contemporarily.¹⁰ Performance law is a common form of jurisprudence among indigenous people. Performance law blends the oral tradition with ceremonies and is dynamic in nature.¹¹ Performance law also expresses meaning through actions and processes.¹²

Among the Tlingit, this performance law can be observed at ceremonial potlatches through the oratory of elders, Tlingit song and dance performances, and the tremendous amount of giving that takes place at these events. Through these ceremonial potlatches, history, law, and values are transmitted from generation to generation. Performance law, in a contemporary sense, can also be observed at the Sealaska Corporation through its investments in organizations and programs that promote the culture of the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian. Finally, this performance law is also manifest through Sealaska’s investments in programs that seek its shareholders' social and economic well-being.

i. **Tlingit Raven Story and a Jurisprudence of Transformation**

In terms of Yéil, there appears to have been two characters called Raven.¹³ One was a Supreme Being, and the other was considered a Trickster. It is unclear if these were the same Being manifested in different forms that served different functions, but they exhibited different character qualities.

In the Tlingit story of “Raven and the Box of Light,” Yéil manifested as Trickster.¹⁴ In the story, the world was cloaked in darkness because an old chief held the light in a clan house.¹⁵ Raven transformed Himself into a hemlock needle in the stream.¹⁶ The old chief’s daughter drank the water containing the hemlock

---

⁹ Rennard Strickland, Fire and the Spirits: Cherokee Law from Clan to Court 10-11 (1975).
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¹² *Id.* at 169-70.
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needle and was impregnated.\textsuperscript{17} She gave birth to Raven as a boy.\textsuperscript{18} In the story, the chief would not deny his grandson anything, and Raven asked to play with the chief’s boxes.\textsuperscript{19} Initially, the chief refused, but Raven screamed until his grandfather relented.\textsuperscript{20} Raven opened the box, and the stars flew into the sky.\textsuperscript{21} This same interaction with the grandfather happened again, and Raven opened another box, and the moon floated out of the box into the sky.\textsuperscript{22} Eventually, Raven grew tired of being a boy and transformed back into a Raven. When everyone was asleep, he opened the final box, and it released the Sun into the sky. Through this story, Raven transformed the world from darkness to light.\textsuperscript{23}

This story is similar to other tribal stories of transformation, which blend the core values of the people with jurisprudence of transformation.\textsuperscript{24} In many cases, this jurisprudential philosophy of transformation is taught through the story of Trickster.\textsuperscript{25} Trickster stories, in many cases, have an element of surprise, convey the contradictions and tensions of life, and express the value of change and transformation.\textsuperscript{26} Trickster stories are similar to an asterisk in the oral tradition, as they encourage a person to step out of the box, innovate, and break taboos in order to, like Raven, release the light out of one’s box for the benefit of the world. Like the Tlingit story of “Raven and the Box of Light,” Tlingit law and governance reflect a journey of honoring timeless laws and values while embracing change and transformation.\textsuperscript{27}

\textbf{B. Dualism: Wooch.Yax}

Underlying Tlingit Law is a spiritual philosophy of dualism.\textsuperscript{28} This Tlingit principle of dualism is called \textit{Wooch.Yax}, which means “Balance.”\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Wooch.Yax} includes the concepts of social and spiritual balance, as well as reciprocity and respect.\textsuperscript{30} Historically, this was similar to other tribal legal traditions of harmony and balance that underlie the laws and values of other Tribes throughout the

\footnotesize{
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} Alaska Native Knowledge Network, \textit{Raven Steals The Sun, Stars And Moon}, http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/npe/culturalatlases/yupiaq/marshall/raven/RavenStealsSunStarsMoon.html [https://perma.cc/B4S9-LNDE].
\item \textsuperscript{18} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Henderson, \textit{supra} note 10, at 161-63.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Id. at 161.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Id. at 162.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Rosita Faith Worl, Tlingit At.oow: Tangible and Intangible Property 34 (May 1998) (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University) (on file with author).
\item \textsuperscript{29} Sealaska Heritage, \textit{Unit 4, Clans and Moieties}, https://www.sealaskaheritage.org/sites/default/files/Unit%204_3.pdf [https://perma.cc/XW3Z-XQXV].
\item \textsuperscript{30} Worl, \textit{supra} note 28, at 83-84.
\end{itemize}
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world. The principles of dualism, harmony, and balance are also similar to Anasazi jurisprudence which focused on harmony and balance with the ecosystem, nature, and spiritual forces. The Tlingit were also historically animistic and believed that all creation had a spirit called yéik. The Tlingit believed it was necessary to live in harmony and balance with each other, the natural world, and the supernatural world.

This dualistic belief in harmony and balance created a binary social and governmental structure for the Tlingit Tribe. The traditional Tlingit social structure was, and still is, comprised of two moieties. These two moieties are divided between the Eagle and Raven moieties. Historically it is believed that the Eagle people migrated from the interior of Canada and the Raven people migrated from the south to Southeast Alaska before becoming one people. In this dualistic structure, clans are organized under both the Eagle and Raven moieties. Generally, under the Eagle moieties, inland animal crests represent the clans, for instance, the Bear or the Wolf clans. However, this is not mutually exclusive, as the Killer whale clan is organized under the Eagle moiety. Under the Raven moiety, the clans are generally offshore and sea-based mammals, such as the Coho Salmon clan or the Sockeye Salmon clan. The association with different animal crests was generally based on pre-contact mythic time and supernatural encounters with animals, recorded in the Tlingit’s oral tradition.

C. Marriage between Binary Moieties

Under this dualistic moiety structure, Tlingit law proscribed that a person could not marry within their clan or marry within their moiety. A person could only marry someone in another clan that was part of the opposite moiety. For

See, e.g., John W. Ragsdale Jr., Anasazi Jurisprudence, 22 Am. Indian L. Rev. 393, 417 (1998) (noting “the jurisprudence of the Anasazi . . . was in chosen service to rhythm, balance, and unity within the natural and human communities”).

Id.

Id., supra note 1, at 1.

Walter R. Echo-Hawk, In the Courts of the Conqueror 359-60 (2010).

Worl, supra note 28, at 83-84.

Id. at 39.

Id. at 33.

Id. at 134-44.

Id. at 128.

Nora Marks Dauenhaur, Richard Dauenhaur, Haa Kusteeyí, Our Culture 6 (Nora Dauenhaur & Richard Dauenhaur 1994).

Worl, supra note 28, at 130.

Id.

Id.

Id. at 41.

ANKN, Tlingit Indians of Southeastern Alaska, http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/iks/subsistence/tlingit/appendixa.htm#:~:text=A%20person%20could%20not%20marry,other%20of%20these%20marriage%20groups [https://perma.cc/83CB-N3P5].

Worl, supra note 28, at 37.
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instance, a person from the Coho salmon clan is part of the Raven moiety.\textsuperscript{47} They could only marry a person from a clan that was part of the Eagle moiety.\textsuperscript{48} An example might be a member of the Coho Salmon clan marrying a Killer whale clan member, who is a part of the opposite moiety, the Eagle moiety. This would also work the opposite way regarding a Killer whale clan member under the Eagle Moiety marrying a person in a clan under the Raven moiety.

Descendancy in Tlingit society was historically matrilineal.\textsuperscript{49} The children were born into their mothers’ moiety, clan and house group.\textsuperscript{50} For instance, if the mother was from the Raven moiety and was part of the Coho Salmon clan, then the child would be born into the same Raven moiety, Coho Salmon clan and house group.\textsuperscript{51} The children would have equal ownership rights of their clan’s property throughout their life with other clan members but also had a special relationship with their fathers’ clan where they were a “Child” of the Father’s clan.\textsuperscript{52} For instance, if their father was from the Killer Whale clan, they were called a “Child of the Killer Whale Clan.”\textsuperscript{53} They were not members of the opposite moiety or their father’s clan, but they had a special status of being a “child” of their father’s clan.\textsuperscript{54} This was similar to a life-estate within the father’s clan, where they had “use rights” to their father’s clan property throughout their life.\textsuperscript{55} However, like a life-estate, the use rights to their father’s clan property would not be passed down to their children.\textsuperscript{56} In contemporary times the identification with a clan is still very strong among Tlingit people, and the structure of the two moieties of Raven and Eagle remains intact.\textsuperscript{57} Also, the matrilineal structure of being born into one’s mother’s clan is still intact.\textsuperscript{58} The Tlingit law of marrying another person on the opposite moiety is not as strictly enforced or observed. However, there is an underlying awareness of the law of marrying a person in the opposite moiety and the need to practice this tradition.\textsuperscript{59} In particular, there have been cases in contemporary times where a person was disqualified from being a clan leader because they married within their moiety.\textsuperscript{60}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[47]{Id.}
\footnotetext[48]{Id.}
\footnotetext[49]{Sealaska Heritage, Unit 7, Clans and Moieties, \url{https://www.sealaskaheritage.org/sites/default/files/Unit%207_2.pdf} [\url{https://perma.cc/28UX-P3K4}].}
\footnotetext[50]{Worl, \textit{supra} note 28, at 37.}
\footnotetext[51]{Id. at 41, 46.}
\footnotetext[52]{Id. at 54.}
\footnotetext[53]{Id.}
\footnotetext[54]{Id.}
\footnotetext[55]{Id. at 56.}
\footnotetext[56]{Id.}
\footnotetext[57]{Central Council Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska, \textit{Our History} \url{http://www.ccthita.org/about/history/index.html} [\url{https://perma.cc/KTL5-S4HK}].}
\footnotetext[58]{Id.}
\footnotetext[60]{Id.}
\end{footnotes}
D. Haa Aani: Our Land

Historically, the Tlingit owned almost all of Southeast Alaska exclusively. The Court of Claims in Tlingit and Haida v US, recognized the Tlingit’s possession of the lands, water, and trade routes that compromised almost all of Southeast Alaska, and included trade routes into the interior of Canada. The Tlingit called this land Haa Aani, which means “our land.” Haa Aani was not just a geographical designation but represented a spiritual philosophy. The philosophy of Haa Aani recognized not only that Southeast Alaska was the homeland of the Tlingit, but that all creation had a spirit and it was necessary to be good stewards of the land in honor of past, current, and future generations. Haa Aani included the philosophy of using the land productively and not wasting the resources of the land. As a result, Haa Aani promoted stewardship of the land for future generations while encouraging industry and the productive use of the land, waters, and seas.

i. Kwaans: Geographical Regions

At the time of European contact, Haa Aani was divided into 17 different tribal subdivisions called kwaans. The kwaans were not governing structures but represented regions of the Tlingit where villages and clans were located. Each kwaan covered a region of Southeast Alaska and was composed of resident clans that owned the land and waters of the area. The kwaan was generally composed of at least two clans in a village that shared a reciprocal relationship, similar to a marriage. This reciprocal relationship between the two clans from opposite moieties included reciprocity in ceremonial potlatches. Also, through paired house groups of clans from opposing moieties, it provided the economic benefit of access to shared land and resources for both clans. The reciprocal relationship between the two clans was a form of Wooch.Yax and had an underlying value of sharing and generosity between the clans. It also multiplied access to land and resources for each clan.

62 Id. at 456.
63 Sealaska Heritage, Heritage Forward, https://www.sealaskaheritage.org/about
64 Id.
65 Id.
66 See Tlingit & Haida I, supra note 61, at 456.
67 Id., at 457.
68 Worl, supra note 28, at 51-52.
69 Id.
70 Id. at 52.
71 Id. at 39, 52.
72 Id. at 38, 52.
73 Id. at 39, 52.
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This relationship with the opposing clan is still in force, especially through ceremonial potlatches, which always involve the two opposite clans from the Raven and Eagle moieties. The Tlingit word for potlatch is Ku.éex, which is translated as “invitation to a ceremony.” The potlatch is central to the culture of the Tlingit. Though a potlatch can serve different purposes, the Tlingit in contemporary times emphasize the memorial aspect of the ceremony. In a potlatch, if a member of a clan dies, the opposing clan will pay for the funeral expenses of the deceased clan member. The potlatch has an element of wills and trust law as the opposite clan will pay for the funeral expenses, like a life insurance policy. For instance, if a Coho salmon clan member passes away, the Killer whale clan will pay the funeral costs. Then the Coho salmon clan will repay the Killer Whale clan through the potlatch. The potlatch is therefore a repayment of the clan debt. It includes the memorialization of the deceased clan member, the release of grief, and the giving of gifts to the opposing clan. The giving in these potlatches can be extravagant and includes the giving of money and gifts between both clans. The underlying reason for the potlatch is the value of Wooch.Yax: to restore spiritual and social balance after losing a clan member and restore the opposing clan for paying for the funeral expenses. It is a powerful expression of Wooch.Yax and there is a sense of extravagant generosity, family, and a unique sense of community, identity, and spirituality that comes with the experience. The potlatch is, in some respects, an embodiment of the value of Wooch.Yax and could be described as an invitation to a ceremony to restore harmony and balance.

Because of this reciprocal relationship with the opposing clan, a Tlingit’s experience with their culture in terms of the potlatch is generally centered around their own clan and the opposite clan. For example, a person who is a Coho Salmon will primarily experience the potlatch with the opposing clan, which could be the Killer whale clan. A Tlingit can grow up in Southeast Alaska, and their core ceremonial and cultural experience with potlatch will primarily be with their own clan and their father’s opposing clan. This does not mean they are not invited to other potlatches or involved in different Tlingit events, but like ancient times, Tlingits still live within somewhat of a virtual kwaan, where the potlatch is concerned, as their primary experience of the potlatch will be with their own clan

74 Id. at 37-38.
77 Id.
78 Id.
79 Id.
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and their father’s clan. Therefore, in a ceremonial and cultural sense, the principle of *Wooch.Yax* is still very much in force.

Historically, the kwaans were associated with one or more principal villages and were usually along the shoreline of Southeast Alaska. The kwaan included both the permanent village of the clans as well as their hunting and fishing territories. The members of the Tlingit clans generally had two homes during the year within the kwaan region. During summer, all community members would migrate to smaller villages, which were generally hunting and fishing camps owned by the clans. The Tlingit lived a fairly structured life between their winter homes, then migrating to their hunting and village camps during the summer and returning to the shoreline villages for the winter. The hunting and fishing territories were similar to farmers going to harvest. The Tlingit would harvest from their clan-owned fishing camps and bring the fish and game back to the village for the winter. Because of the abundance of natural resources, including great supplies of fish, wild game, and berries, the Tlingit as a whole generally enjoyed a surplus, which led to an advanced tribal culture and material abundance.

Many of the Tlingit were also exceptional traders who traded within their own tribe, with the Athabaskan in the interior and traveled as far south to Mexico using their cedar canoes to travel long distances. This was also a form of *Wooch.Yax* as it reflected the philosophy of the interrelationship between the Tlingit, as well as other tribes, nations, and other institutions. In this case, *Wooch.Yax* was expressed through the interrelationship of commerce with other tribal nations.

**ii. Clans: The Traditional Core Social Unit**

Within the kwaan, as noted earlier, the clans historically owned the lands and waters in the area. Traditionally, the clan was the core of the social unit. The clans’ property rights were communally based rather than individually based. In other words, the clan owned the property rather than the individual.

---

83 Id.
84 Id.
85 Id.
86 Id. at 18.
89 Central Council Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska Our History, *supra* note 57.
92 Id. at 7.
93 See id. at 59.
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The clan conducted subsistence activities and ceremonies. The clan also owned the intangible and tangible property of the clan into perpetuity. The Tlingit word for this property right of the clan is *at.oow*, which means “an owned or purchased object.” The intangible property rights included songs, stories, names, and crests. These were essentially intellectual property rights. The tangible property rights included land, physical structures, warriors’ armor and weaponry, fishing grounds, salmon streams, hunting territories, as well as utilitarian objects, equipment, and slaves. This clan system of ownership was so pervasive, that, in essence, every part of Southeast Alaska was marked as owned by one of the clans. This was unless the land was barren and then it was used as a marker to define the limits of land ownership. However, if there was a stream not owned by a clan, it was considered open for public use by those who needed it.

The individual members owned the tangible and intangible property equally and in common with other clan members. The basis of this property right was membership in the clan. The clan member could not sell clan property without the clan’s consent. Clan ownership of the intangible and tangible property rights was in perpetuity, and new members born into the clan through their mother had equal rights to the clan’s property. The clan ownership could be described as communal fee simple title as it went into perpetuity, with new

---

98 Id. at 4.
99 Id. at 3.
100 Tlingit & Haida I, *supra* note 61, at 457.
101 Id. at 458.
102 Goldschmidt & Haas, *supra* note 82, at 15.
104 Id. at 231.
105 Id. at 232.
108 Jim Kimmons & Hannah Hottenstein, *What Is Fee Simple Ownership?*, THE BALANCE, https://www.thebalancesmb.com/fee-simple-ownership-in-real-estate-2866601 [https://perma.cc/5PE6-MJZL] (last visited Mar. 5, 2022, 3:04 PM). Fee simple title, in an Anglo-American legal sense, is the absolute ownership of land of potentially infinite duration. It can be transferred to another through a sale, will, or gift. It is the most common form of title to homeownership in America. Worl, *supra* note 28, at 9. The Tlingit had a similar concept of title to property and land. However, it was communally based and required the consent of the clan to sell the land or property. The legal title of the land or property by the clan was exclusive and was considered to be of infinite duration unless extinguished with the permission of the clan.
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members being born into the clan. In fact, the names of individual clan members were owned by the clan as a form of *at'oow*, and were passed down from generation to generation.\(^{109}\) It was believed the clan was immortal, with the same individuals existing in the clan through the passing on of the name.\(^{110}\) The names could be described as being somewhat of an office or title, as it represented the embodiment of that person in the clan.\(^{111}\)

### iii. House Groups

The Tlingit also had house groups similar to subsidiaries.\(^{112}\) The house groups were basically extended family units that lived in the historic Tlingit houses with formal names that represented their house.\(^{113}\) The house members were a socio-economic unit but were still members of the clan and moiety they were part of.\(^{114}\) Though the clans are still very strong in Southeast Alaska, generally, the traditional Tlingit house family structure has been replaced by the nuclear family.\(^{115}\) However, an undercurrent of the house group is still very prevalent among the Tlingit people today, expressed through one’s association with a particular extended family. It might be said in a practical sense that though there are still recognized house affiliations, it has been supplemented by a family’s last name, representing a large extended family one is a part of.\(^{116}\)

### IV. Tlingit Governance Structure

#### A. Decentralized Governance

In terms of the historic Tlingit form of governance, it was largely a decentralized form of governance.\(^{117}\) For instance, though the Tlingit clans were organized under the two Eagle and Raven moieties, they did not have leaders over moiety.\(^{118}\) In other words, no universal leader of the Raven or Eagle moiety existed.\(^{119}\) Instead, the leadership among the Tlingit was found with the clan leaders and house leaders.\(^{120}\) The name for a clan leader was *shaadei hani*, which is translated as “leader”.\(^{121}\) The house leader was *hits’aatii*, which meant “keeper

\(^{109}\) Worl, *supra* note 28, at 41-42.  
\(^{110}\) Id. at 41, 43.  
\(^{111}\) See *Id.* at 42.  
\(^{112}\) *Id.* at 46.  
\(^{113}\) *Id.* at 46-47.  
\(^{114}\) Sealaska Heritage Q & A, *supra* note 59.  
\(^{115}\) *Id.*  
\(^{116}\) *Id.*  
\(^{118}\) *Id.* at 39.  
\(^{119}\) *Id.*  
\(^{120}\) *Id.* at 57.  
\(^{121}\) *Id.* at 58.
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of the house". The leader of each clan held the property in trust for the members. The clan leader served a fiduciary role and protected the property of the clan for the benefit of the clan. The clan leaders enjoyed a special status within their clan, but they did not have the authority to dispose of communally held property without the consent of the clan.

Though there were no universal leaders over the Raven or Eagle Moieties, one clan leader from each moiety was recognized as the community leader in the village. These two leaders were generally senior clan leaders and were top leaders in community-wide actions. These initiatives could be for either peaceful or war activities. As a result, each village had two leaders.

B. Clan Leadership Training

The clan leader went through rigorous training, usually through his maternal uncle, who raised him. This concept of leadership training by the Tlingit is called Haa Latseen, which is leadership training and the “way of the warrior”. The clan leader was expected to be “exemplary” in the various spheres of Tlingit life and was expected to exercise leadership in the political, ceremonial, and economic aspects of the clan’s life. Some of the responsibilities of the clan also included being a spokesman in “ceremonial activities and political actions”. The clan leader, in consultation with the council, would also decide when salmon streams could be used by other clans, as well as hold memorial feasts where the clan’s crests and ceremonial property could be displayed. Clan leaders at times served as lead warriors called x’eigaa kaa. The clan leader would also often trade on behalf of the tribe.

C. Council Assembly

The process of governmental decisions was made traditionally through council assembly. The house leaders would meet to discuss issues and then agree upon a course of action. The house leaders would then convene at a

123 Wohl, supra note 27, at 58-59.
124 Id. at 63.
125 Rosita Kaahání Wohl, supra note 94.
126 Goldschmidt & Haas, supra note 81, at 11.
127 Id.
128 Id.
129 Id.
130 Wohl, supra note 28, at 60.
131 Sealaska Heritage, supra note 63.
132 Wohl, supra note 28, at 60.
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council assembly, in which every adult male of the local clan would have an equal right to express an opinion. This meeting also included women of high status and older women. In the clan meeting, the senior ranking clan leader would preside over the clan council meeting. The clan used majority rule to make decisions, where the decisions made by the house leaders were generally adopted.

At the clan level, the governmental decision making was centralized within the individual clans. However, as there were 17 distinct kwaan’s with many clans within each kwaan, the governance model as an aggregate was decentralized with most of the clans’ governmental decisions dispersed throughout Southeast Alaska. Sometimes the clans would unite for war in temporary federations, but generally, the governance was done through the clans.

There are studies that suggest the Tlingits were beginning to centralize at the time of contact, at the kwaan level. This was because population growth and clans were beginning to be established in more than one village. Also, through extending “use rights” to non-clan members, the non-clan members were beginning to have access to property outside their clan. As a result villages were beginning to emerge as a socio-economic force. There is a theory that the Tlingit were on a path toward consolidation, which may have led to a more centralized form of governance among the Tlingit in the contemporary era.

V. TRANSITION TO ANCSA

A. The Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB)

Before reviewing Tlingit governance and law at the Sealaska Corporation, I will discuss the role Tlingit played in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA), which eventually led to the creation of the Sealaska Corporation. This transition to settling the land claims in Alaska also reveals a steady shift in the governance of the Tlingit that would later manifest at Sealaska.

The Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian were instrumental in the land claims for Alaska Natives through the Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) and later the
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Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN). This tradition of Haa Latseen – leadership – was very strong among the Tlingit, who not only initiated civil rights for Alaska Native to vote but spearheaded the land claims for Alaska Natives. The move towards land claims was driven by the Tlingit concept of Haa Aani – “Our Land”. Historically, the land claims movement was inaugurated by Peter Simpson, a Tsimshian from Canada and a devout Christian. He served a prophetic role for the Tlingit people and was considered the “father of the land claims” in Alaska, along with William Paul, a Tlingit lawyer. There is a legendary conversation between Peter Simpson and William Paul, in which Peter Simpson asked William Paul whose land Alaska belonged to. William Paul thought about it for a moment. Then he replied: “We do.” Peter Simpson replied: “Then fight for it!” These words of Peter Simpson to William Paul represented the beginning of the land claims movement in Alaska.

One of the key organizations that started the Alaska Native land claims movement was the Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB), founded in 1912. William Paul, Peter Simpson, and others were the foundational members of ANB. It was primarily composed of Tlingit Christians. However, membership in the organization was organized around kwaans or villages. This suggested a shift to more of a regional form of governance. ANB pressed aggressively for “voting rights, desegregation, and social services, as well as advancing the first Tlingit and Haida land claims in Alaska.” In continuation of the mandate of Haa Aani, in 1955, William Paul brought a land claims suit for compensation from Congress for lumber taken from the Tee-Hit Ton. The Tee-Hit Ton were a Tlingit clan whose homeland was in the Tongass Forest. The Tee-Hit Ton claimed “full proprietary ownership” based on aboriginal title.
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This aboriginal title was based on the clan ownership of the land by the Tee-Hit Ton. In one of the worst Supreme Court decisions in Federal Indian law history, the Supreme Court ruled against the Tee-Hit Ton, denying them compensation for a taking under the 5th Amendment. However, the decision laid the groundwork for the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANSCA), as it was the first time the Supreme Court implicitly recognized aboriginal title in Alaska.

B. IRA Transition in Alaska

With the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) in 1934, the IRA governments eventually extended to Alaska. During this period, Tlingit kwaans were formed into IRA village governments. However, this was a temporary governmental structure for the holding of land and as a primary focal point of tribal governance. The land IRA governments previously held was, in most cases, transferred over to either Alaska Native village or regional corporations at the passage of ANCSA in 1971.

In 1935, Congress authorized the Tlingit and Haida to form a lawsuit to obtain compensation for extinguishing aboriginal title land in the Tongass Forest. The Department of the Interior supervised the creation of a separate entity to manage the suit, and the Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian (CCTHITA) came into existence. CCTHITA was composed of a delegation from the Tlingit IRA kwaan (village) governments and the Haida.

---
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comparative tribal governance model might be the 8 Northern Pueblos\textsuperscript{175}, though in this case, it was a delegation from the IRA villages of the Tlingit and Haida.\textsuperscript{176} The lawsuit ended up being \textit{Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska v. United States}\textsuperscript{177}, in which the Tlingit and Haida eventually settled with the Court of Claims in 1968.\textsuperscript{178} This settlement was for a taking of the Tongass Forest, Glacier Bay National Park, and the extinguishment of fishing rights.\textsuperscript{179} I will discuss this case further in the paper in terms of its impact this settlement had on the land claims of the Tlingit and Haida through ANCSA. However, an important by-product of this case was that CCTHITA continued as a Tribal government and eventually was Federally recognized.\textsuperscript{180} CCTHITA remains a regional Tribal Government with delegates from the various villages throughout Southeast Alaska\textsuperscript{181} and has extended its delegation to include representatives from Washington State.\textsuperscript{182}

\section*{C. Alaska Federation of Natives}

In 1966, the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) was formed for the purpose of land claims for Alaska Natives, which continued the fight of ANB and William Paul.\textsuperscript{183} The AFN earned an initial victory when the Secretary of Interior Stuart Udall executed a land freeze on Native lands until the Alaska Native land claims were settled.\textsuperscript{184} This forced a resolution by the State of Alaska, Alaska Native people, and the Federal government for aboriginal land claims before any further land selections could take place in the state of Alaska.\textsuperscript{185}

The discovery of oil at Prudhoe Bay was the eventual turning point for the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS) would need to cross over land that various Alaska Native groups claimed.\textsuperscript{186} This land freeze put the building of the TAPS and oil exploration on
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This brought strong public pressure to settle land claims in Alaska. After intense negotiations among the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) delegates, various Alaska Native groups, and state and federal government representatives, Congress finally passed Alaska Native land claims legislation in 1971.

VI. ANCSA AND THE BIRTH OF SEALASKA

With the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) in 1971, Alaska Natives received 44 million acres of land. Alaska Natives, through this legislation ceded 321 million acres, representing 90% of the state and which the federal government and state governments appropriated. In compensation for this land cession, Alaska Natives received 926 million dollars, representing around $3 an acre.

A. ANCSA: A Unique Innovation

ANCSA was unique as instead of creating a reservation system for Alaska Natives, it established 12 Native Regional corporations and over 200 village corporations to manage the funds received and land to meet the “real economic and social needs” of Native shareholders. These corporations were based on the region the Alaska Natives came from, which included the Tlingit, Haida, Tsimshian, Inuit, Athabaskans, and Aleut in their various regions throughout Alaska. Most Natives are enrolled in both their regional corporations and either a village or urban corporation. Based on the ANCSA, generally a Native will have 100 shares of stock in their Regional Corporation and 100 shares in their village or urban corporation.

B. Sealaska Regional Corporation
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Sealaska Corporation is one of the regional corporations established by ANCSA.\(^{198}\) Its shareholders are members of the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian Nations.\(^{199}\) It has around 22,000 shareholders and is the largest Regional Corporation in Alaska.\(^{200}\) Sealaska is located in Juneau, Alaska.\(^{201}\) Though the largest Native Regional Corporation in terms of shareholders, it has the least amount of land of the regional Corporations.\(^{202}\) Sealaska owns 362,000 acres of surface estate and 560,000 acres of subsurface estate.\(^{203}\) This represents 1.6% of the original land base of the Tlingit nation.\(^{204}\) This is also a small portion compared to 44 million acres settled with Alaska Natives.

C. Sealaska & Section 14(h) of ANCSA

The reason for this disparity is that under section 12 of ANCSA, each regional Corporation, except Sealaska, received land in proportion to its number of shareholders residing in the region of the Corporation or to the relative size of the area to which the Regional Corporation had aboriginal land claims.\(^{205}\) Sealaska instead received its land under section 14(h) of ANCSA, a separate section of ANCSA from the other Corporations.\(^{206}\) As a result, Sealaska did not receive land in proportion to the number of shareholders or in proportion to its aboriginal land claims.\(^{207}\)

The reason for this, as referenced earlier, was the decision in *Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska v US.*\(^{208}\) Pursuant to the case, the Tlingit and Haida received compensation through the Court of Claims for the taking of 17 million acres in the Tongass National Force and 3.3 million acres in the Glacier Bay National Park.\(^{209}\) The 1968 settlement provided by the Court of Claims did not compensate the Tlingit and Haida for 2,628,207 acres of land subject to aboriginal
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“Traditional Tlingit Law & Governance and Contemporary Sealaska Corporate Governance”
title.\textsuperscript{210} The Court of Claims also determined the value of the lost Indian fishing rights at $8,388,315\textsuperscript{211} but did not compensate for those rights.\textsuperscript{212} The actual compensation of $7,546,053 that the Tlingit and Haida Tribe received was a fraction of the fair market value of the Tongass National Forest and Glacier Bay National Park.\textsuperscript{213} The settlement of the taking of both the Tongass National Forest and the Glacier Bay National Park, both part of the aboriginal homeland of the Tlingit Nation, worked out to just .43 cents per acre.\textsuperscript{214}

Therefore, as a result of the previous settlement in \textit{Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska v. United States} in 1968, Sealaska received its land through section 14(h) of ANCSA instead of section 12.\textsuperscript{215} Southeast Alaska Natives represented 20\% of the Native population in Alaska in 1971 but ended with receiving a small portion of their land returned through ANCSA.\textsuperscript{216} As a result, the Tlingit and Haida people who led the fight for Native Land claims lost most of their land.\textsuperscript{217}

**D. Sealaska Corporate Form**

The land Sealaska now owns is in Southeast Alaska. This is the traditional homeland of the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian people.\textsuperscript{218} Like other regional corporations, Sealaska has surface and subsurface rights to the land.\textsuperscript{219} The land is held in fee simple status\textsuperscript{220} and does not require the Secretary of the Interior’s approval or an Act of Congress to sell the land, which is unique among Native American Nations in the US.\textsuperscript{221} The various Southeast Village Corporations received surface rights to the land.\textsuperscript{222} However, the Regional Corporations, including Sealaska, have subsurface rights to the Village Corporations’ land.\textsuperscript{223}
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As part of the ANCSA settlement Section 7(i), the 12 regional Corporations must share 70% of their subsurface revenues with the other 12 Regional Corporations. However, the Regional Corporation is one of the 12 regional corporations included in the sharing of 70% of the revenues. This can amount to the Regional Corporation keeping around 51% of its revenues.

After 70% of the subsurface revenues are shared between the 12 Regional corporations, as part of Section 7(j) of ANCSA, the Regional Corporations share 50% of their subsurface revenues with the Village Corporations. As a result, though the Village Corporations do not have rights to their subsurface land, they get a certain percentage of the revenues back through Section 7(j) of ANCSA.

According to ANCSA, Sealaska and the other Regional Corporations were required to be established as for-profit corporations. The Village Corporations were allowed to choose a for-profit or non-profit corporate model. However, all the Village and Urban Corporations chose to be for-profit corporations. The ANCSA Regional Corporations, including Sealaska, were incorporated as for-profit Corporations under Alaska State Law. However, the Regional corporations are not under the jurisdiction of the State of Alaska but under the jurisdiction of Congress. Any type of authority the State of Alaska may have relative to ANCSA Regional Corporations is delegated by Congress. Still, Congress holds the ultimate jurisdiction over ANSCA Corporations, including plenary power. ANCSA Corporations also do not have the same relationship with the Secretary of Interior as other Federally-recognized Tribes in the US, where the Secretary of Interior has to be consulted in terms of making business decisions. ANCSA corporations are largely autonomous from the Secretary of Interior when making business decisions regarding the direction of the Corporation. This is because the Congressional policy focus of ANCSA was Native self-determination over Alaska’s tribal lands. Historically Alaska
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Natives leading up to the lands claims largely rejected the Reservation model as they wanted full control of their lands and destiny.\textsuperscript{238} This resulted from the negative experience they had with BIA agents during the IRA period, which they viewed as overly paternalistic.\textsuperscript{239} This would later have repercussions in \textit{Alaska v Native Village of Venetie}, where the Supreme Court held that Alaska Natives are not recognized as “Indian Country”\textsuperscript{240} due to a lack of federal supervision.\textsuperscript{241} The Supreme Court made this ruling despite ANCSA Corporations still being under Congressional jurisdiction\textsuperscript{242} being subject to plenary power and there being no express language\textsuperscript{243} that Congress extinguished Indian Country in ANCSA.\textsuperscript{244}

E. Sealaska: A Unique Hybrid Corporation

Though ANCSA Corporations are for-profit corporations, they are unique as they were created to “address the real economic and social needs” of Alaska Natives.\textsuperscript{245} Along with addressing its shareholders’ social and economic needs, Sealaska also seeks to promote the culture of the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian people.\textsuperscript{246} This is represented through its mission to “strengthen people, culture, language
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\end{itemize}
and homelands” of the Native shareholders. It also is manifested through performance law through the creation of the Sealaska Heritage Institute by Sealaska. The Heritage Institute is a non-profit corporation founded in 1980 to promulgate the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian culture and is primarily funded through Sealaska. Since its inception, Sealaska has invested $20.1 million in cash and in-kind service in the Sealaska Heritage Institute. Sealaska also, in 2012, took the additional step of identifying four core traditional Tlingit values and incorporating them as a guiding force managing their corporation. These values include: Haa Aaní (Our Land), Haa Latseen (Our Strength & Leadership), Haa Shuká (Past, Present, and Future Generations), and Woonch.Yax (Balance).

The Corporate form of Sealaska is essentially a hybrid Corporation that was established not only to be a for-profit corporation, but for the social and economic needs of its Native shareholders. Sealaska’s mission is also to strengthen the culture and homelands of its Native Shareholders. Sealaska, along with other ANCSA Corporations, is also a unique hybrid corporation as it owns much of the aboriginal lands of its people for its management and development and is responsible for protecting the aboriginal land base. The most comparable hybrid corporation is the Makivik Corporation in Northern Canada, which the Inuit established to administer the lands and compensation they received under the 1975 James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. This agreement settled the Inuit land claims in Quebec. The difference with the Makivik Corporation is that it is a non-profit corporation with for-profit subsidiaries. However, similarly, it is a hybrid Native corporation created to not only own and operate large businesses that create jobs but also improve the social and economic conditions of the Inuit people and preserve the culture of the Inuit.
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VII. SEALASKA CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

A. Board of Directors

In terms of the Governance of Sealaska Corporation, like many corporations, the Board of Directors manages the Corporation. Under its bylaws, the Board of Directors is composed of 13 Board members. Under ANCSA, each Board member must be a Sealaska Shareholder, and therefore must be Southeast Alaska Native. The Board has the fiduciary role of managing the corporation and making business decisions. The Board also hires and monitors the Corporate officers, in particular making the final decision of hiring the CEO of Sealaska. Each Board member serves a 3-year term and is elected by the Sealaska Shareholders. Sealaska Board members are elected at the Sealaska Annual Meeting. This election is a straddled approach as not all Board members are elected simultaneously but based on which Board members are up for election at the end of their 3-year terms.

Based on the Sealaska by-laws, the Board elects the various Sealaska Corporate officers, which include the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the Chief Operating Officer (COO), General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Secretary, Treasurer, and Vice-Presidents. However, in a practical sense, though the Board selects the CEO, the CEO generally hires the other corporate officers, and the Board elects to approve the CEO’s decision.

B. Corporate Officers

Like most corporations, Sealaska Corporate Officers run the day-to-day operations of the Corporation. Unlike the Sealaska Board, the Corporate officers do not have to be Sealaska shareholders, nor do they have to be Alaska Natives. However, since 1982 Sealaska has consistently had Native CEOs who are shareholders of the Corporation. Generally, the CEO and the officers will
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develop the corporation’s strategic plan and a multi-year operating plan, including a budget.\textsuperscript{273} As part of this hybrid corporate structure, the strategic plan not only includes means to increase the profit of the corporation and maximize shareholder value, but includes the social and economic well-being of the Shareholder, scholarships, education, elder benefits, and the promotion of the Southeast Native culture, generally through investing in these areas.\textsuperscript{274} The strategic plan and operating plan are presented to the Board of Directors, who either approve it, reject it, or amend it.\textsuperscript{275}

The CEO is the principal executive of the Corporation.\textsuperscript{276} However, based on the by-laws, all elected officers serve at the pleasure of the Board of Directors. They may be removed by the Board when it judges to be in the corporation’s best interest.\textsuperscript{277} By the same token, all the staff officers are appointed by the CEO and may be removed by the CEO if it is also determined to be in the best interests of the Corporation.\textsuperscript{278}

C. Shareholders

Like other corporations, the Native shareholders serve a limited role in the day-to-day governance of Sealaska.\textsuperscript{279} However, the shareholder’s role in the corporation cannot be underestimated. Shareholders are the collective owners of the corporation, who own the aboriginal land in fee simple.\textsuperscript{280} They are analogous somewhat to clan members traditionally, though their contribution is more indirect unless they are Sealaska employees.\textsuperscript{281} When ANCSA first established the Regional Corporations, it had a provision that the Shareholders could alienate or sell their stock in 1991.\textsuperscript{282} If this had taken place and the shareholders sold their shares, the corporation could have been liquidated. As a result the title to the land held by the corporation could have been potentially extinguished.\textsuperscript{283} This was because the land is held in fee title by Sealaska without being held in trust by the Federal government.\textsuperscript{284} Therefore, it does not require the permission of the federal government to extinguish the aboriginal land owned by the Corporation.\textsuperscript{285}

\textsuperscript{273} Telephone Interview with Chris McNeil, Jr, supra note 225.
\textsuperscript{274} Id.
\textsuperscript{275} Id.
\textsuperscript{276} Sealaska Bylaws, supra note 261, Bylaw 4.4, at 25.
\textsuperscript{277} Id. 4.3, at 25.
\textsuperscript{278} Id.
\textsuperscript{279} GAO, at 12.
\textsuperscript{281} Royhster, Blumm, & Warner, supra note 221, at 112.
\textsuperscript{282} Id.
\textsuperscript{283} Id.
\textsuperscript{284} Id.
\textsuperscript{285} Id.

"Traditional Tlingit Law & Governance and Contemporary Sealaska Corporate Governance"
However, in 1992 an amendment was passed by ANCSA, which made the stock inalienable. This is a limited form of putting the corporation’s land in trust, though not under the Federal government. Most Tribes in the US have a split title with the Federal government, where the Federal government is the ultimate owner of the land and the Tribes have a right of occupancy. In this Federal-Indian trust relationship, aboriginal land cannot be sold to anyone but the Federal government who can then extinguish the land. Generally, for a tribe to sell its land it requires an act of Congress. However, with Sealaska, the land is not held in trust by the Federal government. By making the shareholder’s stock inalienable, this is an internal mechanism to hold the land in trust by the corporation from being sold by the shareholders and thus protect the land from being extinguished. This is likely not the ultimate solution to protect the land from extinguishment, but an internal mechanism for the protection of the land by making the stock inalienable.

Through the 100 shares, the shareholders also receive dividends, generally on a quarterly basis. This dividend is approved by the Board of Directors for distribution. The dividend generally comes out of a combination of the Sealaska Permanent Fund and out of the operations of the corporation. The Sealaska Permanent Fund was established which is a blend of stocks and investments which the dividend can be derived from.

In 2022, Sealaska also established a Sealaska Settlement Trust, which is an ANCSA Settlement Trust, to make distributions to its shareholders and descendants. As a result of changes to the tax code brought about by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, the Sealaska Settlement Trust now provides significant tax savings for both Sealaska and its shareholders. These tax savings are realized when distributions are passed through the settlement trust, rather than
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paid directly to shareholders from Sealaska. Sealaska is now able to make pre-tax, rather than after-tax contributions to the Settlement Trust and shareholders, whose dividends were previously subject to a federal income tax, now receive their distributions tax-free.

The shareholder also has the power to vote for the Board of Directors at the annual meetings. Shareholders can vote for either a Board-nominated candidate or an independent candidate for the board. The shareholder can also initiate and vote for resolutions for the corporation. The voting for the Board of Directors and resolutions are voted by the Shareholders at the annual meetings. This voting is done either in person or by proxy.

Through ANCSA, initially, only Natives born before the Act took effect in 1971 could receive shareholder stocks in the corporation. ANCSA was amended to give Alaska Natives Corporations the option to include shareholders born after 1971. Sealaska was one of the few Alaska Native Corporations to amend its by-laws to include new shareholders born after 1971. As a result, these new shareholders were issued shares in the corporation. This was voted on and approved by the shareholders. It expanded the number of Native shareholders in the corporation. This is significant for the continuation of the corporation,

297 Duke Law, *The 2017 Tax Act and Settlement Trusts*, https://alr.law.duke.edu/article/the-2017-tax-act-and-settlement-trusts-edwards-vol35-iss1/ [https://perma.cc/V3A4-YLX4] (last visited March 9, 2023, 6:18 AM). Under ANCSA, Alaska Native Corporations can establish settlement trusts which are separate legal entities from the Corporation. Since their inception through an ANCSA amendment in 1987, ANCSA settlement trusts were used sparingly by ANCSA corporations, because of hurdles presented by the Internal Revenue code. However, these hurdles were largely removed by tax code changes brought about by the 2017 Tax Act. Through the 2017 Tax Act, ANCSA corporations now pay a 10% tax on ordinary income for contributions made to the settlement trust and shareholders pay no taxes on their distributions. The settlement trusts were created by ANCSA “to promote the health, education, and welfare of its beneficiaries, and preserve the heritage and culture” of Alaska Native shareholders. As a result, many ANCSA corporations have settlement trusts that include elder, scholarship and distribution programs for their shareholder beneficiaries. Settlement trusts can be either pass through entities or established as endowments. The settlement trusts are not subject to the rule against perpetuities and can therefore potentially continue into perpetuity.
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which according to its Articles of Incorporation is designed to go into perpetuity.\textsuperscript{309}

\textbf{D. Subsidiaries & Core Businesses}

The Sealaska governance structure also includes various subsidiaries that Sealaska owns throughout not only Alaska, but also throughout the US.\textsuperscript{310} The subsidiaries in certain cases have Sealaska shareholders as the CEOs.\textsuperscript{311} These subsidiaries include areas such as Timber corporations, digital transformation, seafood, environmental services, and manufacturing of synthetic and plastics.\textsuperscript{312} Sealaska serves as the parent corporation of these subsidiaries.\textsuperscript{313}

As part of its core business, Sealaska also has strategic business partners.\textsuperscript{314} These business partners are in the areas of sustainable foods, environmental services, drilling, and natural resource management.\textsuperscript{315}

Sealaska also has business interests that include government contracting through Sealaska’s government services group.\textsuperscript{316} These government contracts largely come as a result of Native preference through section 8(a) of the Small Business Act.\textsuperscript{317} This Native preference Amendment has been a key amendment for the survival of Alaska Native Corporations and for their success.\textsuperscript{318}

\textbf{E. Sealaska Partnerships: Kwaan Governance}

Sealaska also has partnership relationships with Alaska Native organizations such as Sealaska Heritage Foundation, CCTHITA, Spruce Roots Inc., ANB, Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN), and Sustainable Southeast

\textsuperscript{309} Sealaska Corp., Restated Articles of Incorporation of Sealaska Corp, art. II (2003), available at https://www.commerce.alaska.gov/cbp/main/search/entities [https://perma.cc/3WQP-KFHE].
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Partnership (SSP). In particular, as CCHITA is a regional Tribal Government and Sealaska is a regional Corporation, it could be argued that governance for the Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian people has in part centralized at the kwaan regional level. Also, through the other related organizations that Sealaska is partnered with, it is another means of participation in the governance for the Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian people. Though these organizations are not connected with Sealaska in a formalized governance model, they are a form of governance and means of participation for tribal members, both at the Kwaan regional level and through partnering organizations.

As stated earlier, Sealaska shares its revenues through section 7(j) with the Village and Urban corporations. However, these Village and Urban corporations are largely autonomous from Sealaska in their governance. They also represent a form of governance that Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian people can participate in as shareholders.

VIII. INCORPORATING TLINGIT VALUES IN SEALASKA

A. Four Core Values

In terms of the continuation of Tlingit values at Sealaska, in 2012 the Council of Elders from the Sealaska Heritage Institute willed Sealaska four core values that will be the core values of Sealaska business operations. These values were already expressed in different forms and actions by Sealaska before these Tlingit Core values were officially recognized to be integrated into the Corporate form, but they are now officially acknowledged as the core values for the corporation going forward. A number of these values were referenced earlier in this paper. The Four Key Values that were passed down from the Council of Elders to Sealaska are:

Haa Aaní: Our Land: Honoring & Utilizing our Land (Haida: Íít’ Tlagáa; Tsimshian: Na Laxyuubm)

Our ancestors, who have lived in this land for more than 10,000 years, taught us that everything has a Spirit. When we utilize our resources, we must acknowledge the Spirits of the Land, Sea and Air and tell them the benefits that their use will bring to our People. Our ancestors protected the ownership of our land for their children and grandchildren just as we must do for future generations.
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Haa Latseení: Our Strength: Strength of Body, Mind, and Spirit (Haida: Íirit’ Dagwiigáay; Tsimshian: Na Gatlleedm)
The “way of the Warriors” path to achieve physical and inner strength. Young men and women are taught through this value to protect and care for their families and clans. They are to seek truth and knowledge and to adapt to changing times while maintaining the integrity of the ancient values of the Tribe.

We maintain strong bonds with our ancestors whom we honor through our lives and in our ceremonies. We also have responsibilities to our future generations, and we must ensure that we protect our land and culture for our children and grandchildren and those who will follow them.

Wooch Yáx: Balance: Social and Spiritual Balance (Haida: Gu dlúu; Tsimshian: Ama Mackshm)
Wooch Yáx must be maintained to ensure social and spiritual harmony lest ill will goes wandering and causes harm. Wooch Yáx governs: Interrelationship between the Eagle and Ravens clans. Interrelationship between the Tlingit and others, including other tribes, nations and institutions. Wooch Yáx requires that our People and our organizations conduct business with Yán gaa doonéekw or “Dignity,” realizing that everything has its rightful place and that all action and business must be done with integrity.325

Sealaska has modified these core values somewhat for the corporate context, but the spirit of the values remains intact. Sealaska calls them “values in action”. They are to be embedded in Sealaska’s governance and operating culture. The Sealaska also adapted these four values in its Code of Ethics. I include the Sealaska version of the four core values that are now in the Sealaska code of ethics. I also include commentary by current Sealaska CEO Anthony Mallott, after each value:

“Haa Aaní (Our Land) leads us to strive for sustainable communities and a sustainable relationship with our lands.”326

According to the current Sealaska CEO Anthony Mallott, Haa Aaní is very important because the main impetus of ANCSA was retaining ownership of

325 Sealaska Heritage, supra note 63.
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traditional homelands. The focus for Sealaska in this regard is the stewardship, sustainability of the land, and the promotion of aboriginal land restoration for Sealaska and the Southeast Alaska Native village corporation and tribes.

“Wooch.Yax | (Balance, Reciprocity and Respect) guides us to a high value.”

According to CEO Anthony Mallott, Wooch.Yax represents the balance Sealaska expects to create within all relationships, including Sealaska’s relationships with its natural resources. The companies, relationships and projects need to provide value. This is the main measure of balance, “in proportion to the time and capital invested in the endeavor.” Wooch.Yax also represents the type of relationship Sealaska wants to build with its employees. According to CEO Mallott, Sealaska must reflect how strongly it values its employees “by recognizing their efforts and creating a culture where employee voices are listened to and where they see their efforts leading to progress.”

“Haa Shuká (Our Past, Present and Future) inspires us to learn from our past.”

According to CEO Mallott, in the Native corporate context, Haa Shuká culturally describes the connection the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian have with their ancestors and the responsibility to carry the Native culture, values and strength forward to the future generations. In the spirit of Haa Shuká, Sealaska looks “to its history by understanding the assets it was given and what strengths it has.” Sealaska also looks to its history to determine “what values it needs and wants to carry forward, what challenges Sealaska faces, and make decisions to benefit current and future generations of shareholders.” Haa Shuká speaks to sustainability and is a powerful value to Sealaska “given the 10,000-year history the Tlingit have with their homelands”.

“Haa Latseen: (Our Strength, Leadership) drives us to be responsible for continuous improvement and accountable to the people who rely on us.”
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According to CEO Maltott, Haa Latseen in the Sealaska corporation context is a value that indicates the discipline Sealaska needs to utilize its strengths and the responsibility to train and provide leadership so Sealaska can achieve its mission of “strengthening our people, culture, and homelands.” In addition, Haa Latseen leads Sealaska to invest its assets in areas where it can use its strength and “competitive advantages for the optimal future benefit of our tribal member shareholders.”

B. Incorporating Core Tlingit Values into the Code of Ethics

The four core values have been incorporated into the Sealaska code of ethics for its employees, management, Sealaska Board of Directors, and the contractors, controlled subsidiaries, consultants, and other persons authorized to act on Sealaska’s behalf. Failure to adhere to the code can lead to disciplinary action by the corporation. The use of the code is also included as part of the oath of office as Board members.

The four core values are in the initial CEO statement of the code of ethics as broad visionary values for the Corporation. The four core values are not used as sub-headings to the various areas of the code of ethics, but the ethics are largely derived from the four core values and Tlingit values in general. The Native corporation wrote the code of ethics and emphasizes Woonch Yax principles of fairness, accountability, making ethical decisions, and a respectful workplace. Sections of the code are very practical and cover such topics as environmental, health and safety rules, and substance abuse policies. However, other parts of the Sealaska Code of Ethics are unique to Sealaska. An example of this is the “Doing the Right Thing For Our Shareholders” section. It recognizes the corporation’s hybrid nature, stating that the code, while reflecting the “ordinary legal relationship” between officers, directors, and shareholders, also recognizes the relationship between Sealaska employees, officers, directors, and shareholders born out of ANCSA. It also acknowledges the unique relationship Sealaska has with shareholders based on the shareholders collective ownership of Sealaska. “Doing the Right Thing For Shareholders” focuses on the unique

---

340 Philanthropy Northwest, supra note 250.
341 Id.
342 Sealaska Code of Ethics, supra note 327, at 4.
343 Id.
344 Id. at 29. The oath of office by the Board members includes upholding the Sealaska code of ethics, along with being accountable to the by-laws of the Sealaska, fiduciary duties of the State of Alaska, and laws of the state of Alaska.
345 Id. at 3.
346 Id. at 8.
347 Id.
348 Id. at 9.
349 Id. at 13.
350 Id.
351 Id.

“Traditional Tlingit Law & Governance and Contemporary Sealaska Corporate Governance”
relationship and transaction between Sealaska and other Native corporations, including Native corporations and shareholder businesses, and states that these relationships should reflect fairness and integrity. The Sealaska Board of Directors adopted this code of ethics as an amendment. This is a form of incorporating Tlingit values into the day-to-day business operation of Sealaska and is a form of performance law of Native values and principles.

IX. APPLICATION OF FOUR CORE VALUES AT SEALASKA

Sealaska’s articulation and application of the four core values follows largely a combination of performance law through corporate investment in programs and businesses that reflect Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian values and corporate decisions and actions that align with Tribal values. Applying the four core values pre-dated the official incorporation of these values. This performance law of the four values has been revealed through both intentional acts by Sealaska to align with traditional Tlingit values and certain seemingly inadvertent confluence of forces through Congressional enactments that have overlapped with Tlingit law and culture in terms of the structure of the Corporation. I include several examples that show the use of the four values in a significant manner at Sealaska, both before Sealaska officially incorporated the four values and since the values became part of Sealaska corporate policy.

A. Haa Aaní: Our Land at Sealaska

i. Public Law 113-291

Public Law 113-291 transferred 70,075 acres of land from the Tongass Forest back to the Sealaska Corporation. This was a result of much lobbying and negotiation done by Sealaska over many years. This land was provided in section 14(h)(8) of ANCSA but had not been transferred to Sealaska yet since the passing of ANCSA in 1971. Sealaska met much resistance from various groups in Alaska, particularly environmental groups, but eventually, Sealaska prevailed in 2014 with the transfer of the land back to Sealaska. Sixty-nine thousand five
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hundred eighty-five acres went to Sealaska as a “Sealaska Selection,” and 490 acres were for cemetery and historical sites of the Tlingit.\textsuperscript{359} The land is located in the Tongass National Forest, which was part of the aboriginal homeland of the Tlingit nation.\textsuperscript{360} As mentioned earlier, it had previously been taken by the United States government through the creation of the Tongass National Forest.\textsuperscript{361} The Act represented through a Congressional Act both the Tlingit core values of \textit{Haa Aani} (Our Land) because of the restoration of the aboriginal land to Sealaska and the Tlingit people. The passing of the act also represented \textit{Wooch.Yax} (balance and reciprocity) because of the bipartisan Congressional support for this legislation to pass.\textsuperscript{362}

\textbf{ii. Sealaska’s Carbon Sequestration Program}

Sealaska has set aside over half of its forested lands to create a carbon bank.\textsuperscript{363} Through this program, greenhouse gas emitters in California can now buy carbon offset credits based on Sealaska’s carbon bank that is stored in the trees of Sealaska’s land.\textsuperscript{364} As a result, Sealaska will benefit from revenues through the program without logging on the land, and it will help preserve the rainforest.\textsuperscript{365} This represents \textit{Haa Aani} in terms of the stewardship by Sealaska for the sustainability of the land as well as \textit{Haa Shuká} by maintaining the land for future generations.

\textbf{B. Haa Shuká: Past, Present and Future Generations}

\textbf{i. Sealaska Heritage Institute}

Sealaska founded the Sealaska Heritage Institute in response to Tlingit elder’s concern about the continuation of the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian cultures.\textsuperscript{366} As noted earlier, the Heritage Institute was founded as a non-profit corporation in 1980 to promulgate the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian cultures.\textsuperscript{367} Sealaska has consistently been a part of funding the Heritage Institute throughout its history.\textsuperscript{368} The Heritage Institute organizes the Annual Celebration, which brings together the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian in a celebration of dances and
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songs and honoring the culture in Juneau, AK. It also does extensive scholarly studies of the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian cultures and has a program to restore the Tlingit language. It also recently established the Walter Soboleff Heritage Center, which will exhibit the creation of Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian art, have lecture series and has a Heritage store. This is a form of Haa Shuká, as the Heritage Institute was established to learn and understand the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian cultures, as well as the continuation and development of these cultures into the future generations. It is also a form of performance law by Sealaska, in terms of investing in the Sealaska Heritage Institute to promote and continue the culture.

ii. Incorporation of New Shareholders

As noted earlier, Sealaska was one of the few Regional Corporations to amend its by-laws to include new shareholders born after 1971. Some shareholders expressed initial resistance based on their concern that incorporating new shareholders would dilute the stock. This was a tension between financial concerns and the Tlingit values in terms of the future of the people and Sealaska. However, eventually, the amendment prevailed and was voted in by the shareholders. As a result, these new shareholders were issued shares in the corporation and expanded the number of Native shareholders. These shares are life-estate stocks that continue for their lifetime and cannot be gifted or inherited, which is dissimilar from the original shareholder stocks for those born before Dec. 18, 1971. However, it includes all the benefits for the stockholder during their lifetime as other shareholders and is an opportunity for shareholders born after December. 18, 1971, to have 100 shares of stock in Sealaska. This is a form of Haa Shuká, which honors the ancestors while looking ahead to future generations. This is significant for the continuation of the corporation as part of the Articles of Incorporation for Sealaska is for the Corporation to go on into perpetuity. It is also an example of the challenges of adhering to Native values in the face of contemporary issues and pressures.

C. Wooch.Yax: Balance and Reciprocity
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i. ANCSA section 7(i) & 7(j)

Sealaska and the other regional corporations share 70% of their subsurface revenues with the other 12 Regional Corporations through ANCSA settlement section 7(i).\(^{380}\) This is a form *Wooch.Yax*, as it is somewhat like a modern commercial potlatch between the various corporations, where the Regional Corporations reciprocate with one another by sharing 70% of the subsurface revenues between the Corporations. Though ANCSA requires the participation of Regional Corporations, it is an intersection between a Congressional enactment and the Tlingit value of *Wooch.Yax*.

Through Section 7(j) of ANCSA, the Regional Corporations share 50% of their subsurface revenues with the Village Corporations.\(^{381}\) This is also a form of *Wooch.Yax*, as though the Village Corporation does not have access to the subsurface lands, it still received revenues through Section 7(j) of ANCSA.

ii. Relationship with Business Partners and other Entities

Sealaska has many relationships with other organizations, both profit and non-profit, Native and non-Native. These relationships include director strategic core business partnerships with such businesses as Orca Bay Foods, New England Seafood International, Greg Drilling, a national leader in geotechnical drilling and water remediation, and Sealaska Government and Commercial services.\(^{382}\) Sealaska also has relationships with non-profit organizations, such as the CCTHITA and Sealaska Heritage Institute, that promote the rights and culture of Native People throughout Southeast Alaska and Alaska.\(^{383}\)

These relationships included Sealaska’s internal relationship in terms of seeking to encourage dialogue between Sealaska and its shareholders.\(^{384}\) These relationships are a form of *Wooch.Yax*, in terms of promoting reciprocal and respectful relationships with their partners and shareholders.

Sealaska has been going through a process of balancing its for-profit model with sustainable industries and the stewardship of its lands.\(^{385}\) This is a Tlingit value, as it balances binary concepts for a particular purpose. An example of this is Sealaska’s Carbon Sequestration Program, established for the long-term sustenance of Sealaska lands while being a for-profit venture. Other areas where *Wooch.Yax* is at work is Sealaska’s business model of working with companies

\(^{380}\) Royhster, Blumm, & Warner, *supra* note 219, at 117.
\(^{381}\) Id.
\(^{385}\) KTOO, *supra* note 365.
that promote sustainable food and renewable energy while being for-profit. Jim Collins refers to this as the “Genius of the AND,” where companies that have achieved long-term greatness incorporate two seemingly irreconcilable concepts. For instance, a company will incorporate enduring values AND innovation. This form of Woocch.Yax is at work—and is a form of the principle of the “Genius of the And.” It is also likened to many Raven Trickster stories that merge enduring values with a jurisprudence of transformation, innovation and new paths.

D. Haa Latseen: Our Strength

i. Small Business Administration 8(a) program amendment

The Former Sealaska CEO, Chris McNeil Jr., was instrumental in passing an amendment to the Small Business Administration 8(a) program to give Alaska Native Corporations and Native Tribes preference in contracting. This was not only vital for the survival of ANCSA Corporations but has led to a flood of Native Corporations using this vehicle for governmental contracts and has increased revenues and profits. This was the case with Sealaska and many other Alaska Native Corporations. This was a form of Haa Latseen (leadership) that extended beyond Sealaska to other Native corporations, Tribes, and Tribes throughout the US.

ii. Scholarship Programs

Sealaska has awarded hundreds of full-time and part-time merit-based scholarships to its community's future leaders every year. Sealaska has awarded approximately 11,000 scholarships totaling $16.4 million. The scholarships are for the development and education of Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian shareholders and promoting future leaders at Sealaska. Sealaska also has Shareholder Preference for employment within Sealaska and its various subsidiaries, governmental partners, and business partners. This is to promote economic opportunities for Sealaska shareholders. There is still a need to hire more Native shareholders in the corporation, especially in executive positions. Still, Sealaska’s scholarships are a form of seeking to develop Native shareholders. Also, through Native preference, Sealaska aims to provide shareholders economic opportunities. These are a small sample of the Four values in action. Sealaska has
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a history of practicing these four core values before and after they were officially incorporated as corporate policy. Through the codification of the four values as core governing principles, as well as a shift of balancing sustainable industries with its for-profit model, Sealaska will likely have a continued evolution of these principles at work in the corporation.

X. COMPARISON BETWEEN TRADITIONAL TLINGIT GOVERNANCE AND SEALASKA CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

As part of the analysis of the evolution of Tlingit governance and law and its application to Sealaska, I will compare the ancient Tlingit governance and law and the current Sealaska Corporate governance. Scholars have argued that Tlingit law and governance through the clans resembles corporate law. Though Washington Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson was a driving force behind the passage of ANCSA, there has been some debate about where the idea of for-profit ANCSA Corporations came from. Some have posited that the AFN may have initiated a corporate model to transfer lands to ANCSA Corporations. Others have suggested that William Paul may have devised the idea of having Regional and village corporations to mirror the Kwaan and clan structure. In this theory, the Regional Corporation represents the Kwaan, and the village corporations represent the various clans. This history is unclear, but it may explain some similarities between the Corporate form and the Tlingit clan structure. The following is a comparison and analysis of the two.

A. Similarities Between Clan Governance Structure & Sealaska Corporate Governance

The traditional clan governance model was a council assembly, where a house leader would meet and then convene at the council assembly, which the senior ranking clan leaders would preside over. This is like a corporate Board meeting regarding the interaction between the CEO and the Board of Directors. The CEO and corporate officers resemble senior clan leaders in their leadership duties. However, there are some procedural similarities between the CEO meeting with the Board and House leaders who would convene with senior clan leaders to get their initiatives approved at the council assembly. For example, the Sealaska CEO meets with the Board to present their strategic and operating plan, and the Board either approves it, amends it, or rejects it. This is similar to the house
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leader who would bring their initiatives to the clan assembly to seek approval of their plans by the senior clan leaders. Though the rank and responsibility of the CEO are more analogous to the senior clan leader meeting with other senior clan leaders at the Board meeting, there are procedural similarities with the house leader meeting with the council to seek approval for their plans.

The council assembly meetings were attended by all the adult males of the local clan, who had a right to express their opinion and women of high status and older women. The male and female members of the clan might be said to represent Sealaska shareholders. Though shareholders don’t attend private Board meetings, they are able to vote for Sealaska Board members, initiate resolutions, as well as run for the Board. Another similarity is that the council decisions were made by majority decision-making. This is like shareholders voting on board resolutions that require a majority vote.

Historically, the land was owned at the clan level. The clan ownership of the land was held in communal fee simple title. Therefore, the land could only be sold with the consent of the entire clan. Similarly Sealaska owns the title to the aboriginal land in fee simple, and the Sealaska Board requires a majority vote by the shareholders to sell the land. This is like the prohibition of clan leaders from selling clan property without the consent of the clan. Also, historically individual clan members could not sell clan property without the consent of the clan. This is similar to shareholders not being able to alienate their stock, which would cause the extinguishment of the land.

i. Kwaan Governance and Decentralization

Today’s ownership of the land has transferred from the clans over to Sealaska and the village and urban corporations, which has affected the modern governance model of the Tlingit. Sealaska could be argued to represent a Kwaan form of governance, as it is a regional corporation, and the village and urban corporations are like individual clans. In a contemporary sense, Sealaska appears to be a merger between the Kwaan and the clan, to make a regional corporation. Like the Kwaan, Sealaska does not govern the village or urban corporations much.
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Historically, the governance of the Tribe was centralized with the clans. However, in the aggregate, the large number of clans spread out through the Kwaan geographic regions of Southeast Alaska caused the governance of the Tlingit to be largely decentralized. Like the clan governance structure, Sealaska’s corporate decision-making is centralized with the Board of Directors. However, because of the large number of Village and urban corporations throughout Southeast Alaska, as well as such organizations as CCTHITA, Sealaska Heritage Institute, and AFN, there are opportunities for participation in the governance of the Tribe beyond Sealaska. As a result, the contemporary Tlingit governance is decentralized like the ancient clan structure. A distinction from the ancient clan structure is introducing a Kwaan form of governance represented by Sealaska, a regional corporation, and CCTHITA, a regional tribal government. Through Sealaska and CCTHITA the Tlingit have consolidated their governance at the regional Kwaan level. This is also likened to the binary structure of the Eagle and Raven moieties, though in a less formal sense. As a result, the Tlingit have a regional form of governance through Sealaska and CCTHITA, while still maintaining an informal decentralized governance model through the various village and urban corporations and Native organizations that shareholders can participate in.

ii. Clan and Corporate Fiduciary Roles

Historically the Clan leader had a fiduciary role in their clan to steward clan property.408 It could be analogized that the Board of Directors represent senior clan leaders, as they have a fiduciary role of good faith and loyalty under the laws of the State, as well as through the Sealaska by-laws and Code of Ethics.409 The Board members are similar to senior clan leaders who would preside over the council assemblies. The Sealaska CEO and corporate officers might also be analogized to be senior clan leaders, except they manage the day-to-day operations of Sealaska.

In the ancient clan structure, the clan owned the names as a form of at.oow.410 This is still somewhat the case today in a modern corporate form. The clan members would inherit the names during their lifetime, but the name still belonged to the clan. The clan-owned names carried on from generation to generation and represented an embodiment of the originally named person. Similarly the Board of Directors and various Corporate Officers are titles and offices that carry on after the individual director or officers leaves the corporation.

408 Worl, supra note 28, at 63-64.
409 Sealaska Code of Ethics, supra note 327, at 29.
410 Worl, supra note 28, at 41.
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This ownership of the names was rooted in the belief that the clan was immortal and was to continue into perpetuity.\textsuperscript{411} Similarly, according to its articles of incorporation, Sealaska is designed to have a perpetual existence.\textsuperscript{412}

\textbf{iii. For-Profit Model and Stewardship}

Through ANCSA, Sealaska was set up as a for-profit corporation. This appears to be consistent with the old clan structure and culture of the Tlingit people as they were highly organized and industrious, and lived on abundant land that produced a surplus for the clans, which represented a profit.\textsuperscript{413} However, because of \textit{Wooch.Yax}, there was also a focus on generosity and distribution through the Potlatches. This did not mean there was universal equality, as there were aristocratic Tlingit called \textit{aanyadi}\textsuperscript{414} and clan leaders of special status. Still, the motive was generosity and distribution as a form of exhibiting one’s wealth. The dividend is analogous to this as it represents a distribution from the Corporation to the shareholders. This is also analogous to sections 7(i) and 7(j) of ANCSA, where Sealaska shares 70% of its subsurface revenues with the other regional corporations, as well as 7(j) where it shares revenues with the village corporation.

Historically, the Tlingit, through the principle of Haa Aani, were reverent stewards of the land with a mindset of sustainability while being industrious and seeking to make the most of land, waters, and seas.\textsuperscript{415} In a similar manner, Sealaska, though being a for-profit corporation, has begun to focus more of its business portfolio on sustainable enterprises.\textsuperscript{416} This is a combination of \textit{Haa Aani}, our land, and \textit{Haa Shuká} in terms of planning for future generations.

\textbf{iv. Sealaska Partnerships and Subsidiaries}

Sealaska has many business partnerships. This is analogous to the history of Tlingit trading. Ancestrally, the Tlingit were accomplished traders, having extensive trade networks with the other Tribes.\textsuperscript{417} In a similar manner, Sealaska now has extensive partnership networks with other businesses, as well as non-profit organizations, representing \textit{Wooch.Yax} through the interrelationship of all things.

Historically, the clan also had subsidiaries, called houses, that generally consisted of an extended family that functioned as a socio-economic unit. Similarly, Sealaska also has subsidiaries in Alaska and throughout the U.S. However, the difference is that Sealaska serves as a parent role to the subsidiary

\textsuperscript{411} Id.
\textsuperscript{412} Sealaska Corp., Restated Articles of Incorporation, supra note 301.
\textsuperscript{413} Tlingit & Haida I, note 60, at 457.
\textsuperscript{414} Wory, supra note 28, at 57.
\textsuperscript{415} Tlingit & Haida I, note 60, at 457.
\textsuperscript{416} KTOO, supra note 356.
\textsuperscript{417} Baker, Smythe and Dethloff, supra note 75, at 10.
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and has certain fiduciary duties to the subsidiary. Also, the house group was composed primarily of Tlingit clan members, whereas the Sealaska subsidiaries do not currently have a high Native shareholder employment rate.418

v. Children of the Father’s Clan Use Rights and Corporate Life-estate Stocks

Along with being members of their own clan, children had a special relationship with their father’s clan where they were a “Child” of that clan.419 Though they were not clan members, they had “use rights” to their father’s clan property throughout their life.420 However, like a life-estate, the use rights to their father’s clan property ended when they died and were not passed down to their children.421 This is similar to the stocks new shareholders who were born after 1971 were issued by Sealaska. The shares are corporate life-estate stocks that continue for the duration of their lifetime but cannot be gifted or inherited by their descendants.422 However, these life-estate stocks include all the benefits of the stocks of the original shareholder born before Dec. 18, 1971.

The stocks issued to new shareholders could be analogized as somewhere between the use rights of the “child of the father’s clan” and full clan membership rights. They are like the rights of the children of the father’s clan as they are life-estate stocks that cannot be willed to their descendants. However, they are like full clan membership rights as the life-estate stocks include all the benefits of the original shareholders for the duration of the shareholder’s life.

B) Differences Between the Clan and Corporation

There are several differences between the Clan and Corporation. Some of these differences are issues that still need to be resolved for the benefit of Sealaska, the Tlingit, as well as ANCSA Regional and Village corporations. The Tlingit believed that if Wooch.Yax is not maintained, things are out of balance, and it can cause harm. As noted earlier, the potlatch is for repayment of the debt to the opposing clan. Through this repayment of the debt, Wooch Yáx (balance) is restored. The following are issues that are currently out of balance and need to be resolved for Wooch.Yax to prevail and balance and harmony in these areas to be restored.

1) Land Issues: Restoration of Haa Aaní

Some of the differences between the Corporation and the clan are the amount of land Sealaska and the village corporations have. Previously the Tlingit owned basically all of Southeast Alaska exclusively and continuously.423

---

418 GAO, at 46.
419 Worl, supra note 28, at 54.
420 Id. at 56.
421 Id.
422 Welcome to MySealaska, supra note 369.
423 Tlingit & Haida I, note 60, at 457.
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Currently, Sealaska only owns 1.6% of its original land.\textsuperscript{424} This is an issue that still needs resolution, in terms of the restoration of land for Sealaska and Southeast Alaska Natives.

Since Tlingit and Haida accepted compensation for the taking of the Tongass Forest and the Glacier Bay National Park, it would likely be difficult to restore the title to the land through the judiciary based on this previous claim. Though not to preclude the use of the judiciary, an alternative approach could be an Amendment to ANCSA. The reason for this approach is Congress has jurisdiction over ANCSA Corporations, as well as plenary power. One possibility is to amend ANCSA to move Sealaska out of section 14(h) of ANCSA into Section 12 of ANCSA. Through section 12 of ANCSA, Sealaska could potentially negotiate to establish its land claims in proportion to its number of shareholders or the relative size of its aboriginal land claims, like other ANCSA Corporations. Sealaska would have a strong argument in equity before Congress, as the compensation the Tlingit and Haida received for the taking of 17 million acres in the Tongass National Forest and 3.3 million acres in the Glacier Nation was a fraction of the fair market value of the land at .43 cents an acre.\textsuperscript{425} Also, the Tlingit and Haida were not compensated for 2,628,207 acres of land subject to aboriginal title nor were they compensated for the lost fishing rights.\textsuperscript{426} Amending ANCSA to move Sealaska into section 12, could be a means to restore a significant portion of the aboriginal lands for Sealaska and Southeast Alaska Natives.

2) Subsistence Issues: Restoration of At.oow

Historically the clans had complete control over the subsistence rights, which included fishing territories, hunting territories, and the ability to harvest berries exclusively. In a contemporary sense, ANCSA on its face extinguished the subsistence rights of Alaska Natives.\textsuperscript{427} However, according to the historical record, the Secretary of the Interior was to work with Alaska Natives to establish their subsistence rights, especially at the village level.\textsuperscript{428} This never happened, but the subsistence rights have been restored somewhat through Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation (ANILCA).\textsuperscript{429} This still is an issue because of the need to restore subsistence rights for Alaska Natives, including the Tlingit. The reason for this is ANILCA gives “rural” preference, which includes Native and non-Native, rather than “Native” preference.\textsuperscript{430}

\textsuperscript{424} We Are Sealaska, supra note 196.
\textsuperscript{425} Sealaska Testimony on H.R. 740 and H.R. 1306, at 3.
\textsuperscript{426} Id.
\textsuperscript{427} Royhster, Blumm, & Warner, supra note 221, at 116-117.
\textsuperscript{428} Id.
\textsuperscript{429} Id.
\textsuperscript{430} Id.
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If a village or Native community is designated as non-rural, it could lose its subsistence rights. This happened in 2006 with the Tlingit Village of Saxman.431 It was designated as non-rural by the Federal Subsistence Board, and the village lost its subsistence rights.432 Though the Village of Saxman was restored to rural status in 2016,433 this example shows the vulnerability of Native Villages losing their subsistence rights under rural preference. A suggested reform would be to change the preference in ANILCA from rural preference to “Native preference”. This would give Natives preference for subsistence rights in the villages.

Another approach could be to amend ANCSA to establish permanent and exclusive Native subsistence rights for the villages. This amendment would outline the villages’ subsistence rights and provide hunting and fishing rights. This amendment could include the authority for Villages to lease fishing and hunting rights to non-Natives. This would be like the clan territorial rights of the Tlingit, who, by permission of the clan, would lease hunting and fishing rights to non-clan members.434

3) Reform of the Village Corporation & Sovereignty: 2 Clan Leader Model

Another difference between the clan ownership of the land and the Corporation is a lack of sovereignty and governmental jurisdiction over the land and members by the corporations.435 This is an especially important issue at the village level, where there is a lack of governmental powers by Native Village Corporations and a lack of infrastructure in the village.436 Because of a lack of governmental powers, it makes it difficult for Villages to exercise jurisdiction over their subsistence rights, build infrastructure and establish a judiciary.437 This generally is the traditional role of tribal governments rather than corporations.

One approach for the villages to establish governmental jurisdiction is to put some of the lands into trust with the federal government. Previously Alaska Native tribes were prohibited from putting land into trust. However, in 2014 a

432 Id.
433 Id.
434 Goldschmidt & Haas, supra note 81, at 12.
435 Philanthropy Northwest, supra note 250.
437 Berger, supra note 188, at 61.
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case temporarily changed this.\textsuperscript{438} In \textit{Akiachak v. Salazar}, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held that the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to take land into trust for Alaska Natives under Section 5 of the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), 25 U.S.C. § 465.\textsuperscript{439} This invalidated a previous regulation - 25 C.F.R. § 151.1 - which prohibited the Secretary of Interior from acquiring land into trust for Alaska Native Tribes.\textsuperscript{440} As a result, Alaska Native tribes could submit a request through the BIA to put land into trust.\textsuperscript{441}

The benefit of putting land into trust is greater control over subsistence rights and addressing health, welfare, and safety issues by the Tribal government.\textsuperscript{442} It also protects the land from being taxed by the state or local government, which would aid in the economic development of the Villages.\textsuperscript{443} The disadvantage of this approach is that it subjects the land to greater federal jurisdiction, restricts alienation, and requires BIA approval to lease the land.\textsuperscript{444}

This period of Alaska Native tribes putting land into trust was short-lived. In 2017 the Trump administration rescinded this rule and no longer allowed Alaskan Native tribes to put land into trust.\textsuperscript{445} However, in 2019 Congress passed H.R. 375, which amended 25 U.S.C. § 5129 of the Indian Reorganization Act.\textsuperscript{446} Through this amendment, it includes Alaska Natives as an “Indian Tribe” in the statute.\textsuperscript{447} As a result, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to put land into trust for Alaska Native tribes.\textsuperscript{448} An overwhelming majority in Congress passed H.R. 375, but it still needs to pass the Senate. If it passes the Senate and is signed into law, it would enable Alaska Native tribes to put land into a trust.\textsuperscript{449} This would allow Village governments to exercise greater jurisdiction of their subsistence rights and protect the land from being taxed by a state or local government.\textsuperscript{450} Also, by amending the statute to include Alaska Natives as an

\textsuperscript{439} Id.
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\textsuperscript{441} Id. at 118.
\textsuperscript{442} Id. at 119.
\textsuperscript{444} Ristroph, \textit{supra} note 438, at 119.
\textsuperscript{445} AK Public Media PBS NPR, \textit{supra} note 443.
\textsuperscript{447} H.R. 375, 116th Cong. § 1 (2019).
\textsuperscript{448} AK Public Media, \textit{supra} note 446.
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“Indian Tribe,” it would recognize Alaska Native trust land as “Indian Country” and partially overturn Venetie. 451

Another possibility is for Village Corporations to be reformed to include governmental powers. The historical charter cities in America are a model for this. In the Montgomerie Charter of 1730, New York City was granted an elective structure that included governmental powers.452 At the time, New York City was a charter corporation. This conveyance of governmental powers to New York City was distinct from modern municipal law.453 Generally, modern municipal law involves delegating authority from the state to the city. In this case, the quasi-governmental powers conferred on New York City were derived from its corporate, private property.454

Based on this conceptual framework, Village Corporations could be reformed to include governmental powers through an amendment to ANCSA. Like the Montgomerie Charter, instead of these governmental powers being delegated authority from a state or federal government, the governmental power would come from either the Village Corporations’ ownership of the surface estate or through inherent tribal sovereignty.455 Village Corporations could be organized as chartered corporate municipal city-states. As a result, the village corporation would have corporate and governmental powers.456 The Village Corporation would therefore have the continued freedom to make business decisions while also having certain governmental powers. By reforming the village corporation to include governmental powers, the village corporation could potentially have jurisdiction over the village subsistence rights, establish a tribal judiciary where needed, and have governmental powers to develop more infrastructure in the villages.

Another approach would be establishing a chartered municipal government separately from the Village Corporation through an ANCSA amendment. A chartered municipal government would serve the same governmental function as a tribal government but would be separate from the Village Corporation within ANCSA. The chartered municipal government would also be based on tribal sovereignty and have similar governmental powers as IRA Tribal Governments in the U.S.457 Like the ANCSA Corporations, the chartered municipal government would not be under the jurisdiction of the State of Alaska but instead would be under Congressional jurisdiction. Structurally, this village

451 Id.
453 Id.
454 Id.
455 Id. at 1347.
456 Id. at 1346.
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government could be a chartered municipal government or a unique ANCSA Tribal Government.

Through this amendment, an option could be created within ANCSA for Villages to establish a chartered municipal government, like the IRA governments have the option to establish federally chartered corporations. This would establish greater jurisdiction over the land, waters, subsistence rights, and village members than is currently available through village corporations. Specific innovations could be built into the amendments that could be customized for effective governance of the villages. For instance, these chartered municipal governments could have a regional component for the judiciary. The village courts system could be established that includes an Alaska Native appellate court network throughout the state of Alaska and certiorari to a federal court. Another innovation could be a more streamlined and expedient method for the chartered municipal government to put the land into trust with the Federal government if they chose to exercise that option.

Having an option for an ANCSA charter municipal government to work with the ANCSA village corporations would be like the ancient Tlingit leadership model of having two senior clan leaders. The two clan leaders would be embodied in the ANCSA chartered municipal government and the village corporation. This could be an avenue to restore the balance of having sovereignty and governmental jurisdiction over the land and members at the village level.

4) Blood Quantum and the Issue of Perpetuity: Honoring Haa Shuká

Another dissimilar area between the Clan and Sealaska is based on ANCSA’s requirement that a Native be \( \frac{1}{4} \) Alaska Native blood to be a shareholder. This is not the case with CCTHITA, which uses a lineage model for Tribal members. Like many tribes, this is problematic as more Natives marry out of the Tribe, and their children would be unable to qualify as shareholders. This could lead to the eventual extinguishment of qualified shareholders based on blood quantum. Historically the clan was designed to continue into perpetuity. Sealaska has this same mandate in its Articles of Incorporation. Sealaska could consider passing an amendment to change the shareholder qualification from \( \frac{1}{4} \) Alaska Native blood to proof of lineage. This is what CCTHITA has done for tribal membership. This use of lineage seems more in harmony with Haa Shuká (our future) and would be a means for Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian to be Sealaska shareholders into perpetuity.

---

458 25 C.F.R § 81.2; 81.5(c)
461 Sealaska Corp., Restated Articles of Incorporation, supra note 301.
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5) Native Leadership Development and Employment: The Spirit of Haa Latseen

Historically, the Tlingit also had a well-developed Clan leadership training program where the maternal uncles trained their nephews. Also, clan members were fully involved in the economics of the clan. Sealaska has a Native preference and seeks to support Native-owned businesses.\textsuperscript{462} However, though there is Native preference, it still reviews the qualifications of the applicants and is not required to hire shareholders. Like many Regional and village corporations, there has been a transition to hiring more Native shareholders in the corporation.\textsuperscript{463} However, though the Board of the Sealaska is exclusively Native shareholders and the Sealaska CEOs since 1982 have been solely Native, there appears to be a need to hire more Native shareholders in the Corporations. This includes hiring more Native shareholders in its subsidiaries, contractors, and business partners.

One possibility would be to create a Haa Latseen Leadership and Employment program, to funnel Native shareholders into Sealaska and its business partners through Native preference. As part of this process, Sealaska could establish goals to hire a certain number of Native shareholders for corporate executive positions and employees. For example, one long-term goal could be to be the number one employer of Native shareholders among the 12 Regional ANCSA Corporations. This goal would include Sealaska and its subsidiaries, business partners, and executive positions.

As part of the Haa Latseen program, Sealaska could implement a Corporate University\textsuperscript{464} within Sealaska for the employees to foster the continued development of their skills and professional advancement. Sealaska could also make available online learning as a benefit for its shareholders. In terms of online learning for shareholders, Sealaska could contract with universities that have online learning and online learning companies to provide a discount for Sealaska shareholders. This could include undergraduate and graduate degrees and continued career development. Having a Corporate University for Sealaska employees and online learning as a benefit for shareholders would supplement the scholarship program Sealaska already has for its shareholders. This would be a form of Haa Latseen, as it would help develop its shareholders’ leadership strengths and skills to contribute to Sealaska as employees or work outside the corporation.


\textsuperscript{463} Smiddy, supra note 230, at 842-43.

\textsuperscript{464} ELM, The Corporate University Shift: Why Great Companies Invest in Custom Learning, (last visited Aug. 31, 2022, 2:43 PM), https://elmlearning.com/the-corporate-university-shift/ [https://perma.cc/P7GZ-FKW3]. Some of the benefits of a Corporate University include: 1) control over the content delivery system; 2) setting the tone of leadership development; 3) reinforcing culture; and 4) supporting innovation and development. These benefits appear consistent with Sealaska’s unique regional corporate model.
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There could also be separate online courses that include the Four Core Values for employees. This would be a method to continue incorporating the Four Core Values into the culture of Sealaska. These Four Core value courses could be separate courses along with mainline professional skill development courses.\textsuperscript{465} The Sealaska Heritage Institute might also consider creating online learning courses of the stories, values, and history of Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian nations.

Part of the philosophy of Haa Latseen is “continuous improvement.” By having a Haa Latseen Leadership and Employment program, it would create employment opportunities for shareholders by Sealaska setting target goals to hire more Native shareholders at Sealaska and its business associates. Also, by providing a Corporate University for employees and making available online learning as a benefit for shareholders, it will help equip shareholders to contribute to the continued improvement and growth of the Sealaska Corporation. This program would also be consistent with ANCSA’s mandate to address the real economic and social needs of Native shareholders.\textsuperscript{466}

\textbf{XI. Conclusion}

In conclusion, the historic governing structure was centralized at the clan level. However, the clans were spread out over 17 different regional kwaans throughout Southeast Alaska and, in the aggregate, created a decentralized form of government for the Tlingit nation. The modern-day Tlingit governance through Sealaska and CCTHITA has consolidated at the Kwaan Regional level, which is part of the evolution of Tlingit governance in the modern era. However, through Sealaska’s partner organizations and village and urban corporations, Tlingit governance also has a decentralized form of governance. The Tlingit believe in four core governing values which are the Haa Aani (Our Land), Haa Latseen (Our Strength & Leadership), Haa Shuká (Past, Present, and Future Generations), and Wooch Yáx (Balance). These values and protocols have officially been embraced and incorporated into the Code of Ethics by Sealaska. However, before this, they were practiced and in operation primarily through performance law.

\textsuperscript{465} In terms of the online courses for shareholders, Sealaska could also partner with universities to develop customized content unique to ANCSA Corporations. For instance, there might be an ANCSA MBA degree for shareholders or a mini-ANCSA MBA or business degree for shareholders that would include mainline business courses, as well as cover issues unique to ANCSA corporations. These customized courses would be courses available as part of the general curriculum of the Corporate University for employees and on-line courses available for shareholders. Sealaska would not necessarily have to create the content but could work with universities to provide guidance for these customized courses. Another form of this would be an MBA with an ANCSA certificate or a Law Degree with a certificate in Indian & Alaska Native Law.

\textsuperscript{466} Smiddy, supra note 230, at 830.
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Sealaska’s corporate governance structures bear several striking parallels to the ancient Tlingit clan structure. However, changes have been brought about by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, including the transference of land from the clans to Sealaska and the Native and Village Corporations. There are also several issues that Sealaska and the Tlingit still need to resolve, in particular, the area of land claims, sovereignty, and subsistence rights.

The Tlingit are a unique people who embrace inviolate principles and laws yet are open to change and transformation. With the help of the Creator, perhaps, solutions to these issues will be the next boxes of light to be opened for the benefit of the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian people and, ultimately, the world.