

SÉRIE ANTROPOLOGIA

197

**SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY WITH ABORIGINAL
PEOPLES IN CANADA:
FIRST IMPRESSIONS
Stephen Grant Baines**

(English version of Série Antropologia 196)

**Brasília
1996**

SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY WITH ABORIGINAL PEOPLES IN CANADA: FIRST IMPRESSIONS

Stephen G. Baines¹

Research survey in Canada

I carried out a preliminary research survey of five weeks duration - July and August 1995 - in some of the principal academic centres of anthropology with aboriginal peoples in Canada, financed with a Faculty Research Scholarship from the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a research grant from the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq). I refer to my stay in Canada as a preliminary research survey, since such a short stay could not be classified as research. In this paper I in no way aim to outline a history of the discipline, a task already done by many Canadian anthropologists, and which I am by no means qualified to do, but merely comment on my first impressions from an outsider perspective, and try to piece together and juxtapose some of the viewpoints of anthropologists interviewed.

I visited the departments of anthropology at the Université de Montréal and McGill University in Montreal, Laval University in Quebec city, the University of Waterloo and the University of Toronto, in Ontario, and also visited Ottawa. From Toronto, I travelled by coach across Canada to British Columbia, where I made short visits to the university Program of First Nation Studies of the Secwepemc (Shuswap) Cultural Education Society and Simon Fraser University (SCES/SFU), in Kamloops; the Shuswap reserves of Adam's Lake and Skeetchestn; the University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC) in Prince George; the Witsuwit'en reserve of Moricetown; the University of British Columbia (UBC) and Simon Fraser University in Vancouver; as well as Victoria, capital of BC.

During these five weeks, I interviewed 29 anthropologists who carry out research with native peoples (three of whom identify themselves as native people) and I made contacts with another four. Most of the anthropologists interviewed are university lecturers, but one works in a government department. I also interviewed four native leaders (one of whom is a PhD student in ethnohistory, another a PhD student in social anthropology), an ecologist who carries out research with native peoples, a political scientist, three historians

1. Lecturer in Social Anthropology, Department of Anthropology, Universidade de Brasília, and researcher with the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq). My thanks to the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs for the Faculty Research Program Scholarship and the Brazilian National Research Council for a grant which made possible my research survey in Canada. My thanks also to Prof. Julio Cezar Melatti, for reading a version of this paper and offering his helpful suggestions. The responsibility is, however, entirely mine.

who work with native history, and two persons who work with native policy in government departments². To preserve the anonymity of the persons interviewed, following the request of several of them, I shall not identify the authors of citations, except when taken from articles cited in the bibliographical references.

The research survey fits into the research project that I have been working on since 1990, about social anthropology with native peoples that is carried out in Australia seen through the prism of social anthropology with indigenous peoples that is practised in Brazil. The project was inspired by Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira's proposal (1988:143-159) to study the peripheral styles of anthropology. That is, those anthropologies situated in countries on the periphery of the metropolitan centres of the discipline - the USA, England and France - "where Anthropology, as a scientific and academic discipline was originally invented and consolidated"³ (Cardoso de Oliveira, 1988:144).

A dialogue has already been initiated, by anthropologists resident in Brazil, who have spent periods of research in Canada. Prof. Guillermo Ruben (Universidade Estadual de Campinas, São Paulo) studied Francophone anthropology in Quebec based at the Université de Montréal, Prof. Luís Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira (Universidade de Brasília) is undertaking post-doctoral research in the area of legal anthropology at the Université de Montréal, Prof. Beatriz Perrone-Moisés (USP) undertook ethnohistorical research at the Université de Montréal, Celso Azzan Júnior wrote his doctoral thesis on anthropology in Quebec supervised by Prof. Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, and Prof. Simone Maldonado (Universidade Federal da Paraíba), who works on the anthropology of fishing, spent

2. My thanks to all the persons who accepted being interviewed for their kind collaboration: Gilio Brunelli, of Développement et Paix, Montreal, and PhD candidate in anthropology at the Université de Montréal, who kindly shared his apartment with me in Montreal; Robert Crépeau, Pierre Beaucage, Rémi Savard, Louise Paradis, and Roland Viau, lecturers at the Department of Anthropology, Université de Montréal; Bruce Trigger, Department of Anthropology, and Ludger Muller-Wille, Department of Geography, McGill University; Pierrette Dèsy, Department of History, UQAM, Montreal; Yvan Breton, Department of Anthropology, Université Laval, Quebec; Pierre Trudel, Montreal; Maxine Cole, Assembly of First Nations, Ottawa; Roger Suffling, Faculty of Environmental Studies, University of Waterloo, Ontario; Donna Patrick, PhD candidate in linguistic anthropology at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto; Richard B. Lee, and Krystyna Sieciechowicz, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto; Lise Hansen, Director, Negotiations Support, Land Claims and Self-Government Negotiation, Ontario Native Affairs, Toronto; Anna DeAguayo, PhD candidate in anthropology at the University of Toronto; Rodney Bobiwash, coordinator, First Nations House, University of Toronto; Ron Ignace, and Marianne Ignace, Secwepemc Cultural Education Society & Simon Fraser University Program, Kamloops, B.C.; Jim McDonald, Anthropology and First Nations Studies, UNBC; Antonia Mills, First Nations Studies, UNBC; Robin Fisher, and Mary-Ellen Kelm, History, UNBC; Marcelle Gareau, and Richard Lazenby, Anthropology, UNBC; Adam and Georgan Gagnon, Moricetown, B.C.; Jay Powell, David Aberle, Bruce Miller, and Julie Cruikshank, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, UBC; Paul Tennant, Department of Political Science, UBC; Darcy Dobell, Director, Treaty Mandates, Lands and Resources Policy Planning and Research Division, Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, Victoria, B.C.; Lynne Gregor, Senior Negotiator, Federal Treaty Negotiation Office, British Columbia Region, Indian and Northern Affairs, Victoria, B.C.; Noel Dyck, and Dara Culhane, Simon Fraser University, and Cathy Narcisse, PhD student in anthropology at Simon Fraser. Telephone contacts were made with Robert Paine, Carleton University, Ottawa; Toby Morantz, McGill University, Montreal; Bernard Arcand, Laval University, Quebec; and Gerald Gold, York University, Toronto. I thank Harvey Feit, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, abroad at the time of my visit, and Robert Paine, for kindly sending me articles. I was unable to interview many other distinguished professors who work with First Nations since they were away at the time of my survey. Obviously, time limits also restricted the number of centres I could visit.

3. The translations are mine.

periods lecturing at Laval University.

In addition, some anthropologists resident in Canada have undertaken recent doctoral and post-doctoral research with Indian populations in Brazil, such as Prof. Robert Crépeau (Université de Montréal), Gilio Brunelli (Université de Montréal), Sophie Cloutier (Université de Montréal), and Bernard Von Graeve (University of Toronto). Prof. Yvan Breton (Université Laval) has undertaken recent research on fishing in Brazil.

In my case, I aim to focus on anthropology with native peoples, and considering that the anthropologists resident in Brazil have undertaken research in Quebec solely within Francophone anthropology, I aim to concentrate more, but not exclusively, on Anglophone anthropology, in the future. Taking into consideration that there already exists an established line of comparison between anthropology with native peoples that is practised in Australia and that which is done in Canada⁴, it made sense to include anthropology with native peoples in Canada within the Brazil-Australia comparison. In Canada, as in Brazil and Australia, anthropological research with aboriginal peoples has been directed towards people over whose territories the nation-state has expanded.

If the anthropology which is practised in Australia has been described by some anthropologists in that country as being semi-peripheral (Baines, 1995:75), Frank Manning, discussing anthropology in Canada, describes this country as "a kind of metropolitan colony" (1983:2), neighbour of the biggest super-power in the world. Several anthropologists interviewed stressed the proximity of the USA as being a major factor of influence in moulding the development of anthropology in Canada, and many anthropologists who work in Canada are of American origin and trained in the USA. Some, like Prof. David Aberle at UBC, who has worked for many years with the Navajo, continue research with aboriginal people in the USA as well as in Canada. An Anglophone anthropologist who works in one of the principal universities in eastern Canada affirmed that "basically I would say Canadian anthropology developed, to a very large degree, as an extension of American anthropology into Canada, and in many ways it stayed there". He stressed that he did not think that there was a notion of anthropology in Canada being markedly different from that of the USA, adding that:

"It's probably true that Francophone anthropology has been influenced perhaps more by contacts with France, and, certainly in the 70s, with structuralism. Most of the founders of anthropology in French Canada were also trained in the USA, so, in fact, I think that it is highly problematic that Francophone anthropology in Canada is less American, or significantly less American, than Anglophone anthropology".

He added, also, that there have been other influences, such as, for example, a strong British influence through some individual anthropologists with British training or connections,

"but, primarily, North American anthropology has been a continental anthropology. I don't think it's reasonable to talk about any distinctive (style of) Canadian anthropology (...). Certainly, there are a number of Canadian

4. For example, Sally Weaver, (1983a, 1983b, 1984), Noel Dyck (1985), B. Morse (1988), and many others.

anthropologists trying to maintain that there are highly distinctive trends in Canadian anthropology, but I think that would be very very difficult to demonstrate".

Pierre Maranda, writing in 1983, observed that Canadian anthropologists tend "to situate themselves within the framework of international anthropology (American anthropology?) rather than break away from it by characterising the discipline that we practise as Canadians in our own way." (Maranda, 1983:124). However, Maranda notes that of the 78 replies to his questionnaire about anthropology in Canada (64 from Anglophones and 14 from Francophones) (1983:118-119), only two Anglophone anthropologists questioned whether "abroad" included the USA. For all the others the USA was "abroad" (1983:127).

Maranda (1983:115) mentions that fieldwork only began to be undertaken outside Canada after the establishment of anthropology departments in the universities. By 1978, Canadian anthropologists were carrying out fieldwork, financed by SSHRCC grants from the Canadian government, in Latin America, South East Asia, Oceania, Africa, Australia, and other countries (Maranda 1983:117). By the early 1980s, among research abroad, there was a predominance of fieldwork in Africa, Europe and Central America. For both Anglophones and Francophones, in their publications abroad, the USA predominates, Francophones publishing proportionally more in the USA than Anglophones. This corroborates the self-image presented by some Francophone anthropologists as being, on the one hand, more cosmopolitan than the Anglophones, and, on the other hand, to turn their backs on the Anglophone Canadian anthropologists.

Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira proposes an ethnography of anthropology, affirming "the inviability of dissociating the application of anthropology (...) from the sociocultural, including the political, conditions which bring about its emergence as a discipline" (1988:149). He adds that "such knowledge occurs in an ideologised environment, from which neither the anthropologist nor the discipline are able to escape. (...) it is important to distinguish types of societies within which the discipline is installed" (Ibid.). Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira distinguishes, in addition to the "type of society constituted by countries (...) of a deep Western tradition, such as the oldest nations of Europe (...) at least two other kinds of society in which anthropology has been implanted and has faced very peculiar contexts: (...) the old Asiatic nations" e "the `new nations'" (1988:148-151).

Bruce Kapferer affirms, in an article on nationalist ideology and comparative anthropology, that "the subjectivity of the anthropologist, like that of any other person, is rooted in the historic and ideological worlds in which he is positioned" (1989:166). Developing a similar line of thought, Mariza Peirano points out "that the anthropologist's thinking is part of the very sociocultural configuration in which it emerges" (1992:237), and that "given that the development of anthropology coincided with and was linked to the formation of the European nation states, the ideology of *nation-building* is a parameter and an important symptom for the characterization of the social sciences wherever they emerge" (Ibid.).

The representations which anthropologists present about themselves emerge in diverse forms, revealing a perspective of members of imperialist nation-states, in the case of the central countries (see Stocking Jr., 1982:172). This way of presenting themselves may be also pertinent for anthropologists in European nations of colonization who thought

of their countries as extensions of the central countries, which may be postulated in the case of Australia during the first half of the present century (Baines, 1995). Anthropologists may see themselves as members of nation-states ex-colonies of European countries (as in the cases of present-day Brazil, Australia and Canada, despite immense differences), as members of minority nations who vindicate independence from the state (many Francophone Quebeckers), and as members of autochthonous minority nations within nation-states, some of whom vindicate greater autonomy within the nation-state, while others aspire to sovereignty⁵ (some aboriginal anthropologists in Australia and Canada).

Alcida Ramos, reflecting on the style of ethnology with indigenous populations that is practised in Brasil, notes that "The privileged focus of Brazilian ethnology on interethnic relations is, like most things, linked to a specific social interest and historical context. It is associated with an attitude of political commitment to the defense of the rights of the people studied" (1990:453). In an attempt to characterize the ethos of Brazilian ethnology, Ramos cites Mariza Peirano, who relates "the brand of anthropology that is practised in Brazil (...) to the roots of the modernist movement of the 1920s and the effort to build a Brazilian nation. The responsibility of the intellectuals was to construct a national identity based on what was 'native'" (Ramos, 1990:455). Ramos suggests the possibility of portraying the anthropological worlds in Anglo-American and in Latin traditions, remembering also that, in Brasil, the "condition of colonized has shaped a style of social thinking proper to the Brazilian intelligentsia" (1990:456). Ramos argues that "the hegemony of Euro-American ideas, attitudes, and fashions that, directly or indirectly, invade the minds of the population of countries such as Brazil which, in this respect, is no different from other Latin American nations", leads to "the reaction to it in the form of a posture critical of things hegemonic (...) often but not always of Marxist inspiration, (which) has had the effect of departing from the positivist style of North American or British social sciences" (Ibid.). Ramos emphasizes that "anthropology in Brazil meets international standards of quality while maintaining its own flavor (...) We speak the lingua franca of anthropological theory, but retain our own thick and recognizable accent" (1990:456). She also mentions the possibility that "the nature of academic work in Brazil is such that it permits greater freedom of action than in the anthropological environments of the Anglo-Saxon world" (1990:455).

The overwhelming American influence over anthropology in Canada is vividly portrayed in what Marilyn Silverman describes as a colonial encounter in Canadian academia, evident in the process of selection of an assistant professor by a Recruitment Committee in which she participated. She describes how the "central metaphor was 'Canadian [incompetent] versus American [competent]'" (1991:388) and how the Canadian candidates were summarily removed from consideration, since the members of the Committee began their discourse "with the premiss of the colonized: things Canadian were inferior. Our aim was to hire someone who was top-class. By definition, such a person could not be one of our inferior selves. Where then should such a person come from? Obviously from our superiors, from the colonizing other, from the United States" (1991:391). To make her point, Silverman, in this article, states in very strong terms the question of the colonized thinking of some of her colleagues. However, she concludes that "Surely it cannot be accidental that Canadian anthropologists, in the periphery of an

5. See Levin, 1993.

empire, are concerned with the political-economic trajectory of power and exploitation in its various forms" (1991:392).

Krystyna Sieciechowicz, examining the state of Canadian anthropology from the perspective of the University of Toronto, distinguishes "a number of constants in our research" with an "emphasis on community, social structure, history, political economy, power and ideology" (1993). She also comments that the "complex of Indian issues is a moral question", and that "the Indian question in Canada is a question of the country's conscience" (Ibid.).

As Adam Kuper stresses, speaking from the perspective of a central country in the discipline, the USA, and advocate of an international and universalist anthropology, in social anthropology, "Our object must be to confront the models current in the social sciences with the experiences and models of our subjects, while insisting that this should be a two-way process (...). This is, inevitably, a cosmopolitan project, and one that cannot be bound in the service of any political programme" (1995:551). Tendencies towards nativism, observed in the work of some anthropologists in Greece, for example, in the form of a posture critical of the hegemonic, have been revealed to stem from the hegemonic discourse fashionable in American academia. Kuper, cites Gefou-Madianou, who offers a critique of these anthropologists' tendencies, noting that "It is implicit in their writings that native Greek anthropologists have greater reflexivity and ability to 'truly' understand Greek culture and indigenous categories" (Gefou-Madianou 1993:172-3 apud Kuper, 1995:546). Kuper also cites Herzfield (1986), who addresses the limitations of the native Greek ethnographic tradition, "bringing out its subordination to political programmes, and its sometimes hidden relationship to a cosmopolitan anthropological discourse" (Kuper, 1995:547). Kuper shares with Herzfield a "sceptical view of nativist ethnography, with its nationalist - occasionally even racist - overtones" (Ibid.).

Kuper points out the dangers of local debates, which can lead to "a form of ethnographic provincialism", and poses the question: "Does the conversation peter out as one crosses the boundaries between regional traditions of study?" (1995:550). Comparing anthropology in Indian and Brazil, Mariza Peirano points out that "In our case (Brazil), between the high level of local politization and the fascination for international fashions, the parochial bias seems to emerge, strangely, in the belief that we are part of a homogenous West, (...) unaware of the fact that, the moment the national frontiers are crossed, what was here a theoretical discussion turns immediately into plain regional ethnography" (1992:229-230).

Referring to Quebec, Handler stresses that, "(Quebecois) national personality is often discussed in terms of temperament and blood" (1984:60), the Francophone québécois distinguishing themselves from the Anglophones by the "*joie de vivre*" and "Latin blood". M. Estellie Smith observes that "Quebecois have long prided themselves on a certain 'innate cosmopolitanism' considered lacking in the 'stodgy, old-fashioned' Anglo elite" (1984), posture reflected in some Quebecker anthropologists' statements about the discipline in Quebec.

Some general information about Canada

Canada has an area of 9.922.385 km², with an extension of 5.000 km from the Pacific in the west, to the Atlantic in the east, and 4.600 km from Ellesmere Island in the north, to the United States frontier in the south. The population is approximately 28.000.000 (1991), of which more than 75% live in large urban centres situated within 400 km of the US frontier, in a narrow band of densely populated territory. Sixty per cent of the total population live in the south of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The north of Canada, which, up to the 1960s was seen as remote, inaccessible and economically poor, came to be seen, from the 1970s, as a vast source of mineral wealth and hydro-electric energy. This was the decade in which several mega-projects in native territories were initiated. The aboriginal population is around 1.2 million, approximately 4.3% of the total population of Canada.

European colonization began from the late XV century, by French and British. During the XVII century, French colonized the banks of the Saint Lawrence Seaway, and, to a lesser extent, "Acadia" on the east coast. Conflicts in the XVIII century, between England and France, culminated with the fall of Quebec, in 1759, and the annexation of the French colony to the British empire.

The formation of the present-day Canadian nation-state took place over a long period. With the declaration of independence of the USA, in 1776, many American colonists loyal to the British crown, including also some native peoples, migrated to the north to colonize Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and what is today Ontario. The invasions of Canada ended with the 1812-14 war, between Great Britain and the USA. In 1846, the frontier between the USA and the British territories was extended west to the Pacific Ocean, following the 49th parallel. After the American Civil War, three colonies, United Canada (Quebec and Ontario), New Brunswick and Nova Scotia united, through the Constitutional Law of 1867, in a federal union. In 1869-70 the British government ceded the territories of the West and North which belonged to the Hudson Bay Company (Rupert Land). From these territories the provinces of Manitoba (1870), Saskatchewan and Alberta (1905) and the Northwest Territories were created. In 1871, British Columbia joined the federation and Prince Edward Island joined in 1873. In 1949, Newfoundland became the tenth province.

Canada, like Brazil and Australia, can be considered a European nation of colonization, or "new nation". There has been an estimated immigration of eleven million people since 1867, the last five million having been admitted after the Second World War. Recently, there has been American immigration to British Columbia and Canadian emigration from the economically poorer eastern provinces of Canada to the USA.

68.3% of the population of Canada is Anglophone and 23.3% Francophone, 13% speaking both languages. There are also large German, Ukranian, Italian, Greek, several Indian, Chinese, and other language-speaking communities. Vancouver has the second largest Iranian community outside Iran, after Los Angeles.

The Aboriginal Peoples of Canada

The aboriginal peoples of Canada have been classified into several linguistic

families, there being eleven principal linguistic families and over fifty languages.

Section 35 of the Constitutional Act of 1982 includes, as aboriginal peoples, the Indians, Inuit, and Métis. The word "Indian" has a pejorative connotation, the terms "native peoples", "aboriginal peoples", and "First Nations" being more often used by the aboriginal peoples themselves. However, as a native leader stressed to me, all of these terms have been appropriated in diverse and often contradictory ways for political ends.

According to Edward Hedican, it is possible to distinguish a protectionist period of British colonial policy, from the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which declares that:

"It is just and reasonable, and essential to our interest, and the security of our colonies, that the several Nations or Tribes of Indians with whom we are connected, and who live under our Protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them or any of them as their Hunting Grounds" (apud Hedican:1995:9).

This document could be considered the foundation of aboriginal rights, since it recognized that the aboriginal peoples were the original and sovereign inhabitants before the European conquest, and the basis for the Indian Act of 1876, as well as for the period of treaties in which the reserves were created. The creation of Indian Reserves resulted in a distinction between "status" Indians and "non-status" Indians (those Indians not incorporated in the treaties, the Métis, and enfranchised natives). The years from the period of the confederation up to about 1960, decade of Indian activism, have been called the "assimilation era" of Canadian Indian Policy. The objective of the Indian Act was the assimilation of the aboriginal population, proposed through the concept of enfranchisement. However, few aboriginal people opted for enfranchisement. In 1880, an amendment to the Act declared that any Indian with a university degree would be automatically enfranchised. Another amendment, in 1933, gave the government the power to enfranchise Indians without their consent. In 1927, in response to the Nisga'a Indians' land claim in B.C., the government passed an amendment prohibiting anyone from raising money among Indians for any claim without the written consent of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

The period of treaties extended from 1871 to 1923, with the acceleration of the colonization of the continent. Through treaties n^o.1 to 11, the aboriginal peoples ceded vast territories in exchange for reserves, monetary payments, clothes for the chiefs every three years, ammunition and twine. Only treaty n^o.6 provided for medical treatment. Between 1871 and 1877, seven treaties were signed, involving the surrender of large areas by the native peoples, and the bringing together of disperse groups in fixed settlements administered by the government. Four northern treaties were signed in 1899, 1905, 1906 and 1921. Only the first of these includes part of British Columbia. A treaty was signed in 1923, by the Chippewa in Ontario and Georgian Bay.

Noel Dyck draws attention to the fact that, since the end of the XIX century, political activities among indigenous peoples in Canada reflect their repeated attempts to organize political associations beyond the band (community) level in order to follow common interests. The "Grand General Indian Council of Ontario" was the outcome of

sympathetic missionaries' efforts to establish a council of Ojibwa nations prior to Confederation. In existence from the 1870s until 1938, the Grand General Indian Council tended to pursue a cautious course in its dealings with federal Indian administrators, forswearing direct criticism in favour of conciliation" (1993a:92). In the early 1880s, the Plains Cree began to form a political alliance to try to force the federal government to honour what Indians viewed as treaty commitments, ending in the North-West Rebellion of 1885. The Allied Tribes of British Columbia was created in 1915, the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia in the 1930s, and the Métis Association of Alberta in 1932 (Sawchuk, 1993:273). Attempts to form a national indigenous political organization began in Ontario and Quebec during the First World War. In 1918, the League of Indians of Canada was created in Ontario, and, later, the National Indian Brotherhood, which became the Assembly of First Nations.

A revision of the Indian Act, in 1951, included the annulment of laws which prohibited the potlatch and other ceremonies. However, the legislation differed little from before, the clause for forced enfranchisement remaining. A register of Indians was made, in the form of a list of bands with rights to live in reserves and a general list which included persons who did not belong to bands.

In April 1969, the Nisga'a Indian Tribal Council took the government of B.C. to court, challenging this province's denial of native land rights, and claiming aboriginal title in the Supreme Court of Canada. The judges dismissed the case, nearly five years later, in the *Calder* decision of 1973, divided as to whether native title still applied or had been extinguished. A few months after the Nisga'a started their struggle for land rights, in 1969, the federal government issued the "White Paper", a kind of "Enfranchisement Decree", which aimed to repeal the Indian Act and end the federal government's responsibility for aboriginal peoples, thus passing the administration of native lands to the provinces. This government proposal was presented by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs of the Trudeau government, Jean Chrétien, and included the proposal to abolish the *Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development*. The pretext used to try to justify it, was to place aboriginal peoples on an equal footing with the rest of Canadian citizens.

The "White Paper" was strongly criticized by aboriginal peoples, who replied with their "Red Paper", demanding a reform, and not the repeal, of the Indian Act, and a more explicit recognition of native rights in Canadian legislation, partially achieved with the Constitutional Act of 1982. In 1969, Indian agents were withdrawn from Indian reserves, in an attempt to end government paternalism, and, from 1970, the government started to finance native organizations. From the early 1970s, with the demands of indigenous peoples for self-determination, churches were withdrawn from Indian education and residential schools were closed. Special programmes were set up in an attempt to base Indian education on traditional native values.

In 1973, the federal government announced its willingness to negotiate land claims based on outstanding aboriginal title, even for peoples who had not been included in treaties. Two categories of claims were recognized: "comprehensive" claims, and "specific" claims. The comprehensive claims are based on traditional native use and occupancy of land, in regions where no treaties had been made: Yukon, Labrador and most of British Columbia, northern Quebec and the Northwest Territories. Specific claims involve land title, fishing and hunting rights, monetary indemnification and economic and social benefits. Specific claims deal with grievances regarding the fulfilment of treaties and the

administration of Indian lands and other assets under the Indian Act. By 1995, ten comprehensive claims had been settled, most of which are being implemented (some are awaiting proclamation of legislation). Eleven are in the phase of negotiation. In the province of British Columbia, forty Statements of Intent to negotiate were filed with the British Columbia Treaty Commission by aboriginal groups. By April 1994, the federal government received 584 specific claims, and by December 1994, 312 of these had been resolved, 127 through settlements (Canada, 1995). In 1975, the Cree and Inuit of James Bay and the north of Quebec surrendered aboriginal title to approximately 981,610 km² in exchange for monetary compensation, title to 8,500 km², political rights and regional government, educational rights and use of their languages.

The issuing of Bill C-31 in 1985, modifying the Indian Act, aimed to end discrimination against aboriginal women. Before the passing of this Bill, women classified as status Indians who married non-status Indians or non-Indians lost their status. From 1985, the Indian Act abolished enfranchisement and entitles many Indians who had lost status and band membership to reinstatement. The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) gave up the assimilationist policy of the 1960s, the idea predominating that Indian reserves should be centres for community development. Despite attempts by the government to follow a policy of Indian self-government, the idea persists that indigenous peoples are incapable of managing their own lives. Native peoples also see the structures external to their communities as obstacles to their autonomy.

The Indian Act, in conceding official status to some native people and not to others, fragments the aboriginal population of Canada into competing interests groups, such as the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), for Status Indians; the Native Council of Canada (NCC), for non-status Indians; The Métis Society of Canada; the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC)(1971), the Association of Native Women of Canada, and many other groups at the provincial and regional level, such as the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs (1969). In 1991 there were more than 500,000 Indians registered as status Indians under legislative and administrative jurisdiction of the federal government, a population that has almost doubled over the past 25 years. 326,444 status Indians were living in reserves, and 226,872 were living outside reserves. The same year there were 405,000 non-status Indians, 192,100 Métis, and 50,800 Inuit (Statistics Canada, 1991 census). The number of Canadians of indigenous descent may be double the registered population. Status Indians are called "First Nations People", with rights and benefits from the federal government. There are about 2,300 Indian reserves covering approximately 2,8 million hectares, distributed between 606 indigenous bands.

The Inuit, people who speak the Inuktitut language, are made up of several groups with similar lifestyle and language, who claim an autonomous territory, Nunavut ("Our land"), in the Northwest Territories. It is estimated that the ancestors of the Indians migrated from Asia more than 25,000 years ago, while the ancestors of the Inuit migrated about 15,000 years ago. In 1939, a decision of the Supreme Federal Court granted to the Inuit the same benefits of health, education and social assistance that Indians receive, and decided that the term "Indian" of the Constitutional Act of 1867 included the Inuit too. In the 1950s and 1960s, approximately 700 Inuit groups suffered relocations to 40 settlements. At present they are distributed in 66 communities which vary from 100 to 1000 inhabitants. The demand for greater control over their own lands led the government of the Northwest Territories to realize a referendum in 1982, with the division of Nunavut (Inuit)

and Denendeh (Indians and Métis). 56% favoured the decision for more autonomy within the Federal Union. In June 1993, an act of Parliament was proclaimed providing for the creation by April 1, 1999, of the new territory of Nunavut, with an extension of 1,900,000 km², and title to 350,000 km².

About 70% of the indigenous population live in communities which are distant from the urban centres, compared to 25% of the total Canadian population. The average size of indigenous bands has increased to over 650 persons, compared to 200 persons in 1950. Thus, the area of reserves per person has diminished to half of what it was a generation ago (Hedican, 1995:12). Only 16 bands have a population of over 2000 individuals. The birth rate is higher than that of non-indigenous populations, increasing the demand for education, social services and jobs. The average income of aboriginal peoples is two thirds the national average and, of those Indians who live on reserves, 60% depend on the welfare system and 30% depend on temporary work, training programmes, or unemployment benefit.

A migration from reserves to cities is taking place. Of the approximately 30% of Status Indians who live outside reserves, rates of unemployment and dependence on the welfare system between 25% and 30% have been estimated. The aboriginal peoples live at the lowest socio-economic level of Canadian society. Despite the fact that the aboriginal peoples make up approximately 4.3% of the total population of Canada, in the federal prisons 12% of the men and 17% of the women are Aborigines. In the province of Saskatchewan they make up 72% of the total of prisoners. After a series of interethnic conflicts, culminating in Oka, in 1990, the federal government set up a Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples to investigate the economic, social and cultural situation of the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

Ethnology with Indigenous Populations in Canada

Tom McFeat (1980) traces the development of anthropology in Canada to the Jesuit missionaries of the XVII century, there being a collection of 73 volumes of notes and letters about the Iroquois of southern Ontario, which inspired the ethnohistorical works by Alfred Bailey (1937) on the Algonquin, by Leacock (1954) on the fur trade and hunting, by Bruce Trigger (1969, 1976, 1985) on the Huron, and more recent historical research on the James Bay Cree by D. Francis & T. Morantz (1983).

Kenelm Burridge states that "For about two hundred years ethnographies of the Canadian scene were the virtual monopoly of French missionary priests", adding that "the secularization and efflorescence of ethnology that took place in Britain, Europe, Australia, and the United States during the last third or quarter of the nineteenth century had no counterpart in Canada" (1983:306). During the first half of the twentieth century a large part of the ethnographic research in Canada was carried out by Americans.

Richard Preston (1983:286-287) states that anthropology as an academic area was established very late in Canada. It was first introduced in the museums with a view of salvage ethnology and archaeology of Canadian Indians. Edward Sapir, indicated by Franz Boas, was the first Chief of the Anthropology Division in 1910, which began within the Geological Survey of Canada, and the building of the Victoria Museum in Ottawa. By

1920, the staff consisted of four ethnologists: Sapir, Marius Barbeau, Diamond Jenness, e F.W. Waugh. Barbeau and Jenness were trained at Oxford University. Anthropology was introduced at the University of Toronto in 1925, and at the Royal Ontario Museum, gaining the first partial departmental status and an M.A. programme by 1927. T.F. McIlwraith, student of A.C. Haddon, who had also had contacts with W.H.R. Rivers, took up his lectureship in 1925 in Toronto (Burrige, 1983:306). Only in 1937 did the department get full status and a Ph.D. programme (Preston, 1983:288). In 1947 McGill University, in Montreal, established an anthropology position and the University of British Columbia (UBC), in Vancouver, hired Harry Hawthorn as professor of anthropology in the Department of Economics, Political Science and Sociology. At the UBC, the department of Anthropology and Sociology was formed in 1959, and by 1969 it had twelve full-time anthropologist (Kew, 1993-94:80). Anthropology was established at the University of Victoria in 1963 and at Simon Fraser in 1965 (Ibid.).

As Guilherme Ruben (1995) stresses, the founders of the modern programmes of teaching and research in anthropology at the University of Montreal and Laval University, were Guy Dubreuil and Marc-Adélarde Tremblay, respectively. Both were trained in the USA.

Anthropology as an academic discipline only developed fully after the Second World War, period in which the influence of British values was very strong. The first Ph.D. thesis on an indigenous theme was submitted in 1934 by A.G. Bailey, in the Department of History, and the second in 1956. Only in 1964 did McGill University and the UBC start their Ph.D. programmes. According to Preston, the development of the Boasian four-square structure only occurred at the University of Toronto in the 1960s.

From the beginning of the twentieth century there had been a concern with Indian policy, and, in 1884, Franz Boas participated in the committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science to investigate the desperate situation of the native peoples of British Columbia. Boas, working from Columbia University in New York, carried out fieldwork on the Northwest coast of British Columbia from 1886 to 1931 (Rohner, 1969 apud Kew, 1993-94:78). In 1909, the National Museum became a focus for anthropology in Canada, directed by Edward Sapir, student of Boas, until 1926, and then by the New Zealander Diamond Jenness, ex-student of R. Marett at Oxford (Burrige, 1983:306), who worked together with Marius Barbeau in the defence of indigenous rights.

An amendment to the Indian Act, in 1927, prohibited the political organization of indigenous peoples beyond the local community level. Jenness and Barbeau, together with other anthropologists, expressed opposition to the government policy which prohibited the potlatch and the dance of the Tamanawas from 1882 to 1951, the Sun Dance in the Prairies from 1910 to 1934, and the ceremonies of the guardian spirit among the Salish. Despite a predominantly "salvage ethnography" - an attempt to reconstruct traditional culture as it was before contact - during the decades prior to the 1960s (Kew, 1993-94:78-79), anthropologists had been assuming an ever increasing role in Indian policy. The Survey of Contemporary Indians of Canada (1966-7), directed by Harry Hawthorn, of the UBC, and Marc-Adélarde Tremblay, of Laval University, involved approximately 50 ethnologists. 150 recommendations were submitted related to Indian policy and economic, political and educational needs.

In 1940 there were eight ethnologists lecturing in three universities - Toronto, Montreal, McMaster - and perhaps four in museums. By 1950 there were nine

anthropologists in five universities. By 1960 there were 35 anthropologists in eight universities. By 1970 there were 170 anthropologists in 24 universities, and by 1979-80, 270 anthropologists in 35 universities (Burrige, 1983:307). Burrige adds that in 1983, anthropology was still in a period of consolidation in Canada, despite there being, per head of population, 1:90,000, compared with 1:80,000 in the USA, 1:330,000 in Great Britain, and 1:120,000 in Australia. This same year, 55.5% of anthropologists working in universities were trained in American universities (mainly Chicago, Harvard, and Berkeley), 24.4% in Canadian universities (mainly UBC, Toronto, and Laval), 11.6% in UK and Irish universities (mainly Oxford and L.S.E.), 7.3% in Paris, and 1.2% in Dutch universities. Of 780 M.A. theses and 142 Ph.D. theses completed in Canadian universities, 31.3% were on Canadian themes, 7.3% on South American themes, and 8.6% on Australian themes, in addition to other regions of the world. Marc-Adélar Tremblay characterizes the early 1980s as "a time of unprecedented theoretical fragmentation" (1983:333), an unavoidable consequence of the immense growth and diversification of the discipline.

In addition to universities, there are, at present, colleges of tertiary education which offer some courses in anthropology. In British Columbia, in 1993-94, there were fifteen public colleges or combined university/colleges and two private colleges in the province, all of which offered some university-level credit courses in anthropology (B.C. Council on Admissions and Transfer, 1993-94, apud Kew, 1993-94:80).

Lee Drummond (1983:108) observes that up to the 1960s, aboriginal peoples were the object of study *par excellence* of anthropology. Several of the anthropologists interviewed stressed the White Paper controversy of 1969-70, as the point of fundamental changes in anthropology with native peoples in Canada, from a "salvage ethnography" or traditional ethnology, acculturation studies, and studies of relations between aboriginal peoples and Canadian society, to an anthropology which has to take into consideration several new factors. For example, aboriginal definitions of native issues, the need for the anthropologist to negotiate with the people the terms in which research is carried out, situations which involve large scale economic development projects and which involve local communities with world events, the enormous proliferation of anthropological consultants, land claim processes, aboriginal politics, and a climate of criticisms directed at anthropology by the native peoples and by various agents of the national society.

A big impetus in studies of native peoples occurred in Anglophone anthropology in Canada during the 1960s and early 1970s, with the intensive occupation of the north of the continent and studies directed towards questions of development and modernization. These studies were directly related to the building of the Canadian nation, but were seen by the anthropologists involved not so much as a question of nation-building, but more as a question of dealing with specific problems as experts or technocrats. However, with the rise of the native political movement in the 70s, anthropologists, to a great extent, lost this role as advisers to government. Native people no longer allow anthropologists to play this role, and one anthropologist mentioned that one of the most terrible effects is that as native people become more self-governing, very often they sell out to the very interests that the anthropologists have been opposing the hardest.

An Anglophone anthropologist interviewed pointed out that, from early on, native people themselves forced anthropologists to see the immense contradiction in the notion that you could be promoting the development of the nation and, at the same time, helping

native people to advance their own interests. However, he stressed that these anthropologists saw themselves as technocrats offering advice and in no way as patriotic contributors to building the Canadian nation. The same anthropologist mentioned that studies of native peoples and the nation-state in Canada, from Robert Paine onwards, have become increasingly less an attempt to intervene or change a scene, than simply to understand it, marking a retreat from action.

Dyck categorizes the bulk of social and cultural anthropological publications written during the 1970s and 1980s under one or more of four headings: ethnohistory, ethnology, community studies, and native-state relations (Dyck, 1990:43-45). Both Dyck and Kew point to a paucity of anthropological research on the situation of native peoples in urban settings (Dyck, 1990:48, Kew, 1993-94:89), despite the fact that in B.C., for example, in 1989, nearly half of registered status Indians were resident off-reserve. According to one native leader interviewed, there are around 65.000 native people living in Toronto, "the largest Indian community north of Mexico". Currently there are First Nation graduate students writing their PhD theses on themes which had been almost ignored until recently. For example, a graduate student in B.C. is examining suicide among aboriginal peoples in Canada, while another, in the east of Canada, is working on urbanization.

In the 1970s, the attention of ethnologists moved from more isolated communities to acculturated Indians, urbanized Indians, minority groups, ethnic fractions or sections, etc., which marks a development, in some ways similar to that observed by Peirano (1991) in the anthropology which is practised in Brazil. From a focus first on aboriginal peoples, there was a shift to other themes such as ethnic minorities within the national society, and then to the Canadian national society itself, as well as a concern with political issues and discourse analysis (Drummond, 1983; Paine, 1983). However, as in Brazil, some anthropologists have continued and continue to carry out research with aboriginal peoples.

An Anglophone anthropologist interviewed mentioned a new tendency in anthropology with native peoples in Canada in the 1980s, when there was:

"a general movement away from a concern with economic and social development and a growing idealist trend, which encouraged an interest in the studies of symbolism and beliefs (...). So that today there seems to be much more interest in trying to understand what native people believe, what the impact of belief systems on behaviour is, from that sort of symbolic (...) point of view, which of course, in a way, reflects the drying up of funds for development research (...). the interest have moved away from studies of economic, political questions of development to this sort of Germanic effort to achieve some sort of *verstehen*, some sort of synthetic understanding of how native people perceive things".

He added that with the growth of a strong native political movement in Canada, anthropologists try to preserve a role for themselves not by being intermediaries, since native people no longer need these, but being people who study how these different worlds which are cognitively different from each other are interacting.

Richard Lee & Carolyn Filteau observe that in 1978-79 there were 21 anthropology departments in Canadian universities, thirteen departments of sociology and anthropology, and one department of anthropology and archaeology (1983:215). Different

from anthropology in the UK, France, and Brazil, the majority of the departments follow the Boasian approach, which is the American pattern, of four subfields of anthropology: social and cultural anthropology, archaeology, physical anthropology and anthropological linguistics. For example, according to one informant, the Department of Anthropology at the Université de Montréal has about 22 regular lecturers, five in archaeology, three in linguistics, three in physical anthropology, and eleven in social/cultural anthropology. Some departments have departed from this approach, such as the Department of Anthropology at Laval University, which offers only social anthropology, and, in all Canadian departments, social/cultural anthropology is the central subdiscipline. Over 50% of all anthropologists in Canadian departments classify themselves as social/cultural anthropologists.

In 1982 there were approximately 250 anthropology lecturers in 34 anthropology departments (Lee & Filteau, 1983:216). According to Herman, Vallee, & Carstens, (1982 apud Preston 1983:293-294), in 1983 there were 22 departments of anthropology, thirteen departments of anthropology and sociology, one of anthropology and archaeology, and three of archaeology. Also there were anthropologists in some of the 32 departments of sociology. Of the total of 39 departments with anthropology, eleven departments had from 11 to 31 full-time staff. Eleven departments had Ph.D. programmes, employing about 250 professors. Twelve other departments had M.A. programmes and fourteen stopped at the B.A. In addition, ten museums employed 38 Ph.D.s and 83 others. In Preston's words, the social structure of anthropology in Canada was, at this time, "part of a very complex hierarchical service industry or bureaucracy, distinguished by the ideal of intellectual excellence, and weakened by bureaucratic tendencies to careerism, product fragmentation, and superficiality" (1983:295).

According to Gold & Tremblay (1983:55), referring to Francophone anthropology in Quebec, "only a few anthropologists of the sixties were action oriented". However, by the seventies, "Québécois nationalism, and the issue of who controlled the Quebec economy preoccupied many anthropologists..." (Ibid.). Thus, according to Hedican, "the controversy surrounding the James Bay hydroelectric project was seen less in the context of aboriginal rights and issues than it was in the context of Quebec nationalism and economic independence from the rest of Anglophone North America" (1995:17-18).

Despite this, there was also a concern with indigenous issues by some anthropologists in Quebec. The project of applied anthropology carried out by the McGill University team with the northern Cree began in 1964, directed by Norman Chance, who was substituted by Richard Salisbury in 1971, when the project was called the Programme in the Anthropology of Development, breaking with the tradition to separate theoretical and applied anthropology. Salisbury stressed that, in the anthropology carried out in Canada, theory has developed in close relation with an anthropology of action (1979:229). Lee & Filteau point out that "a sense of engagement, a sense of commitment to political issues and causes has pervaded much of our discussions" (1983:221), which had led many anthropologists to profess an activist political orientation. They add that "This sense of commitment may in fact be diagnostic of Canadian social-cultural anthropology when it is compared with its counterparts in Britain and the U.S." (1983:221-223).

Michael Asch (1983:202) stresses that applied anthropology, closely related to political issues of indigenous peoples, far from distracting researchers from theoretical problems, has contributed to theory. In the 1970s, in western Canada, the Mackenzie

Valley Pipeline Inquiry served as a means for investigating sensitive indigenous issues, such as the dependence of the Dene nation. The result of the Inquiry, headed by Chief Justice Thomas Berger, was the recommendation of a moratorium of ten years on further gas and oil development in the Mackenzie District until aboriginal land claims and environmental impact problems were resolved. Asch (1983:202-204) shows how the acculturation model, predominant at the time, and used by expert witnesses who appeared on behalf of the pipeline application, became obsolete when faced by the rejection by the Dene and Inuvialuit of proposals based on this model. The 1970s brought an increase in the quantity and quality of anthropological research on the impact of mega-projects, in the work of anthropologists such as Harvey Feit (1973) and Adrian Tanner (1981), who demonstrated, through their research into economic organization and hunting, that the aboriginal peoples are managers of their environment and not passive agents accepting it.

Gold & Tremblay emphasize that the participation of anthropologists with the James Bay Cree stemmed from the inability of the Cree to assess the particular consequences of the new hydroelectric development for their communities and for a hunting and trapping economy that they wished to continue. A transactional model emerged from the research, and, different from previous research, the anthropologists in Salisbury's team placed Cree hunting territories into a larger framework of the relationship between communities, natural resources, the division of labour and the ideologies that govern the use of the land, in research such as that of Harvey Feit (Gold & Tremblay, 1983:62). Gold & Tremblay mention that most of postwar research with the Inuit of New Quebec had been directed by non-Canadian and non-Quebecker anthropologists, and that this research does not deal with the colonial situation. However, during the 1960s and 1970s, Gold & Tremblay (1983:63) observe a shortage of research in Quebec on Indian-white contacts, native leadership, the politics of native relationships with the government, bands and local groups, and the emergence of new ethnic identities within a context of provincial and national native political movements. Most research tended to focus on less acculturated Indian bands. Parallel to research in Indian ethnology, there was research in urban anthropology, on ethnicity among immigrants, industrialization, and the anthropology of health. Gold & Tremblay conclude that "the corpus of anthropological studies carried out in Quebec is sufficiently extensive to give the discipline a unique identity" (1983:70), marked by an interest in (Quebec) national objectives and a more extensive cosmopolitan experience.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Rémi Savard published structuralist studies of Inuit and Montagnais myths, influenced by Lévi-Strauss. Savard shows how the Montagnais, cheated by White society, symbolically reverse their situation by becoming the trickster to the White man, in an anti-colonial discourse. Asen Balikci states that "The Québécois went to study the Amerindians of Quebec. Their Amerindians, in their province. The history of the Amerindians was partly their history" (1980:124), rather similar to the Brazilian case, where anthropology has been related to the process of nation-building (Peirano, 1991, Ramos, 1990).

Alcida Ramos, referring to contemporary Brazilian anthropology, affirms that "it is the Indian issue that is the main focus of political attention, even though ethnologists dedicated to indigenous studies are but a minority in the profession" (1990:456). She adds:

"Of all the concrete objects of Brazilian anthropological research, indigenous

societies are the best representatives of 'Otherness'. ... Yet, Brazilian Indians are *our* Others, they are part of our country, they constitute an important ingredient in the process of building our nation, they represent one of our ideological mirrors reflecting our frustrations, vanities, ambitions, and power fantasies. We do not regard them as so completely exotic, remote, or arcane, as to make them into literal 'objects'. Their humanity is never lost on us, their predicament is our historical guilt, their destiny is as much theirs as it is ours. ...the Indian question is a particularly privileged field for the exercise of the twofold project of academic work and political action" (1990:456-7).

In the highly politicized situation of ethnological research with indigenous peoples in Canada, it is common that the aboriginal communities demand that the researcher signs a contract before beginning research. The aboriginal people often demand that the research brings benefits which they define, and that it be formulated within their own interests. Several anthropologists interviewed stressed that their research was oriented primarily towards needs which the native peoples defined, and that, in recent years, there has been a tendency towards a more applied anthropology linked to specific problems faced by the people such as land claims. They pointed out that, with some exceptions, since the 1970s, less long-term fieldwork is being done than in the past, and more fieldwork done in short stints but carried out over a diachronically longer period.

There are approximately 400 members of the CASCA (Canadian Association of Social and Cultural Anthropology), which does not include all the anthropologists in Canada. In addition to the CASCA, there is the SAAC (Society for Applied Anthropology in Canada), the CAMA (Canadian Association of Medical Anthropology), the Canadian Society of Sociology and Anthropology, and also regional anthropological organizations, and separate organizations for archaeology and physical anthropology.

Some of the principal Canadian journals in social/cultural anthropology are: Culture, published by the CASCA; Anthropologie et Société, of the Department of Anthropology of Laval University; Recherches Amérindiennes au Québec, founded in 1971, an independent society; Yuit; Études/Inuit/Studies; and Anthropologica, published in Ontario, as well as regional journals such as BC Studies, founded in 1969.

Many anthropologists work outside of academic institutions as consultants. Richard Salisbury (1983:192) distinguished four types of applied anthropologists: independent consultants, who operate as businessmen, selling themselves to clients, those who work in government agencies, those who work for business firms, and those who work for local groups. Within these types, Salisbury distinguishes between administrators, workers and consultants. Anthropologists employed by native communities and tribal councils carry out tasks defined by the employer.

Anthropologists have often been not treated seriously by judges, lawyers and government agencies. This is clear, for example, in the case of *Delgamuukw v. B.C.*, heard in the British Columbia Supreme Court, the outcome of which was made public on 8 March 1991. The case began at Smithers in 1987, when hereditary chiefs of the Gitksan and Witsuwit'en claimed 55,000 square kilometres of crown land in northern B.C. In 1984, hereditary chiefs took the province to court. The aboriginal people lost the claim, and the judge rejected the testimony of the chiefs and the anthropologists who acted as expert witnesses (see Miller, 1992; Ridington, 1992; Cruikshank, 1992; Culhane, 1992). One of

the three anthropologists who were asked by the Witsuwit'en and Gitksan to write a report as expert witnesses, Antonia Mills (1994), published her report in a book. The case was appealed at a provincial level, and it was recognized, in 1993, that aboriginal peoples do have certain rights linked to traditional use and occupancy. As in the case of the land claim of the Wampanoag of Mashpee, in the USA (Clifford, 1988), the judge gave far more credit to historical documentation than to native oral tradition and anthropological interpretations.

In the early 1980s one third of the ethnologists based in Canada carried out research in Canada, and two thirds of graduate theses in ethnology dealt with Canadian themes, in a process, identified by Frank Manning, "whereby Canadian ethnologists have turned their attention towards their own country" (1983:4), having done research with native peoples, with other ethnic groups, and on a variety of social problems and other topical phenomena. Burrige (1983) also stresses this tendency within anthropology in Canada to look towards Canada. Quebec led the way in the study of local communities, where Gerald Gold e Marc Adélar Tremblay note the importance of rural and native studies, many of them done through team research.

In my interviews, on the one hand, the majority of Francophone anthropologists stressed the differences between themselves and Anglophone anthropologists, and the paucity of communication between the two groups. Some Francophone anthropologists referred to themselves as being more cosmopolitan than the majority of the Anglophones with a culture more focussed on the intellectual life of Paris and the large academic centres of the northeast of the USA, than with the provincialism of the Anglophone anthropologists in Canada. On the other hand, many Anglophone anthropologists stressed that, despite the language barrier, there has been quite a lot of communication between Anglophone and Francophone anthropologists, as if this reflected the will to unite in a single nation. An Anglophone anthropologist who has worked for many years in Quebec affirmed that there is a dialogue between Anglophone and Francophone anthropologists through the CASCA, as well as there being Francophone academics teaching in Anglophone departments and vice versa: "There are a lot of bridges for communication. I don't see that as a great problem".

However, several Anglophone anthropologists interviewed did state that the dialogue and exchange between Anglophone and Francophone anthropologists are not as good as they "should be", adding that they hope that they will improve. One Anglophone anthropologist went to the point of expressing his hope that with Internet the differences may be diminished. Those who share a federalist ideology of Canada as one bilingual nation (Francophone and Anglophone - an ideology which sometimes de-emphasizes the aboriginal peoples and large immigrant communities) express their will that Francophone and Anglophone anthropologists may be able to communicate as members of the Canadian nation. While those who support the separation of Quebec emphasized the precariousness of communication between Anglophones and Francophones, stressing their close ties with anthropology in the large centres of the northeast of the USA and France more than with the Anglophone anthropologists of Canada, identified with their colonial oppressors.

The strong focus toward metropolitan anthropologies may also contribute to a lack of dialogue between anthropologists within the province. According to Azzan Júnior:

"this is certainly one of the reasons there seems to be such little dialogue between anthropologists of/in Quebec. Frequently working on similar, if not the same,

themes, on the same or neighbouring societies, or similar cultural characteristics, these anthropologists, separated often by a few rooms, or a short bus ride, prefer to cite colleagues from France, the USA, or England" (1995:62).

After affirming that there is little audience in Quebec for studying Indians, one Quebecker anthropologist asked me why (with some exceptions) Quebeckers do not study Indians in Quebec. I replied that one of the reasons may be that the tradition of anthropology developed in the central countries, to which anthropology in Quebec aspired to, directed its attention towards the exotic overseas. He agreed that in a way this is true, since:

"we wanted also to study abroad (...). This is the answer from the anthropological side. But from society, the question is that *we are the Indians here*⁶. What are the Indians in America? The first occupants of the soil. Those who really know nature, who are in contact with the earth, mother earth, and so on. But you know, in relation to the English this is how we see ourselves. So Indians and us, we occupy the same niche. So what about the question of studying Indian rights to the land. We're struggling for *our* right to the land. (...) Our problem with the Indians is the land. This land is *ours*. This land we were deprived of by conquest. When you talk about conquest in Quebec, it is not when we arrived. It is when the British arrived. Of course, when the French arrived they did not conquer anything. They didn't have the strength (...) No powerful army, nothing like this. The same as in Brazil, the Indians here couldn't be conquered except village by village. (...) So there was no French conquest. (...) We were conquered by the British. So this is the conquest that is illegitimate. So this is the background of the minority people. (...) It can be played on different tunes. It can be played that we are so near the Indians that we're about the same".

He described Indians and immigrants as "two extremely problematic topics in anthropology in Quebec (...). Two topics in which what anthropologists have to say is not quite welcome with society at large", which led anthropologists hired to study Indians to progressively develop other fields of interest. He added that the study of Indians in Quebec has been quite limited for this reason, in sharp contrast to Anglophone anthropology: "There is a big development of Indian studies (in anthropology) in English Canada (...). There is a tremendous social space for hearing about Indians". The big question, according to this interviewee, is that of the land.

While England made treaties with the native peoples in most of the Anglophone colonies of what is now Canada, in the colony of Nouvelle France, along the St. Lawrence Seaway and to the north of it, France never made treaties. The native peoples of this region still claim it as their territory, and a satisfactory negotiation with them has never been reached.

The same Francophone anthropologist pointed out that there were more people

6. Emphasis made by the anthropologist interviewed. Here he was outlining a very popular common sense view about Aboriginal peoples in Quebec.

interested in studying Indians in Quebec in the 1970s, "This was the golden age of militancy (...) when the idea that there were easy solutions to most social problems" was predominant, and when the Indian political movement had "a very radical discourse (...). This discourse became quite close to the radical québécois nationalist discourse". However, with the building of the James Bay hydroelectric scheme, it was the Anglophone anthropologists from McGill University who gave the anthropological support to the native peoples, and not the Francophone anthropologists who had been their most radical supporters in the years before. He added that "common sense in Quebec is now (...) fighting a struggle against what are felt as being our oppressors, and turning its back on the Indians, who appear to be competing for the same land, for the same basic resources".

Commenting the remark that "We're the Indians here", an Anglophone anthropologist remarked that, in the 70s, some Quebecer nationalists referred to themselves as "the blacks of Canada" to stress their subordinate position as Quebecers in Canada, and that now that it has become politically incorrect to say this, some are saying "We are the Indians of Canada". Another Anglophone anthropologist, of Quebecer Jewish mother and Irish catholic father, commented that, having been brought up in Montreal, the close historical link between Quebec nationalism and anti-semitism had always been evident, and with an Irish republican father the same person also expressed little confidence in the so-called British justice.

One Francophone anthropologist interviewed pointed out that some native politicians use the Quebec independence movement for political ends, when addressing certain Anglophone audiences, accusing Quebec of attacking their fundamental rights, and saying that "We (Quebeckers) are the worst racists ... that we are ethnonationalists, racists". He added that "anthropologists are Quebecers, they are emotional and nationalist too", which leads to a "confrontation of nationalities (...) which does not help the good relations between Quebecers and First Nations". Another Francophone anthropologist mentioned that many of the accusations of racism directed at Quebecers are part of a public discourse for political ends, and that some Anglophone Canadians, including some anthropologists and lawyers, seem "happy that they have some native representative to say what they do not dare say". Yet another emphasized that the Indian question is being used both by the federal government and the Quebec provincial government, and the native peoples use this contradiction to advance their own cause.

An Anglophone anthropologist elaborated further on this issue, pointing out that the Quebec provincial government,

"has very much exacerbated the level of antagonism between Indians and Francophone Quebecers. Now, one of the results of this is that this kind of exacerbation is even on the relations between Francophone anthropologists, and ones who have had close relations with Indians in the past. So that, at the present time relations are bad. French Canadians tend to view Indians as supporters of federalism. This creates a very bad atmosphere, a very difficult and tense atmosphere between French Canadian anthropologists and native people",

especially since the Oka crisis in 1990. The then provincial premier, Robert Bourassa, planning to build a new hydroelectric project at James Bay, and fearing opposition from the Cree, sent in the provincial police against a group of Mohawk who occupied some

traditional land near Montreal that was being used for urban development. The premier, in an attempt to show the strength of the provincial government, sent in the provincial police, believing that this would also intimidate the Cree in the north of the province. This led to a crisis which lasted all the summer, until the Canadian army was called in:

"The result of this has been to create a great deal of romantic good will for Indians in English Canada, since Indians are seen basically as opposing Franco-Quebeckers and their interests (for independence). Their (the Indians') political role has been very much enhanced as a result of this, and therefore English Canadians generally tend to be rather romantically well disposed toward native people at the moment. Although, as I say, if it comes down to any local issue, they're as unwilling to give up land or resources to the Indians that they're claiming as anywhere (...). At the moment, anthropologists in Quebec have the question of what is their loyalty to their own ethnicity. How does this relate to the native people, given that native people are perceived by the majority of French Canadians as playing a hostile role, and, on the other hand, this is something that brings a lot of support for native people in other areas".

According to Sieciechowicz,

"The explosion of Oka in 1990 was the direct result of years of negotiations over lands without conclusion. The Mohawk of Oka and the Huron of Lorette were regarded as not aboriginal to Quebec territory and thus from the Province's perspective were there by grace of the province. This was hardly the reading of any of the indigenous groups. They were in these lands either because they were invited there by the Jesuits, in the case of the Huron, or were asked to move by the Sulpicians, as in the case of the Mohawk. From the indigenous perspective, an invitation to settle was a respected means of living in a new land. In the non-native view it is a very weak claim to land" (1995).

The majority, but not all, of the Quebecker Francophone anthropologists identify with the movement for independence of Quebec, finding themselves in a tense situation by the fact that the majority of the aboriginal peoples of Quebec, many of whom are Anglophone as a second language, and live in a region incorporated to Quebec at the beginning of this century⁷, do not support the separation of Quebec, fearing a worse treatment than they receive from the Canadian federal government (in the referendum of October 1995, 96.3% of the Cree voted against the independence of Quebec, *The Globe and Mail*, 26 October 1995). At the same time that they defend native peoples' rights, some Quebecker anthropologists do not agree with the division of Quebec through the possible secession of vast territories by native peoples who threaten to break with Quebec in the case of its separation from the Canadian federal government⁸. The economic viability of an

7. The Quebec Boundary Extension Acts of 1898 and 1912 transferred jurisdiction over the Cree territory of James Bay from the federal government to the Province of Quebec (Salisbury, 1994:157).

8. Feit observes that the Cree of the James Bay region, "began mobilizing opposition to large-scale hydroelectric

independent Quebec would depend on selling hydroelectric energy to the USA. In the words of a Francophone anthropologist, after having declared his solidarity with Indian rights: "We will not let the Indians take Quebec". The ideology of Quebec nation-building, with which many anthropologists identify as Quebecers, enters into direct conflict with their commitment to the Indians' interests. According to Savard, who has a long career in which he has strongly supported native rights, cited by Robert Crépeau, "The legitimacy of Quebec nationalism ... would be chimerical if it became a technocratic nationalism insensitive to the pre-Columbian laughter in present-day Quebec" (Crépeau, 1995:147).

Tremblay e Lévesque observe, in their paper on Quebecer studies in social sciences about autochthonous peoples in the north from 1960 to 1989, that:

"A good number of striking events have occurred in the last four or five years without the specialists in Aboriginal questions and Quebec society bringing a notable scientific contribution that might clarify these situations to the point of reconciling contradictory views and guaranteeing constructive intercultural relations. The silence of anthropologists during the Oka crisis is an example which proves this" (1993:33).

Some of the dilemmas which an anthropologist who identifies with national goals may face are clear in the case of the Egyptian anthropologist, Hussein Fahim, who describes his research with the Nubians in southern Egypt and the Sudan. Fahim shows how, with the construction of the Aswan High Dam and relocation of the Nubian people, he shared "the feeling of unlimited sympathy for the Nubian relocatees - a feeling that was common among most foreign researchers during the survey period" (1977:82). After assuming a government position in policy oriented research, and gaining a "better understanding of national goals" (1977:83), Fahim "began to feel less sympathetic toward their (the Nubians') decline in taking initiative to help solve their own problems. (...) as an indigenous anthropologist, to whom national goals are a prime concern, I began to perceive the Nubian setting in a much larger context" (Ibid.). Fahim then describes how, "as my research relationship with the government changed, so did the Nubians' attitude toward me change" (Ibid.), who "became formal and reserved". In this case the anthropologist's identification with national goals came to be seen by the Nubians as being in direct conflict with their interests.

Fahim compares his role as an "indigenous (Egyptian national, but not Nubian) anthropologist" with that of another anthropologist working in the same region who was a foreigner, and how for him (as an Egyptian working for the government) the Nubians became "only a part of the whole, that is, the nation. At present, the nation constitutes my prime concern" (1977:84). While the Nubians had "no expectations from" the foreign anthropologist, they "anticipated an input on my part in policy making decisions" (Ibid.). While "they realize that he (the foreign anthropologist) is powerless. In my case, the Nubians want me to act" (Ibid.). The demands made by native peoples on an "indigenous researcher attached to the government" (Ibid.) are clearly different from those made on an

development in May 1971, when the Quebec government refused to take their interests into account in the design of the hydro-electric project and in the planning for the development of the region" (1985:31).

anthropologist seen as a foreigner.

However, these same dilemmas may be faced by Anglophone anthropologists carrying out research with native peoples in Anglophone Canada and by Francophone anthropologists who work with native peoples in Quebec. Some Francophone anthropologists stressed that, if they can be called nationalists, the Anglophones, majority in power in the federal government, can be called imperialists, even if they are not conscious of the fact, and their apparent support for the indigenous peoples of Quebec only exists in opposition to the Quebec movement for independence. One Anglophone academic revealed the Anglocentric environment which prevailed in Canadian academia up to the middle of this century: "It was not until the 1960s that English-speaking intellectuals began to take French-speaking intellectuals seriously".

In the words of an Anglophone anthropologist, who has carried out research in Quebec with aboriginal peoples: "It's easy to look at Quebec, and you can say, 'It's clear the way their social science studies link to the Quebec nation and Quebec interests'. But my argument is that this same process is going on in Canada, but because we're implicated in it, it's much harder to stand out of it and actually critique the Canadian nation. People say, 'No, we're not very nationalist'. Don't believe them!". She added that there has been very little critical analysis of Canadian nationalism.

One Francophone anthropologist argued: "The metropolitan anthropologies are also anthropologies with national concerns. Only that they are expressed in a universalist way (...) an affirmation from a nation which positions itself as a universal culture". The same anthropologist clarified that he thinks that the majority of his colleagues do not see their anthropology as peripheral, but think that they are participating in a more global anthropology. Another Francophone anthropologist stated that, when academic anthropology underwent a big expansion in the 1960s, "We were going to study everything. Anthropology here never wanted to be peripheral. It put a stake in being central, and we built our departments as in the USA and went to study in Europe and the USA. We wanted to have a first world anthropology". He added that they did not want to be like the Mexicans "who were at the same time anthropologists and social reformers. We were all social democrats, first world, wealthy, and anthropologists".

One Anglophone anthropologist interviewed, advocate of an international and universalist anthropology, stated that he does not see the situation of anthropology in Canada as colonial, "because I don't think Canadians have ever felt inferior either to Americans or to the British". He argued that any nativist tendencies in anthropology practised in Canada have been overridden by the fact that a large number of Canadian anthropologists carry out research abroad, "so even there we try to be like, to behave in the same way as, American or British anthropologists".

In the words of Maranda, speaking from a Quebecker perspective about Canadian anthropologists' research abroad: "the Anglophones ... collaborate easily with the political authorities whereas the Francophones seem more anxious to identify themselves with the needs of the masses" (1983:123-124). According to Maranda:

"the descriptive parameters of the Anglophones are directly derived from 'international' Anglo-Saxon anthropology. ... Whether it is a question of 'action anthropology,' ecology, or any other approach, nothing distinguishes these works from those of the Americans, in whose wake they seem so anxious to slip, judging

by the great care Anglophone authors take in citing the (Anglo-Saxon) models who have influenced them" (1983:125).

Maranda adds: "there is a greater difference between British and Americans than between Anglophone Canadians and Americans...", while,

"As regards the descriptive parameters of the French-Canadian anthropologists, these differ both from those of the Anglo-Saxon and the French. Never having been a colonial power but always a colonised country, Quebec will have seen the development of a third world ethnography by inhabitants of the third world. Whether they are structuralists like Rémi Savard, Jean-Claude Muller, Bernard Arcand, Yvan Simonis, Bernard Saladin d'Anglure or Eric Schwimmer, or Marxists like Yvan Breton, Pierre Beaucage or Bernard Bernier, they place the emphasis ... on the subordination of the weaker groups by the stronger ... it is the dominated tracing the portrait of other dominated peoples whereas, ... (in the case of the Anglophones) it is the vassals of the dominant tracing the portrait of the dominated" (1983:125).

Ramos suggests that the "humanistic slant of anthropology in Brazil, and the recurrent social involvement of its professionals, may be due to yet another factor, that is, the fact that Brazil has been a colonized country for four centuries both before and after political independence from Portugal..." (1990:456). As cited above, Ramos observes the reaction to Euro-American hegemony in Brazil in the form of a posture critical of things hegemonic, often of Marxist inspiration. Gold & Tremblay (1983:55-56) emphasize the emergence of a Marxist perspective in anthropology in Quebec in the 1970s together with the growth of Quebec nationalism, especially in research on rural communities.

Guilhermo Ruben reaches the conclusion that, different from his "initial hypothesis that there would be a high level of correlation between the conflictive issue of nationality and the theory of identity formulated in Quebec within anthropology (...) the two sets of problems (nationality in Quebec and the theory of identity in anthropology) are essentially autonomous" (1995:125). Ruben argues that anthropology in Quebec refuses to try to define its origins in relation to its institutional history (1995:133), since, according to his hypothesis,

"the origins of the modern university programmes of research and teaching of anthropology in Quebec (in the Universities of Montreal and Laval) are the result of a prohibited relationship, and I would say even incestuous, between their legitimate parents (Tremblay e Dubreuil), founders (...) of the two institutional programmes and another, socially prohibited: American anthropology. In a nationalist, French, catholic, and rural context, how could the participation of an English, protestant and industrial partner be accepted, as co-genitor of the modern programmes of teaching and research in contemporary Quebec?" (1995:133-134).

Ruben adds: "the recognition of the founding fathers of the modern programmes of anthropology in Quebec would imply the recognition of the deep and intimate relationship

of the province with the English world, which would make unviable the ethnic character which marks the style of the discipline in Quebec" (1995:134).

Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira states that "In the case of French Canada, in Quebec, we can observe a strong process of ethnicization of the discipline, producing, strictly, two modalities of anthropology, one Francophone, the other Anglophone, deeply marked by their linguistic-cultural horizons" (1995:188). In Anglophone anthropology in Canada, as in Castilian anthropology in Spain, there is not the dimension of ethnicity present in Francophone anthropology in Canada and in the emergent Catalonian anthropology in Spain⁹.

These examples reveal how a complex configuration of national and imperial allegiances, in which anthropologists are positioned as members of nation-states, permeate their perspectives. While many Francophone anthropologists in Quebec feel that they are colonized by Anglophone Canadians, the majority of both Francophones and Anglophones feel colonized by the Americans.

In the interviews, Rémi Savard, of the University of Montreal, known for his political involvement in indigenous issues and for his explicitly nationalist posture (Azzan Júnior, 1995:100), insisted in speaking to me, seen as an Anglophone, about ethnohistory (granted, about the history of the French and British occupation of the continent in relation to aboriginal peoples - see Savard, 1994). It is as if, three months before the referendum on the possible separation of Quebec from Canada, in which Quebecer anthropologists found themselves in the cross-fire between Quebecer nationalist extremists and anti-separatist indigenous peoples, to speak directly about current political issues was too sensitive. However, Bruce Trigger, of McGill University, known for his voluminous work on ethnohistory, speaking as an Anglophone to an Anglophone, spoke a lot more about political issues of native peoples than about historical matters.

Richard Lee commented on his paper presented at several universities in Australia a few weeks previously (1995), on the state of anthropology today. In a close dialogue, himself, with international hunter-gatherer studies, as well as having done some consultancy work for native groups in Canada, Lee presented a view in which Canadian anthropologists "have a very world-wide perview, which I think is one of the characteristics of metropolitan anthropology, it takes the world as its oyster". He expressed his hope that, with the increasing dialogue between anthropologists around the world, "the metropolis-hinterland distinction in anthropology will fade away".

Several anthropologists who work with native peoples affirmed that it is difficult to speak about a style of ethnology in Canada, considering the immense diversity of approaches. In addition to the differences between Francophones and Anglophones, several anthropologists pointed to some big differences among the Anglophones and among the Francophones. Differences among the Anglophones are evident, for example, in the styles of ethnology that are practised in British Columbia and in the rest of Canada. Anthropology with aboriginal peoples, as other fields of anthropology in British Columbia, was presented as being closer to the anthropology practised in the large academic centres of California, than to that practised in Toronto and Montreal and in all the east of Canada.

9. The dimension of ethnicity present in anthropology in Catalonia was pointed out by Professor Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, in a talk, "Catalonian Identity and Ethnicity", given at the Department of Anthropology at the Universidade de Brasília, on 29 March 1995.

Commenting on anthropology at the University of Toronto, one interviewee mentioned that:

"there is a real tension between British anthropology and American anthropology. There is a strong culturalist dialogue, and ecological and environmentalist dialogue coming from people like Richard Lee, who has been very strong in that area. But there has been a counter tendency from people like Gavin Smith who comes from England (...). I think right now we are very British focused".

Some anthropologists interviewed pointed out the strong influence of British social anthropology and of the Chicago school on social anthropology at the University of Toronto, while what is done in British Columbia, from the influence of the centres of California, is very different, with a greater emphasis on cultural analysis. So much so that one anthropologist stressed to me that the anthropology practised in British Columbia is different from what is done in the rest of Canada. Another anthropologist stated that "Almost all the people who do aboriginal studies in the University of Toronto are social anthropologists", who are more interested in "ecological, economic and political issues".

The same person stressed the importance of a very strong tradition of ethnohistory in anthropology with native peoples in Canada, and associated McGill and Concordia Universities (in Montreal) more with Anglophone Ontario despite the fact that they are in Quebec. According to Azzan Júnior, the anthropologist Guy Dubreuil "says he considers McGill to be 'outside Quebec' because of its lack of concern with what is happening in Montreal and in the rest of the Province" (1995:198, note 3). Azzan Júnior interprets that "What Dubreuil wanted to say in allocating McGill 'outside Quebec' is that its Anglophone anthropology is even less dedicated than Francophone anthropology to the problems of the Province, and that its academic-administrative project seems to adhere entirely to that of the federalists and not to that of the separatists" (Ibid.).

Different from in the east of Canada, there are far more indigenous students in British Columbia taking anthropology courses at undergraduate and graduate levels. Michael Kew, of the UBC, points out that in the three established B.C. universities "areas of primary specialization in British Columbian and North American indigenous societies are prominent" (1993-94:80), adding that, in his impression, despite diverse area interest of college faculty in anthropology, the greatest specialization is in North American First Nations cultures. Anthropologists interviewed stated that a class on ethnology with Indian peoples, in which three or more indigenous students are present, greatly changes the character and dynamic of teaching, since the lecturer faces indigenous voices which constantly question and contest the premises of anthropology. In the words of Kew, in a situation in which native peoples enrol in courses about themselves:

"The most sobering questions which an anthropology teacher may face at the conclusion of a lecture about indigenous Canadian cultures will come from First Nations students who ask: How do you know that? Why do you say that? What gives you the right to say that about us? These are sobering for two reasons. First, they challenge the authority of the teacher and empower the student whose self has been made an object of study and who feels the weight of strangers' stares.

Such questions reveal immediately and in inescapable terms the colonial context within which our classrooms sit. Secondly, 'objects of study' become true subjects calling into question the theoretical, epistemological, and ethical foundations of everything we do as anthropologists. How indeed, do we *know*? Why *do* we represent others as we do?" (1993-94:83-84).

One anthropologist interviewed who works in B.C. stressed that the big difference between anthropology with native peoples in this province, "is that we have indigenous students, from the communities where we are working, in our classrooms, and I think that makes a huge difference (...) here there is a very strong connection with communities and trying to make work relevant to the communities where you are working and that sort of sense of responsibility". She added that she sees this as an advantage. She mentioned that the indigenous presence is less in the departments of anthropology in Toronto and Montreal, adding "I should not overgeneralize, because I think you get that also in Quebec, in some places. The people (mainly Anglophone anthropologists) who are working with the Cree in the north. But (...) people in those institutions often say they have very few indigenous students in the classes".

There are, too, an increasing number of indigenous university lecturers giving courses on ethnology, and many aboriginal Ph.D. students who, within a few years, will take up university positions. Several anthropologists interviewed pointed out that, in British Columbia, different from the universities in the east of Canada, with some exceptions, there is a much more direct and personal interaction between anthropologists and aboriginal peoples. Anthropologists are being constantly requested to participate in indigenous land claims and the interaction does not stop in the lecture room. Many of those anthropologists interviewed in British Columbia observed that in the universities in eastern Canada there is a much greater distance between anthropologists and indigenous peoples comparable with the situation in the majority of the universities in the northeast of the USA. In addition, in British Columbia, four non-native lecturers in anthropology with aboriginal peoples are or have been married to native peoples, one of whose spouses is a native leader and also a PhD candidate in anthropology.

In the words of another anthropologist, who carries out research with native peoples, and lectures in a major university in B.C.:

"Teaching anthropology in this department, the students are so directly engaged (...) so that our kind of obligation is to the communities... Communities send us students. It's very immediate and we really have a multicultural classroom (...) right down into the local level of affairs. (...) I tend to generate questions that are things the local people are asking about, and it's interesting that the intellectual centres of power like the University of Chicago are really quite different. The differences have come out in some meetings when we were all together, and the kind of emphasis on theory and praxis, if you want to be as simple minded as that. (...) Our department feels some commitment to these communities".

Comparing anthropology with native peoples in the neighbouring US State of Washington, he added:

"The University of Seattle has really got out of the Indian game. They no longer really have any real engagement at all with the local First Nation communities. (...) So I'm in the field every day. I'm in constant contact with the people through my work, all the time. And I've engaged some of them as collaborators in academic productions. For example, now I'm bringing out a volume on native justice issues, and some of the chapter contributors are First Nations people. (...) With these communities we have a kind of reciprocal relationship (...). So I've been engaged as an expert witness in court on a number of occasions. (...) I'm trying to have long-term relations with these communities (...) working with them for a number of years, which is the only way you can be effective for them (...)."

The same anthropologist argued that in Canada there is not the same class division among anthropologists that exists in the USA: "We're much less concerned about status (...), it seems to me. We're closer to these communities than they are mostly in the States". He stated that even in places like Oklahoma State or Arizona State there is not the same immediacy that there is in B.C., where anthropologists are directly involved with land claims: "In B.C., right now, we're writing treaties with a whole series of tribes. It's the biggest issue facing this province. (...) Especially being a largely non-treatied area. This is the kind of difference here in the West. So what we are doing is really different from Toronto". He stressed the distance between anthropologists and First Nation communities in the Northeast of the USA, and pointed out that in B.C. it is not possible to present anthropological papers about native peoples which have nothing to do with their concerns, since the communities demand that anthropologists address their concerns:

"The debate (here) is not about the post-modernist critique of anthropology. The debate is about practising, really doing anthropology. We're familiar with the literature about post-modern (...) critique of the anthropological epistemology. But there's another debate going on here in Canada. The debate is in the light of these things but it's different. It is, what are we going to do? What's our role? Are we facilitators? mediators? advocates? positivists? mental observers? (...) We're working with these people. (...) Academics outside our discipline are perfectly willing to take (post-modernist critique) at face value. They're perfectly willing to say, 'Yes, you aren't worth a damn, and you have nothing to say. Your methods are flawed, and you are capitalist and colonialist at heart'. We're hearing this parroted back to us (...) We've got to stop that (...). We've got to get on with our work. Because there's no one else who's taking up the job that we do. Nobody else goes out to these communities and spends years talking to these people".

He described himself as a collaborator, and explained that the communities he works with are often technologically more advanced than the anthropologists. For example:

"They are manipulating the international media, which I certainly can't do (...). The kind of collaboration I have in mind is not that I and the people I'm working with end up with the same viewpoint, or end up with the same product. (...) I

produce academic products of interest to me, and I produce products of interest to them. (...) The people I work with are sophisticated, and they know that I have sets of interests in issues and they need not overlap directly (...). We don't live the same lives exactly. (...) I don't take a position of advocate, but I do take a position of somebody engaged with these communities, and so I respond immediately to things that are of concern to them".

Another Anglophone anthropologist argued that:

"One of the traditions we have in Canadian anthropology is a strong commitment. Very committed grass-roots anthropology and anthropologists. (...) Canadian anthropology has this strong tradition of advocacy. It's a very contained advocacy that stops short of being critical of the government, except critical of their level of tinkering. (...) What I see as the major limitation. (...) While people do respect the tradition of advocacy, they're very reluctant to carry the critique any further. I don't mean to critique my colleagues in this adventurous way. Because the problem is a very big one in Canada. (...) the political style of anthropology in Canada, it's overwhelmingly social-democratic, left liberal. So, as the contradictions become stronger, and as the State becomes less and less involved, less and less required to have a humanitarian face, I think one of the problems faced by Canadian anthropologists now (...) It's more and more necessary to be clearly critical of the Canadian State, of multiculturalism, and to look at aboriginal people within that context".

She added that "there has been a lot of very thorough, deep, local, long-term studies", which she argued has been the strength of anthropology with native peoples, but "a neglect of contextualizing the situation in terms of the Canadian political economy as a whole".

In B.C. there is an active participation of native peoples in museums specializing in First Nations collections, participating as curators and consultants in designing and preparing exhibitions, as well as directing their own museums (Kew, 1993-94:91). In the Museum of Anthropology at the UBC, native artists exhibit contemporary works and practise sculpture in some of the museum exhibition halls. In the words of James Clifford, after making a tour of four major B.C. museums with First Nations collections: "... the political climate was charged in ways I had never felt in other metropolitan settings: New York, Chicago, Washington, Paris, London" (Clifford, 1990:214, apud Kew, 1993-94:84). First Nations are also challenging museums, demanding repossession of their art and human remains unjustly appropriated in the past by museums. The day I interviewed the Shuswap chief, Ron Ignace, he was arranging on his portable telephone to go the next day to the Victoria Museum to repatriate human remains and bring them back for burial.

In B.C. there have also been cultural revitalization programmes, such as the linguistic work led by James Powell, of the UBC, who has worked closely with several indigenous peoples of this province since the 1960s. Although there has been little success in bringing native languages back into everyday use, many of which are operating with a generation that did not speak them: "A much more achievable goal is to develop an ability

with the native language which allows you to use it as a portable symbol of group identity".

Despite an increasing number of aboriginal students in anthropology courses, as one Anglophone anthropologist in eastern Canada pointed out, native people generally feel more affinity with native studies departments than with anthropology, which has become associated with stereotypes of colonial exploitation. I experienced personally the current challenge to anthropology presented by First Nations peoples, when I spoke to a native leader on the telephone, who informed me that he was dealing with politically sensitive material and suggested that I would be better advised to talk to an (non-native) anthropologist, since "You anthropologists understand each other better". When I commented to another native leader, who introduced himself to me as a chief, that he was an anthropologist too, he interrupted: "A chief!" He clarified that he did not like the tag of being an anthropologist and ironized: "I don't know what the hell an anthropologist is!"

The 1990s brought an immense diversification in anthropology with native peoples, making it more and more difficult to characterize a style. Also, as Dyck stresses, "During the past two decades there has been a remarkable increase in the number of publications on native cultures and issues in Canada produced by academics, journalists, government and public agencies and, not least, by native authors and organizations" (1990:40), and "the academic preeminence that anthropologists once enjoyed in this field of study has been overtaken by the rising volume of work conducted within other disciplines, including the emerging discipline of Native Studies" (Ibid.).

In B.C., as in other parts of Canada, there are several First Nations post-secondary training institutes, such as that operated through a partnership between the Secwepemc Cultural Education Society and Simon Fraser University (SCES/SFU), at Kamloops, initiated in 1988. The rapidly growing programme offers university level courses for the educational and employment needs of aboriginal people, including a BA with major in sociology and/or anthropology. In the words of a Shuswap chief, president of the SCES,

"We need to invent or reinvent our own institutions, and part of that, of course, includes education. And native people have been failed in the White system. (...) The residential school (...) killed many of us and oppressed us. So we felt the way to get out of that was to build our own institutions, which we controlled and managed".

The University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC) in Prince George, inaugurated in 1994, and located in the territories of 16 Tribal Councils and 76 bands, offers First Nations Studies BA and MA programmes, including courses in anthropology, as well as a separate Anthropology BA programme. At the UBC, in Vancouver, a Native Studies Programme is also being started.

At present, the dismantling of the welfare state and proposals put forward by the federal government for aboriginal self-government in which the intention to rid itself of the issue of aboriginal rights is evident, reducing its responsibility in relation to indigenous peoples, there is a climate of deception. In the words of an Anglophone anthropologist who had lived for many years in an indigenous community in British Columbia: "We're in for a really tough time, and the assumptions we had that things were moving towards greater self-determination, greater public respect. I just don't think that's what's happening any

more ... There's been a lot of simplistic economic determinism ...". This anthropologist added that the government is offering land rights to the native peoples, yet it is the government which will determine what these rights are. In a rhetoric of native self-government, measures are being taken to facilitate the access of transnational companies.

In a new period of drastic cuts in university education, the perspectives of employment in anthropology are ever more limited. In addition, funds for anthropological consultancy work with aboriginal people are drying up, limiting the action of anthropologists as independent consultants.

Although I do not claim to be able to characterize anthropology with aboriginal peoples in Canada, some of its distinguishing features may be a concern with native peoples within the country, in an anthropology of action in which most anthropologists feel an engagement with the destiny of these peoples. At the same time, there is a reluctance, on the part of many anthropologists, to admit the existence of a specifically Canadian style of anthropology with native peoples, or even a specific style of anthropology, so strong is the presence of American anthropology (as well as that of Great Britain and of France, although to a lesser extent). Some anthropologists, despite admitting today the peripheral or semi-peripheral character of the discipline in Canada, aspire to an international anthropology. However, this universalist aspiration in anthropology in Canada tends to ignore or deny the inequalities and asymmetry of a colonial situation. So also does a more local, nationalist perspective enter in contradiction with the universalist viewpoint.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- ASCH, Michael I. Native research and the public forum: implications for ethnological theory. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:201-214.
- AZZAN JÚNIOR, Celso. *Fragmentos de uma disciplina: A antropologia do Québec vista de dentro*. PhD thesis presented at the Department of Anthropology, Institute of Philosophy and Human Sciences, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, São Paulo, 1995.
- BAILEY, Alfred. *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonquian Cultures 1504-1770: A Study in Canadian Civilization*. St. John, New Brunswick Museum, Monograph Series N° 2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1937 (1969).
- BAINES, Stephen G. Primeiras impressões sobre a etnologia indígena na Austrália. In: Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto & Guilherme R. Ruben (editors) *Estilos de Antropologia*. Campinas, São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp, 1995:65-119.
- BALIKCI, Asen. 'Faux combats; tristes arènes' un commentaire. *Recherches amérindienne au Québec*, 10(1-2), 1980:124.
- BURRIDGE, Kenelm. An ethnology of Canadian ethnology. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:306-320.
- CANADA. Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. *Canada and Aboriginal People: Building a New Partnership*. March 1995.
- CARDOSO DE OLIVEIRA, Roberto. *Sobre o Pensamento Antropológico*. (Biblioteca Tempo Universidade; n°83). Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro; Brasília: CNPq, 1988.
- _____. Notas sobre uma estilística da antropologia. In: Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto & Guilherme R. Ruben (editors) *Estilos de Antropologia*. Campinas, São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp, 1995:177-190.
- CLIFFORD, James. Identity in Mashpee. In: Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988:277-346.

- _____. "Four Northwest Coast Museums: Travel Reflections," In Karp, Ivan & Lavine, Steven D., (editors), *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1990.
- CRÉPEAU, Robert R. A antropologia indígena brasileira vista do Quebec. In: Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto & Guilherme R. Ruben (editors) *Estilos de Antropologia*. Campinas, São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp, 1995:139-154.
- CRUIKSHANK, Julie. Invention of Anthropology in British Columbia's Supreme Court: Oral Tradition as Evidence in *Delgamuukw v. B.C.* *BC Studies/ Special Issue No. 95*, 1992:25-42.
- CULHANE, Dara. Adding Insult to Injury: Her Majesty's Loyal Anthropologist. *BC Studies/ Special Issue No. 95*, 1992:66-92.
- DRUMMOND, Lee. "News show politics and the absent anthropologist" a discussion. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:108-111.
- DYCK, Noel (ed.). *Indigenous Peoples and the Nation State: Fourth World Politics in Canada, Australia and Norway*. St John's: Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Newfoundland, 1985.
- _____. Cultures, Communities and Claims: Anthropology and Native Studies in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXII, 3, 1990:40-55.
- _____. *What is the Indian 'Problem': Tutelage and Resistance in Canadian Indian Administration*. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1993a.
- _____. "Telling it Like it is": Some Dilemmas of Fourth World Ethnography and advocacy. In: Dyck, N., & J.B. Waldram (editors). *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993b:192-212.
- FAHIM, Hussein M. Foreign and indigenous anthropology: the perspectives of an Egyptian anthropologist. *Human Organization*, Vol.36 (1), 1977:80-86.
- FEIT, Harvey. The ethno-ecology of the Waswanipi Cree: or how hunters can manage their resources. In: COX, B. (editor) *Cultural Ecology: Readings on Canadian Indians and Eskimos*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1973.

- _____. Legitimation and autonomy in James Bay Cree responses to hydro-electric development. In: Dyck, Noel (editor) *Indigenous Peoples and the Nation-State: Fourth World Politics in Canada, Australia and Norway*. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, (Social and economic papers; no.14), 1985:27-66.
- FRANCIS, D., & T. MORANTZ. *Partners in Furs: A History of the Fur Trade in Eastern James Bay 1600-1870*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983.
- GOLD, Gerald L. & Marc-Adélar TREMBLAY. Steps toward an anthropology of Quebec 1960-1980. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:47-83.
- HANDLER, Richard. On sociocultural discontinuity: nationalism and cultural objectification in Quebec. *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 25, N°.1, 1984:55-71.
- HEDICAN, Edward J. *Applied Anthropology in Canada: Understanding Aboriginal Issues*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- KAPFERER, Bruce. Nationalist ideology and a comparative anthropology. *Ethnos*, 54 (3-4), 1989:161-199.
- KEW, Michael. Anthropology and First Nations in British Columbia. *BC Studies/Special Issue Number 100*, Winter 1993-94:78-105.
- KUPER, Adam. Culture, identity and the project of a cosmopolitan anthropology. *Man* (N.S.) 29, 1995:537-554.
- LEACOCK, E. *The Montagnais Hunting Territory and the Fur Trade*. American Anthropological Association Memoir, N°.28, 1954.
- LEE, Richard. Anthropology at the Crossroads: From the age of ethnography to the age of world systems. University of Toronto, ms.
- LEE, Richard B. & Carolyn FILTEAU. Notes on the politics of teaching anthropology in Canada. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:215-231.
- LEVIN, Michael D. (ed.) *Ethnicity and Aboriginality: case studies in ethnonationalism*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

- MANNING, Frank. Confusion and creative engagement: a comment on Canadian ethnology. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:2-10.
- MARANDA, Pierre. International posture and tradition of Canadian ethnology. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:114-127.
- McFEAT, Tom. *Three Hundred Years of Anthropology in Canada*. Occasional Papers in Anthropology n° 7, Halifax: St. Mary's University, 1980.
- MILLER, Bruce. Introduction. and Common Sense and Plain Language. *BC Studies/Special Issue No. 95*, 1992:3-6; 55-65.
- MILLS, Antonia. *Eagle Down is our Law: Witsuwi'en law, feasts, and land claims*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1994.
- MORSE, B. Aboriginal-government relations in Australia and the implications for Canada. In: J. Anthony Long, Menno Boldt, and Leroy Little Bear (eds.), *Governments in Conflict?: Provinces and Indian Nations in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988:209-221..
- PAINE, Robert. News show politics and the absent anthropologist. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:84-107.
- PEIRANO, Mariza G.S. The Anthropology of Anthropology: The Brazilian Case. Tese de doutoramento, Harvard University. 1981 (Published in *Série Antropologia* n° 110, Brasília: Departamento de Antropologia, UnB, 1991).
- _____. *Uma Antropologia no Plural: Três Experiências Contemporâneas*. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 1992.
- PRESTON, Richard J. The social structure of an unorganized society: beyond intentions and peripheral Boasians. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of man mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:286-305.
- RAMOS, Alcida Rita. Ethnology Brazilian Style. *Cultural Anthropology*, 5(4), 1990:452-457.

- RIDINGTON, Robin. Fieldwork in Courtroom 53: A Witness to *Delgamuukw v. B.C. BC Studies/Special Issue No. 95*, 1992:12-24.
- RUBEN, Guilherme. O "tio materno" e a antropologia quebequense. In: Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto & Guilherme R. Ruben (editors) *Estilos de Antropologia*. Campinas, São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp, 1995:121-138.
- SALISBURY, Richard. Application and theory in Canadian anthropology: the James Bay Agreement. *Transactions of the Royal Society Society of Canada*. Series IV, 17, 1979:229-241.
- _____. Applied anthropology in Canada - problems and prospects. In: Manning, Frank (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:192-200.
- _____. *A Homeland for the Cree: Regional development in James Bay 1971-1981*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994 [1986].
- SAVARD, Rémi. Un projet d'état indien indépendant à la fin du XVIII^e siècle et le traité de Jay. *Recherches Amérindiennes au Québec*, Vol. XXIV, N° 4, 1994:57-69.
- SAWCHUK, Joe. Anthropology and Canadian native political organizations: past and future trends. In: Dyck, Noel & James B. Waldrum (editors) *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- SIECIECHOWICZ, Krystyna. "The State of Canadian Anthropology: The perspective from the University of Toronto", I Meeting Siena-Toronto, 1993, ms.
- _____. Some Reflections on First Nations Nationalism in Quebec. University of Toronto, 1995, ms.
- SILVERMAN, Marilyn. Dispatch I. Amongst 'our selves': a colonial encounter in Canadian academia. *Critique of Anthropology*, 1991, Vol. 11(4):381-400.
- SMITH, M. Estellie. "Comments" on Handler, R. "On sociocultural discontinuity: nationalism and cultural objectification in Quebec". *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 25, N° 1, 1984:67-69.
- STOCKING, Jr., George W. Afterword: a view from the center. *Ethnos*, 47, 1982:172-186.

- TANNER, Adrian. *Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the Mistassini Cree Hunters*. St. John's: Memorial University Press, 1981.
- TREMBLAY, Marc-Adélar. Anthropology in question: what knowledge and knowledge for what? In: Manning, Frank. (editor) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. (National Museum of Man Mercury Series). Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1983:332-347.
- TREMBLAY, Marc-Adélar & Carole LÉVESQUE. *Les études québécoises en sciences sociales sur les peuples autochtones du Nord 1960-1989: Conditions socio-historiques de production et profil thématique*. Documents de Recherche No. 10. Quebec: Laboratoire de Recherches Anthropologiques, Département d'anthropologie, Université Laval, 1993.
- TRIGGER, Bruce. *The Huron: Farmers of the North*. Montreal: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- _____. *The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660*. Montreal: McGill Queens's Press, 1976.
- _____. *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's 'Heroic Age' Reconsidered*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univeristy Press, 1985.
- WEAVER, Sally M. Australian Aboriginal policy: Aboriginal pressure groups or government advisory bodies? (Part I) *Oceania*, Vol. 54, No. 1, 1983a:1-22.
- _____. Australian Aboriginal policy: Aboriginal pressure groups or government advisory bodies? (Part II) *Oceania*, Vol. 54, No. 2, 1983b:85-108.
- _____. Struggle of the nation-state to define Aboriginal ethnicity: Canada and Australia. In: G.L. Gold (ed.), *Minorities and Mother Country Imagery*, Social and Economic Papers 13. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Newfoundland, 1984.