



March 1983

An Analysis of Outpatient Accident Trends in Two Dry Eskimo Towns as a Measure of Alternative Police Responses to Drunken Behavior

Stephen Conn & Bonnie Boedeker

Suggested citation

Conn, Stephen; & Boedeker, Bonnie. (1983). "An Analysis of Outpatient Accident Trends in Two Dry Eskimo Towns as a Measure of Alternative Police Responses to Drunken Behavior". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, San Antonio, Mar 1983.

Summary

Two rural Eskimo towns of approximately 3,000 persons each have banned the sale but not the use of alcoholic beverages in their communities. In the town of Bethel, police pick up intoxicated persons and transport them to a sleep-off and treatment center. In the town of Barrow, police take intoxicated persons into protective custody. Each town uses its police practice as an alternative to arrests for drunken behavior, decriminalized by the 1972 Alaska State Legislature. At least half of the adult population is picked up in each place. The authors seek to measure the impact of these differing approaches on violence related to alcohol use by employing Indian Health Service data in lieu of poorly maintained police data.

Additional information

Based on research under the multi-year grant project, "Alcohol Control in Village Alaska," funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA).

AN ANALYSIS OF OUTPATIENT ACCIDENT TRENDS IN
TWO DRY ESKIMO TOWNS AS A MEASURE OF ALTERNATIVE
POLICE RESPONSES TO DRUNKEN BEHAVIOR

by

Stephen Conn, Esq., Professor of Justice
Justice Center, University of Alaska

and

Bonnie Boedeker
Research Assistant

For Delivery at Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Annual
Meeting, 1983

Session Title: "The Police and Its Public"
Thursday, March 24, 1983

Work completed pursuant to NIAAA Grant No. 1 H84 AA031383-01 to
Justice Center, University of Alaska. The authors wish to thank
Phyl Booth and Darline Creen.

ABSTRACT

Two rural Eskimo towns of approximately 3,000 persons each have banned the sale but not the use of alcoholic beverages in their communities. In the town of Bethel, police pick up intoxicated persons and transport them to a sleep-off and treatment center. In the town of Barrow, police take intoxicated persons into protective custody. Each town uses its police practice as an alternative to arrests for drunken behavior, decriminalized by the 1972 Alaska State Legislature. At least half of the adult population is picked up in each place.

The authors seek to measure the impact of these differing approaches on violence related to alcohol use by employing Indian Health Service data in lieu of poorly maintained police data.

Introduction

It is common among Alaskan observers to speak of Alaska's "bush" as a vast realm of 586,000 square miles of mountains, rivers and tundra in which over 200 Indian and Eskimo villages are found, villages of three to four hundred persons on average, linked by air, boat or snowmobile.

Yet when criminal justice services are considered, a pattern emerges. In every rural region of the state, villages of small scale look to a town as the primary source of every form of professional and governmental service. Towns and their institutions draw into their domain those charged with crimes and those injured in those crimes. Towns are the base for field representatives of every state and federal bureaucracy as well as the bases for Native non-profit corporations. Towns are also (from the village perspective) the source of village problems, especially those related to liquor.

Towns are larger than villages, averaging two to three thousand in population. Each has a large white minority of government employees as well as an increasingly significant segment of non-Native residents in private employment. Each is policed with an efficiency unheard of in any village. As sources of wage earning opportunities, government service and illicit pleasures (such as bootleg whiskey), towns attract villagers in search of a job, professional attention or a good time. Some villagers relocate to the town for each of these reasons.

Bethel is the hub of the 57 village, 29,000 Yupik (and

Athabascan) region of Southwestern Alaska. Barrow is the hub of the North Slope Borough for 5,000 Inuit Eskimos who live in the town and six villages in Northern Alaska.

The governmental structure of each town is different. Bethel is a first class city with its own municipal police department and a jail used to house both state and municipal offenders. A state trooper detachment stationed in Bethel responds to village requests for assistance when serious crimes have been committed in those far flung places.

A superior court and magistrate work with a town-based state district attorney and state public defender to process arrests in town and in the villages. A combined treatment and sleep-off center and a hospital operated by the federal Alaska Native Health Service (the Alaskan wing of the Public Health Service) provide differing levels of assistance for alcohol-related matters ranging from intoxication to treatment for alcohol-related injuries (as well as for other maladies).

Seriously injured or seriously ill persons are flown into Bethel from villages at government expense after initial diagnosis by village health aides. Medical service is superior to law enforcement; hospital statistics are superior to police data.

In Barrow, a borough government, subsidized heavily from oil taxes, has assumed the police powers of villages and the town. The modern police force headquartered in Barrow has replaced the trooper, village and town police of another era.

A state magistrate, a local Inuit person, was the only judicial figure in residence at the time of this study. A superior court judge, district attorney and public defender flew north periodically from Fairbanks.

Barrow also has an Alaska Native Health Service hospital for the region. No treatment-sleep-off center existed in Barrow.

Alcohol Control Through Police Activity

Central to law enforcement in both Bethel and Barrow has been year round and extensive police pickups of drunken individuals in both public and private places before harm befalls them or others.

Until late 1972, forms of drunkenness both in private and in public were criminal offenses in Alaska. Yet so extensive were police arrests in both towns that even before decriminalization of drunkenness by the legislature, both towns had moved toward partial decriminalization by adoption of a "waiver" policy. It allowed jailed defendants to waive their court appearances and release both police and the cities from civil liability in exchange for a dismissal and release when the jailed arrestee had sobered up.

When Alaska law decriminalized drunken behavior, it replaced this police activity with what it termed "protective custody." After a brief period in which non-police and hospitals were viewed as the appropriate agents for dealing with inebriated persons, police were statutorily authorized to pick up drunks and to

jail them until each had sobered up in a kind of non-arrest, arrest if no other facility was available.

Barrow municipal police had already employed a variety of detention approaches in the early 1970's with the result that nearly every male from 18 to 21 had been picked up at least once for alcohol-related behavior (Hippler and Conn, 1973). Borough police increased the pick-up rate after 1976 and continued to increase pick-ups by 35 to 40% each year in an effort to decrease violent crime, accidents and suicide (Moeller Interview, 1979).

Bethel police used protective custody as a fall-back approach and not as a primary approach. More typically, from 1974 forward, city police transported adults to a combined sleep-off and treatment center. Protective custody was reserved for contentious detainees and for those occasions when the sleep-off center was full.

Hospital Records

In other papers, we have examined the impact on serious accidents (often unreported crimes) when different alcohol control policies were put into place (Conn, 1981 and Conn, 1982). This paper deals with less serious town occurrences which required out-patient treatment in the local hospitals. We seek to discover what impact, if any, the differing police practices have had on rates of "accidents" (reported or unreported crime), especially in those private places where police intervention would not take place unless local residents called for police assistance before violence occurred.

Police Pickups for Drunken Behavior in Rural Towns

Alaska protective custody provisions allow a police officer or emergency patrol to transport a person "incapacitated by alcohol" to be transported to a state or city jail if no treatment facility or emergency medical facility is available unless he is no longer intoxicated or incapacitated by alcohol or for 12 hours, whichever comes first. AS 47.37.170(b) and (1).

Incapacitated means "unconscious or has his judgment or physical mobility so impaired that he cannot readily recognize or extricate himself from conditions of apparent or imminent danger to his health or safety." AS 47.37.170(j). The thrust of the statute as amended was to insure the safety of the inebriate. The thrust of police practice was and is to insure the safety of other persons as well.

As in many other states, protective custody was introduced into Alaska legislation contemporaneously with the decriminalization of drunken behavior in public and private.

Alaska's largest cities and the rural towns under discussion had already adopted a waiver policy as described above (Friedman, 1970).

For a brief period Alaska's statutes did not include a jail as a place appropriate for persons under "protective custody." The police response in rural towns during this period toward drunken behavior floundered as hospitals refused to take in drunken persons.

In Barrow an administrative regulation against being drunk on a public highway was used until it was struck down by the Alaska State Supreme Court. In Bethel, disorderly conduct arrests with one day jail terms were employed (Conn, 1982:88).

Once jailing under protective custody was allowed, it came to be used as the single most important device for Barrow police and for Bethel police as a supplement to the treatment-sleep-off center.

By the period of study, 1977-78, Bethel had added to its police arsenal an open bottle ordinance which allowed a person arrested in public to be arrested and fined. Most persons paid their fine and were then taken to the nearby sleep-off center.

Police practice was also coupled with and supplemented by a decision in Bethel to go dry from 1974 onward. This means that Bethel closed its bars and liquor store, long denounced by villagers as a source of their own problems and many deaths (Conn, 1982). However, drinking in private remained legal in Bethel and liquor could be ordered by telegraph and mail from other Alaska cities or obtained from bootleggers.

Barrow's residents voted their town dry and wet in alternate years throughout the 1970's. However, persuaded by the village council of the only small settlement relatively close to Barrow that liquor-related problems were out of hand in 1977, and shocked by the killing of two non-Native campers in that same year, Barrow also voted to go dry (i.e., no public sales) in

1977. Barrow has remained dry since that time. Drinking in private is still legal.

The Scope and Historical Dimensions of Preventive Police Pickups

Samuel Z. Klausner and Edward F. Foulks (1982) have analyzed police pick-ups in Barrow in 1978 in their book, Eskimo Capitalists. They have attempted to determine levels of alcoholism in the population from this data as well as through an analysis of church records and an application of the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test to interviewees in the Barrow population.

The study and book have generated tremendous controversy in Alaska from scholars and Natives alike, a controversy which the authors address in an epilogue (1982:197-313). This paper will not deal with their attempt to link drinking behavior and the need for detention to oil development and infusions of capital on the Alaska North Slope in the late 1970's.

However, it is important to understand that the rates of police pickups which so shocked these authors in 1978 were a practice common in Alaska towns and cities for decades before oil development and the changes from a subsistence to a capitalist economy which so impressed them.

Massive police pickups were a common legal experience for Eskimo males in towns and cities. Limiting factors were only available police resources and the propensity of non-Native hotel, restaurant and other commercial proprietors as well as

Native friends and relatives to "serve up" clients to this process.¹

As discussed in another paper, the single most significant role of legal agents from the Russians to statehood, through the territorial period, has been the suppression of liquor use among Natives before alcohol-related violence occurred (Conn, 1980).

Deputized teacher-missionaries, officers of the revenue cutters, Army and Navy personnel, agents-for-the-suppression-of-liquor-among-the-Natives, U.S. marshalls, special Native police and town police have focused upon Natives who drank or those who provided hootch (an Alaskan term) or liquor to them. Even when liquor prohibition in Alaska was imposed on both Natives and the tiny white population, police and grand juries focused on Natives only, believing they would be violent if they drank (Conn, Id.).

In the early 1970's Barrow was policed by a tiny and inefficient three to six man Native force. We observed along with the "waiver practice," use of a variety of criminal law statutes employed to "sweep the village" and contain alcohol-related violence before it happened (Hippler and Conn, 1973). Nearly every court appearance before an Eskimo magistrate resulted in a suspended sentence. Police pickups to prevent Natives from hurting themselves or others were viewed by young persons as a kind of natural occurrence in the drinking process, a natural role of Western law - what, in fact, American law did with Alaska Natives.

Alaska cities reduced the impact of police pickups of Natives in public drinking areas on jail and judicial resources by first introducing the "waiver" option, later decriminalizing drunken behavior, and, finally, by adopting protective custody as a response to drunken behavior (Friedman, 1970; Hill, 1975).

Anchorage, the state's largest city, transferred the business of dealing with inebriates in danger to a civilian community service patrol that transports persons to a treatment center far from the locus of Native drinking activity. To the dismay of merchants, these civilians collect only persons who are truly incapacitated and who are prepared to be picked up, leaving other persons on the avenue.

In other places, especially in rural towns, police continued to pick up drunken persons on a magnitude not unlike previous days when drinking in public and private formed possible bases for an arrest.

It can be seriously questioned whether those detained under the provisions of protective custody are in fact appropriate candidates under the terms of the statute.

However, the proposition that, by collecting dangerously intoxicated persons on a truly massive scale, accidents, suicides and violent crime can be contained enjoys widespread acceptance among Native and non-Native political leadership in rural towns as well as among those charged with justice services. If there is a negative check on processing in Native towns, it is formed

not by statutory restrictions, but by citizens who do not request police assistance and removal of persons from their homes.

The present practice, although as broad as were arrests in another period, does offer the Native client of the process some relative advantage. No criminal records are made of those picked up in town systems which are only now beginning to connect rural Alaska to the larger state and national data reporting systems. Thus, young Natives will not have to explain arrests on employment applications as a kind of idiosyncratic, rural practice in some distant city in some distant time and place. However, there is no judicial scrutiny of a practice that has been decriminalized in name if not in actual practice.

Mass pickups of Alaska Natives who drink in order to prevent physical harm to themselves or others is an authentic Alaska legal tradition. It stands independent of episodic historical events, statutory amendments, rapid social change in specific regions, or even scholarly inquiries as to their actual association with alcohol abuse or levels of alcoholism among all or part of specific town populations.

Examples of the Scope of Police Pickups in Bethel and Barrow

In our examination of treatment center data from Bethel for 1977, we were able to isolate town residents from village residents in order to arrive at some indication of the level of police pickups when persons were taken to the treatment center directly or when they were transported after payment of a fine for possessing an open container in a public place. We were able

to eliminate repeat pickups and arrive at a number of resident adults who had experienced at least one pickup.

We discovered that 469 Bethel adults, or 29 percent of the entire population of 3,409 persons, had at least one contact. Average contacts for adults were 3.4 for town persons. As only adults were transported to the center, this means that half of the adult population was picked up at least once in 1977.

In their more sophisticated analysis of Barrow detention data for 1978, Klausner and Foulks found that 45 to 48 percent of the male population from 15 - 24 years of age, 45 to 48 percent of the male population from 25 - 44 years of age and 8 to 13 percent of the male population from 45 - 64 years of age had been detained and jailed at least once in 1978 for protective custody (Klausner and Foulks, 1982:147, Table 8.3). Overall, thirty-eight percent of the population between 15 and 24, thirty-five percent of the population between 25 and 44, and 7 to 9 percent of the population from 45 to 64 years of age had experienced protective custody as practiced by the North Slope Borough Police Department in 1978 (Klausner and Foulks, Id.).

These assessments have evident flaws as statistical data. Whether Klausner and Foulks (or the police) were able to distinguish Barrow residents from residents of the single nearby village of over 300 persons is not clear.

Our own data includes a tiny fraction of persons who walked into the treatment center on their own volition, a percentage

estimated by town personnel as less than three percent.

These statistics are offered only to reinforce our description of a police practice of great magnitude in towns where half of the residents are minors, as well as the impact of this practice on large numbers of individuals within the adult population.

Citizen Involvement in the Barrow and Bethel Approaches

Klausner and Foulks report that "almost all detentions in North Village (Barrow) follow a disturbance leading someone to summon a Public Safety officer" and, further, that "detention is a joint function of intoxication in public and lack of a group to protect the drunk." (1982:199) This latter "function," as the authors illustrate, refers to the large private contributions to detentions, the large numbers of persons collected from the homes of family, friends or acquaintances in this town (see below).

Changing Police Resources

The 1978 Barrow data was gathered after what can only be described as a monumental transformation in police resources in that town. From a tiny, non-professional, municipal force, the North Slope Borough, in 1976 and after, invested thousands of its oil dollars into an entirely new borough-wide operation. By the study date (1978), eight fully trained officers drawn from police departments in the "lower 48," policed the 1700 person population. They introduced an entirely new dimension to policing in Barrow at an entirely new level of intensity. When reported department data on pickups and arrests is compared with our own data from the early 1970's, it appears that those detained and

arrested increased by eight-fold (Moeller interview, 1979).

Unlike Klausner and Foulks, we had an opportunity to observe both the early and later police operations in action. After years of clearly deficient police service, the North Slope Borough purchased what was viewed as the best policing that money could buy. Professionalism, however, meant a replacement of Eskimo police with non-Natives who were, in the main, new to the North and whose contact and perception of the Native population were limited to professional relationships.

The Bethel municipal force of comparable size had both Yupik and non-Native members, most of whom were known to the community.

Commitment of police resources to the detention program as a preventive measure by the Department of Public Safety, North Slope Borough, is recognized by Klausner and Foulks (1981:230). Transport to the treatment center was similarly ingrafted into Bethel police operations as a mainstay of police activity.

Both police operations patrolled public areas of their towns with an intensity and commitment to detention unknown to most American cities. What Barrow's police may have lacked in local knowledge was compensated for by strength of numbers and by resources at the department's disposal.

Both departments were prepared to respond to calls for assistance from public places and from private residences. In fact, most drinking occurred in private residences and not in or near public buildings or in the open (See Klausner and Foulks,

1982:251).

As stated, Bethel police were known to transport drinkers to the treatment center where they were free to leave when they chose to do so. Barrow police were known to transport persons to jail under the detention program where they were detained until jailers determined that they were sober.

Klausner and Foulks report, "Despite the trend toward public control, the largest single source of requests for public safety help in 1976 and 1978 involved people asking for assistance in controlling acquaintances in the callers' own homes. Moreover, from 1976 to 1978, this category accounted for the largest increase in absolute number of referrals." (1982:234.)

Our direct observation of police practices in Bethel during the same time period leads us to place private calls for assistance in a similar position in that city.

Use of Hospital Records

Our close study of arrest records and treatment center data for statistical purposes caused us to look elsewhere in Bethel for a measure of the impact of various types of legal control practices by town-based police and by Alaska state troopers. In another paper, we offer correlations between alcohol-related accidents in villages and in Bethel that resulted in inpatient treatment, after Bethel adopted a dry posture and began testing various police practices to curb alcohol-related violence (Conn, 1982). This paper makes use of outpatient data (described below)

for the more narrow purpose of interpreting the impact on violence of police detention in Barrow and Bethel as well as citizen inclination to cooperate in such practices.

Massive police pickups in each town are and have been the traditional approach for preventing alcohol-related violence before it happens. Police commitment to pickups and police resources sufficient to engage in a program of this magnitude were present in each place.

What then of the ordinary citizen's commitment to these programs? Is there a way to measure not only the commitment of town and borough officials in each place, but also the propensity of citizens to allow detention to occur, to prevent violence by calling for police assistance, by calling for a police pickup of a relative or a friend?

In towns where public drinking is, by near definition, illegal, and private drinking is more common, it is family, friends and acquaintances who first decide to draw in police assistance. It is friends and relations who first decide when danger to self or others (including the drinker) outweighs the repercussions of having the drinker removed.

Given the use of the programs by private persons, what then is the outcome of this police activity? Does it matter whether a jail cell or a bed in a treatment-sleep-off center is the final destination of the person so removed? Finally, does either process appear to reduce violence in the home to a more significant

degree?

To explore these questions, outpatient hospital records from both regions were reviewed.

Our Analysis

Accident victims in the towns of Barrow and Bethel are treated as outpatients at the Native Service hospitals located within each town. An outpatient visit can consist of either a minor accident which does not require hospitalization, or an emergency room visit in which the victim is later hospitalized. Outpatients are drawn from town residents and town visitors from villages.

Differences exist between the number, causation and place of alcohol-related accidents when the Barrow region is compared with the Bethel region. Further differences can be observed by comparing these accident data to the statewide accident data which includes both urban and rural Natives who use Alaska Native hospitals in all towns and cities.

A small portion of the differences might be attributed to idiosyncracies in recording practices between regions. However, certain trends in these data suggest that specifics of alcohol control mechanisms make an impact on how and where alcohol-related accidents occur in rural towns.

Since it may indicate a violation of criminal law, the accident category "Injury Purposefully Inflicted by Another" has been analyzed in this report. This category accounted for a substan-

tial percentage of alcohol-related accidents in both the Barrow region (40%) and the Bethel region (41%). Purposefully inflicted injury, along with other categories such as environmental factors, accidental falls and poisoning are listed in Table 3.

We analyzed "Inside the Home" as a place of injury because of the magnitude of alcohol-related accidents that occur inside the home, and because the home as a place of alcohol-related accidents has an implication on the usefulness of detention practices.

In the Barrow region, 42% of the alcohol-related accidents occur inside the home. This is 14% higher than the statewide ratio of all alcohol-related accidents that occur inside the home (Table 2). In particular, it is higher than other places that set the scene for alcohol-related accidents, including outside the home, highway and street, recreation and public buildings (Table 4).

These data also indicate that the home is frequently a setting for interpersonal violence, especially in Barrow. Within the statewide accident data, 32% of all accidents, purposefully inflicted by another, occur inside the home. In the Barrow region, 56% of purposely inflicted accidents occur inside the home - a figure that is 24% higher than the statewide Native rate.

Several factors should be considered as making the home a significant setting for alcohol-related accidents in the Barrow region. In the period covered by these data, the local option in

Barrow prohibited the sale of alcoholic beverages, and no public drinking establishments existed. The town police used a broad-based protective custody ordinance to detain dangerously intoxicated persons. An intoxicated individual was jailed for 5 - 12 hours after being taken into protective custody.

The legally dry status of Barrow, in addition to the approach to alcohol control by town police, may determine where drinking and violence occur. Liquor is purchased illegally in the town of Barrow, or purchased legally from Fairbanks. It can be safely consumed in private homes without fear of police intervention, at least on the initiative of police.

In Bethel, the dry policy has a similar effect of encouraging citizens to consume alcohol in private. As in Barrow, the private domain is a haven for town residents and village residents with town relatives or acquaintances. When compared to statewide data, the Bethel region, like Barrow, has a higher incidence of home-based alcohol-related accidents. However, these accident data indicate that the magnitude of this type of injury was not as severe in Bethel.

In Bethel, the percentage of all accidents that occur inside the home was 14% lower than the incidence in Barrow. The incidence of alcohol-related, purposefully inflicted injuries in the home was 9% lower in Bethel than in Barrow.

Police practice in Bethel was similar to that of Barrow and yet different. As stated, police confiscated open bottles of

alcohol in public and jailed persons found in possession of bottles until civil fines were paid. Fines were usually paid immediately after confiscation of the bottle. Police conveyed intoxicated persons to the treatment sleep-off center.

The high level of transport of Bethel citizens to the sleep-off center is similar to levels of detention in Barrow. Yet differing levels of domestic violence suggest that residents may be more inclined to solicit police intervention, when domestic drinking occurs and violence is imminent, if the end result is transport to a sleep-off center and not incarceration of a friend or relative in the local jail.

Conclusion

Because protective custody has replaced criminal law charges for being drunk in private as well as in public, it has narrowed legitimate police alcohol control practice, especially where protective custody is the mainstay of alcohol control practice, as it is in Barrow.

Bethel's use of a second resource, a sleep-off center, may be one way to provide a useful avenue for increasing drinking controls within the home through acceptable police intervention into private drinking situations at the request of town residents.

The use of police to prevent violence by picking up intoxicated persons does appear to reduce alcohol-related violence if police pickups are massive in scope. However, without collabora-

tion by citizens, this approach appears to have limits as drinking moves from the public to the private domain.

How long this approach will be tolerated in rural Alaska towns remains to be seen.

Finally, it appears that Alaska law should be redrafted to reflect the actual police practice desired by rural towns. That law should permit police action short of formal arrest for public or private intoxication but still allow for more than detention or transportation of persons believed to be in personal danger because of alcohol consumption.

FOOTNOTE

¹John Angell has addressed the lack of police service in small villages in his book, drawn from a survey of 55 small Alaskan villages conducted by the Alaska state troopers and representatives of non-profit Native corporations. See Angell, Public Safety and the Justice System in Alaska Native Villages (1981). The present paper focuses upon towns and cities where police service has existed at some level of efficiency since statehood in 1959 and even before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALASKA STATE STATUTES, Charlottesville: Mitchie Publishing Co.
- ANGELL, JOHN E. Public Safety and The Justice System in Alaska Native Villages. Jonesboro, TN: Pilgrimage, 1981.
- CONN, STEPHEN. "Alcohol Control and Native Alaskans - From The Russians to Statehood," Unpublished, 1980.
- _____. Town Law and Village Law: "Satellite Villages, Bethel and Alcohol Control in The Modern Era -- The Working Relationship and Its Demise," Unpublished, 1982.
- FRIEDMAN, MARTIN. "The Problem of Drunk in Public Offenses in Alaska," Alaska Law Journal, January, 1970: 17-20. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- HILL, JUDY. "Alcohol and the Alaska Offender," Unpublished, August, 1975.
- HIPPLER, ARTHUR E. and STEPHEN CONN. Northern Eskimo Law Ways and Their Relationship to Contemporary Problems of Bush Justice. Institute of Social, Economic and Government Research, Occasional Paper No 10. Fairbanks: University of Alaska, 1973.
- KLAUSNER, SAMUEL Z. and EDWARD F. FOULKS, Eskimo Capitalists, Oil, Politics and Alcohol. Totowa, New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun & Co., 1982.
- MOELLER, KIM. "Alcohol Abuse and Police in Rural Alaska." North Slope Borough, Department of Public Safety. January 1979.
- _____. Interview by Bonnie Boedecker, Barrow, Alaska, 1979.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Indian Health Service
Hospital, Bethel and Barrow, Alaska. Intake Information,
1972 - 1977.

Table 1

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
ACCIDENTS TREATED ON AN OUTPATIENT BASIS

	TOTAL FIRST VISITS	OCCURRED INSIDE HOME
--	-----------------------	----------------------------

STATEWIDE: All Native Service Units

Total All Accidents	15,827	2,751
Number of Alcohol Related Accidents	2,249	628
Total Accidents with Injury Purpose- fully Inflicted by Another	1,458	467
Number of Accidents with Injury Purposefully Inflicted that were Alcohol Related	858	305

BARROW SERVICE UNIT: Servicing the
Town and Surrounding Villages

Total All Accidents	1,471	391
Number of Alcohol Related Accidents	352	149
Total Accidents with Injury Purpose- fully Inflicted by Another	179	101
Number of Accidents with Injury Purposefully Inflicted that were Alcohol Related	141	81

BETHEL SERVICE UNIT: Servicing the
Town and Surrounding Villages

Total All Accidents	2,457	321
Number of Alcohol Related Accidents	251	82
Total Accidents with Injury Purpose- fully Inflicted by Another	162	74
Number of Accidents with Injury Purposefully Inflicted that were Alcohol Related	103	49

Data Source: Department of Health & Human Services, Alaska Area Native Health Service, On-Request Report 14.

TABLE 2

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
ACCIDENTS TREATED ON AN OUTPATIENT

	<u>STATEWIDE*</u>	<u>BARROW**</u>	<u>BETHEL**</u>
Percentage of all Accidents that were Alcohol Related	14%	24%	10%
Percentage of all Alcohol Related Accidents that were Injury Purposefully Inflicted by Another	38%	40%	41%
Percentage of All Accidents that Occur Inside the Home	17%	27%	13%
Alcohol Related Accidents that Occur Inside the Home	28%	42%	33%
Percentage of all Injury Purposefully Inflicted Accidents, Alcohol Related that Occur Inside the Home	36%	57%	48%
Percentage of all Purposefully Inflicted Accidents that Occur Inside the Home	32%	56%	46%

- * This represents the statewide native population which includes all Native Health Service Units, Urban and Rural
- ** This represents the service unit region which includes the town and surrounding villages

Data Source: Department of Health & Human Services, Alaska Area Native Health Service, On-Request Report 14.

Table 3

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
BARROW REGION SERVICE UNIT

OUTPATIENT ALCOHOL RELATED ACCIDENTS
CAUSE OF INJURY

CAUSE	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Injury Purposefully Inflicted by Another	129	40%
Accidental Falls	56	17
Motor Vehicle	48	15
Cutting and Piercing Instruments	33	10
Undetermined	18	6
Other	16	5
Animal Related, Not Stings	8	3
Suicide	6	2
Environmental Factors	4	1
Firearms	2	-
Machinery	2	-
Accidental Poisoning	1	-
Fires	<u>1</u>	-
TOTAL:	324	

Data Source: Department of Health & Human Services, Alaska Area Native Health Service, On-Request Report 14.

Table 4

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
BARROW REGION SERVICE UNIT

OUTPATIENT ALCOHOL RELATED ACCIDENTS
PLACE OF INJURY

PLACE	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Home, Inside	139	42%
Home, Outside	75	23
Highway and Street	43	13
Not Specified	23	7
Recreation and Sport	17	5
Public Building	15	5
Other	5	2
Industrial Premise	4	1
School	1	-
Resident Institution	1	-
Farm, Ranch	<u>1</u>	-
	TOTAL: 324	

Data Source: Department of Health & Human Services, Alaska Area Native Health Service, On-Request Report 14.