NOTE TO USERS

The original manuscript received by UMI contains pages with indistinct print. Pages were microfilmed as received.

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI
LANGUAGE, POWER, AND ETHNICITY
IN AN ARCTIC QUÉBEC COMMUNITY

by

Donna Rae Patrick

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Curriculum
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Donna Rae Patrick 1998
The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L’auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author’s permission.

L’auteur conserve la propriété du droit d’auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-35278-1
ABSTRACT

In this study, I make use of historical analysis, a language survey, and ethnographic data to examine processes of language choice, presenting a political-economic analysis of the differential uses of Inuktitut, Cree, French, and English in the Arctic Québec settlement respectively known in these four languages as Kuujjuaapik, Whapmagoostui, Poste-de-la-Baleine, and Great Whale River. I address the standard sociolinguistic questions of how and why minority languages persist, despite increasing pressure from dominant colonial languages; and argue that the settlement’s four languages all play important roles in boundary maintenance, in defining valued material and symbolic resources, in establishing national, ethnic, and social identities, and in achieving access to education, employment, and positions of power.

I also explore the development of and tension between the dominant Southern-controlled linguistic market and an alternative ‘traditional’ language market in which local Inuit linguistic and cultural practices are valued. Results from interview and observational data suggest that within the dominant linguistic market in Kuujjuaapik, French and Inuktitut are in transitional positions—positions arising from their relatively recent roles in ethnic mobilization, of the French in Québec and of the Inuit in Nunavik, respectively—and in the changing political economy of the region. Both languages have accordingly entered into competition with English, the historically established language of ‘power’.

In the alternative ‘traditional’ linguistic market, particular forms of symbolic resources are valued and employed to negotiate and define the value of other symbolic and material resources in the community. Paradoxically, Inuit participation in the dominant market appears to be dependent on the persistence of ‘traditional’ cultural and linguistic practices in this alternative language market, in order to justify distinct Inuit rights to control the territory of Nunavik. At the community level, this study explores the construction of ethnic groups and boundaries and how they are linked to valued material and symbolic resources.
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Emerging from a dark age of active oppression, Native communities in the latter half of this century have found themselves surprisingly sound with respect to the type of organization necessary to engage in political battle. Each community has taken a particular approach toward the assertion of its goals. Conceptualizing each community's struggle in terms of a distinctive nationalist movement is the most effective way of understanding what at times may seem like a confusing array of tactics, strategies, and goals. But they remain confusing only as long as the observer fails to recognize the localized basis for native organization and the nationalistic (not just tribal) nature of Native objectives.

Alfred 1995: 13

1. INTRODUCTION

One day in the spring of 1990, while working as an adult educator in a remote Arctic Québec community near the Hudson Strait, I found a pamphlet at my door written in three languages: Inuttitut, French, and English. *The Constitution of Nunavik*, as it was titled, outlined the constitutional principles of an emerging nation-state, and the political and institutional aspirations of the regional Inuit government for the area above the 55th parallel in northern Québec. The pamphlet represented a form of Aboriginal politics which I had not witnessed during my previous six months on the job. For the first time, I became acutely aware of a form of nationalism—the formation of a nation-state—based on a territory governed and populated primarily by Inuit. Whether best seen as a proper 'nationalist' movement, as Alfred (1995) characterizes the Mohawk First Nation political organization in the quotation above, or as the nascent or emerging 'nationalism' of a regional government working toward localized institutional and economic control, this particular political process was shaping the local institutions in which both Native and non-Native people were working. Local identities and institutional practices were being constructed in relation to a range of localized cultural signs, rituals, and symbols; and in relation to the larger political forces of Euro-Canadian colonization, Anglo-Canadian and Quëbécois nationalism, and Inuit self-determination. Significantly, this particular 'nationalist' discourse of Inuit self-determination granted quasi-official status to three languages within its 'constitution'.
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Language had become one of the key symbols of social identity in a socially, historically, and politically complex region.

This study examines sociolinguistic processes of language choice, taking into account the everyday linguistic practices within and between social groups and their relationship to particular historical, political, and economic processes that define and shape various articulations of ethnic identity. It addresses the standard sociolinguistic questions of how and why minority languages persist; and draws on ethnographic research about the actual languages used, and about the circumstances in which and reasons for which they are used in a particular Arctic Québec settlement. One of the main goals of this study is to show that the four languages spoken in this settlement—Inuitut, Cree, French, and English—all play important roles in boundary maintenance, in establishing national, ethnic, and social identities, and in achieving access to education, employment, and positions of power (Grillo 1989, Heller 1994). Another is to show that French and Inuitut are in transitional positions of power in Arctic Québec, positions arising from their relatively recent roles in ethnic mobilization—of the French in Québec and of the Inuit in Nunavik, respectively—and in the changing political economy of the region. Both languages have accordingly entered into competition with English, the historically established language of ‘power’, in the dominant linguistic market.

A key assumption of this research is that an understanding of the complexity of everyday language practices requires an analysis of language use that considers how relations of power have been historically constituted, resisted, and transformed through different political economic shifts in the region north of the 55th parallel. In order to do this, it considers how European dominance, in the form of trade, missionary activity and state intervention, was legitimized through the production of ideologies or discourses about aboriginal ‘others’, or more specifically, the ‘Eskimo’ (as they were known) of the Hudson Bay coast. These historical processes of power and representation coincided with the ethnolinguistic dominance of English in the region, as the language associated with the European market economy and the Euro-Canadian federal state. Since the 1960s, English-language dominance and, more generally, Euro-Canadian dominance have been contested; first by Québécois interests in administering services in French in the northern region of the province and secondly by Inuit political mobilization in the 1970s, their involvement in land claims negotiations and struggle for more Inuit control of the region. A political economic history of language and power provides insight into how ethnic groups and notions of ethnicity have been constructed, and how everyday language practices play an important part in producing, reproducing, and transforming these structures. Ethnic boundaries are
constructed through material, economic, and cultural elements of ‘difference’ as much as through discursive or ideological means.

One way in which to understand the relationships between language use, power, and social processes is to combine a critical historical analysis with an ethnography of everyday linguistic interaction. The historical analysis involves a discussion of political economic shifts over time, and the processes of colonial domination, ethnic mobilization and community-based practices of resistance. Part of this analysis considers the processes of defining ‘us’ and ‘them’ through an examination of writings and representations by Europeans and European North Americans of the indigenous peoples they encountered, which have historically served to legitimize economic, religious, and state domination. An ethnography of language use and the construction of social identities in a multilingual, multiethnic aboriginal community must take this political economic history into account. In sum, it is necessary to view language use, and linguistic processes, as historically, politically, and socially situated, and as important elements in historical, institutional, and ethnic processes. Language choices not only index social identity, but construct notions of ethnicity, group solidarity, cultural power and resistance in an historically complex situation of language contact.

This study is based on fieldwork undertaken during 1993-94 in the community of Kuujjuaaraapik, three years after my experience as an educator in a more northern settlement, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Kuujjuaaraapik, also known as Whapmagoostui, Great Whale River and Poste-de-la-Baleine, is situated at the mouth of the Great Whale River on the southeast coast of the Hudson Bay (see map 1). It is the Inuit name both for the river that runs into the Hudson Bay (literally ‘Little Big River’) and the Inuit settlement, populated primarily by Inuittitut speakers, that was built along the north shore of the river. The predominantly Cree community of Whapmagoostui (‘White Whale River’) lies beside Kuujjuaaraapik, inland from the Hudson Bay. Great Whale River is the English name for both communities; and the French name for this settlement is Poste-de-la-Baleine, relating specifically to the 19th-century white whale fishery at the Hudson Bay Company post. Technically speaking, however, since 1975 English-speakers and French-speakers have lived in either Whapmagoostui or Kuujjuaaraapik, according to divisions laid out in the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA) (see map 2). Unofficially, however, there is a third, primarily non-Native community, located ‘on the hill’, up and away from both First Nations communities. For the sake of convenience, I shall be using the name ‘Poste-de-la-Baleine’ when referring to this predominantly francophone sector, which houses most of the government offices, small businesses and all but a handful of non-Native employees; I shall use ‘Kuujjuaaraapik’ and ‘Whapmagoostui’, respectively,
The region of Nunavik

La région du Nunavik

Source: Tumivut, The cultural magazine of the Nunavik Inuit

Avataq Cultural Institute

Winter/Spring 1994
when referring to the Inuit and Cree communities of roughly 500 residents each. Because English is the lingua franca of these three ethnolinguistic groups, I will be using ‘Great Whale River’ when referring to the larger settlement. Ironically, there are only a few people in Great Whale River whose first language is English, yet, as we shall see, this is by far the dominant language with respect to the number of speakers and its historical role in the community.

1.1. FOUR LANGUAGES, FOUR ETHNIC GROUPS

The four names of the settlement represent power struggles among four competing groups living in the region, and among the four languages that these groups speak. On the one hand, there are two dominant and competing European languages, the product of almost four centuries of English colonial domination and of the introduction of French-language government services and businesses in northern Québec, in the latter half of the 20th century. On the other hand, resistance to this domination by the Cree and the Inuit—two ecologically, culturally, and linguistically distinct aboriginal groups—has allowed for the persistence of two minority languages and ways of life. Thus, four linguistic, cultural, political, ethnic, and ‘national’ identities have come to live side by side in a community of approximately 1100 inhabitants: approximately 500 Inuit, 500 Cree and 100 non-Native residents (of which more than 85% are francophone). The size of each population can increase or decrease depending upon the season, the amount of work available, and the participation in education and training programs outside of the community.

In Great Whale River, the vitality of French, English, Inuktitut, and Cree is quite evident. At the airport, for example, airline tickets are bought and sold, reservations made, time-table information discussed, and a range of lively greetings and farewells in the often crowded waiting room are exchanged in all four languages. Although most people under the age of 45 are bilingual, if not trilingual, interactions rarely involve a language switch—people tend to choose one language to conduct their business or conversation and to negotiate allegiances, friendships and other social networks. Thus, in interactions like these, language choice is bound up with the complex and often contradictory processes of boundary maintenance in the negotiation of ethnic and social identities. At the ‘micro’ level, language choice serves to define, include, and exclude social players. At the ‘macro’ level, historical, political and economic processes have shaped articulations of language, ethnicity and social identity in complex ways.

On the one hand, linguistic practices in Great Whale River play an active role in the social organization of day-to-day community life. As in other speech communities,
linguistic ability and language choice affect one's capacity to make friends, to communicate with elders, and to access jobs, education, and positions of power in a given community (Heller 1994). On the other hand, language is a site of political struggle, and a key element in the construction of 'difference' and in the formation of ethnic identity and nationhood (Grillo 1989: 2). Both of these aspects highlight the importance of language in organizing community life, in constructing social identities and boundaries, and in regulating and providing access to material and symbolic resources. Language is thus linked to power through the regulatory processes of ethnic boundary formation and the formation of collective identities or 'ethnicities'. Ethnicity, which is politically and culturally constructed, acknowledges the role of history, language and culture in the formation of subjectivities (Hall 1992) and in the formation and regulation of social groups. Ethnic boundary processes limit and constrain one's access to desired resources, and form a basis for the political struggles to maintain or increase access to the limited supply of valued resources in northern Québec.

2. MATERIAL AND SYMBOLIC RESOURCES IN ARCTIC QUÉBEC

One of the best ways to describe the material and symbolic resources that are at stake in Arctic Québec is through an historical analysis (this will be provided in chapter 2). For example, recent political contestations between the First Nations and the federal and provincial governments stem from earlier political and economic arrangements that have, in some way, become altered or threatened. As regards the Inuit (and other First Nations in similar situations) changes have included a shift from subsistence living to living from the fur trade (with its attendant cultural, political, and economic practices), and finally to living in settlements (and the promise of material comforts associated with this). Valued material resources are accordingly linked to resources associated with the subsistence and fur trade economy, including local vegetation, seafood, fish, ducks, geese, and fur-bearing animals used for trade, and 'traditional' clothing and food; and to resources associated with Western modernity, such as money and what it can buy: comfortable homes with electricity, running water and plumbing, clothing, food, vehicles, and materials necessary to maintain subsistence (harvesting) activities. For the Inuit, therefore, access to and control over material resources involve two distinct yet linked sets of economic activities: one associated with the Western market economy and modernity, and the other associated with 'traditional' harvesting activities, which have to a certain extent been co-opted into the dominant Western market.
Certain sets of symbolic resources access certain material resources, and form general patterns in the ways they are used. In Kuujjuaraapik, English and French, both powerful state languages, are in direct opposition to Inuititut and Cree, which have historically lacked such institutional support. English and French are associated with material goods in the Western dominant market, and access school-based knowledge, occupational networks, and jobs. Inuititut and Cree, along with local friendship, community, and family networks, access ‘traditional’ values, practices, and material resources. Although the dichotomy between dominant (European) and minority (indigenous) languages is a useful way of describing both the power imbalance between languages and the types of resources that they access, it obscures both the more recent gains in power by aboriginal groups within the dominant linguistic market of the labour force, and the historical differences in power between all four languages. Most notably, it obscures the fact that historically, English and French have not held equal status within the Canadian political economy (Heller 1992); and that, despite the symbolic and economic domination of English, both French and Inuititut now compete with English in the same linguistic market in Arctic Québec. The dichotomy between European and indigenous languages further obscures the relationship between the Inuititut and Cree languages, which display certain significant asymmetries. For example, many Inuit elders living in Kuujjuaraapik today speak fluent Cree, although few, if any, Cree elders speak Inuititut. Historically, Cree appear to have held a dominant economic position, since the furs from the animals they trapped (especially beaver) fetched a higher price at the trading post. Thus many Inuit, particularly those south of Kuujjuaraapik (according to those interviewed), at times relied on trade and aid from the Cree. It is possible that for these reasons, Cree became the dominant language of intercultural communication between Inuit and Cree in certain Southern locations early this century (this will be discussed in more detail in chapter 2).

The differences in sheer economic power that symbolic resources access is complicated by the fact that aboriginal mobilization, not unlike other forms of ethnic mobilization, is predicated on social and cultural ‘difference’. Such difference justifies a claim to territory, sovereignty, or control over the distribution of economic resources in a given region. One group thus has a claim to certain resources (land, mining, fishing, etc.) over another group based on patterns of traditional land usage and inherent or acquired rights. Language, cultural ‘difference’, and ‘traditional’ practices get taken up in complex ways in the struggle for institutional and economic control in the region. In Arctic Québec, plans for creating Nunavik—an independent jurisdiction within the Canadian state and within the province of Québec—are premised on the notion that Inuit cultural and linguistic
practices are unique: that Inuit have occupied the territory above the 55th parallel long before the arrival of Europeans and that as a people, they have maintained certain 'traditional' practices despite the forces of modernity and technological innovation. If the lands that Inuit have inhabited are to be exploited for mining or hydroelectric power, agreements will have to be reached between the provincial government and Makivik Corporation—the Inuit political and economic organization, spearheading the movement for Inuit self-government.

Self-government has become a popular term in First Nations political discourse. It is particularly prevalent in land claims negotiations, where the financial resources to achieve local control over economic, institutional, and social development are at stake. Financing self-government requires indigenous groups to participate on a large scale in the dominant economic and bureaucratic structures—which, paradoxically, are often in direct opposition to the ‘alternative’ traditional economic and symbolic market which the Inuit wish to preserve. In Arctic Québec, relatively rapid political and economic changes, especially since the signing of the JBNQA in 1975, have produced increased local interest (shifting toward more Inuit participation and local control) in institutional domains such as education, health care, justice, social services, and economic development. The political context in this region is even more complex, given the contentious relations between Québec and the rest of Canada, and Québec’s own drive for sovereignty and economic control within its geopolitical borders.

In studying language use and social processes, especially in the multilingual aboriginal community of Kuujjuaraapik, one must take into account the historical and contemporary political conflicts at the local, provincial, and national levels. These include current political struggles between the federal Canadian state, on the one hand, and First Nations, Québec, and other francophone and ethnolinguistic minorities, on the other. In this analysis of the relation of language to the political and ethnic processes in a small community, we can perhaps gain insight into similar processes within other parts of Canada. We can also aim to broaden our understanding of what political issues are at stake for people who want to maintain their language and ethnic or aboriginal identity in the midst of social processes leading toward ethnic stratification and inequity within the larger Canadian state.

3. THE RESEARCH SITE

Great Whale River is an amalgam of residential and non-residential buildings from different eras, lying on the banks of the Great Whale River and the Hudson Bay. Since the mid-
eighteenth century, it has seen prospectors, whalers, traders, Church of England missionaries, R.C.M.P. officers, federal government employees and agents, anthropologists, the U.S. Army, Québécois administrators and bureaucrats, and non-Native workers and writers of all types. It has seen sweeping changes arising from the signing of the JBNQA in 1975. More recently, the Cree and Inuit communities went through several years of local resistance to hydroelectric development, beginning with the announcement of the Great Whale hydroelectric project in 1989. This latter period saw even more visits by Americans and a handful of Canadians and Europeans who ventured to this community either to write about or to show solidarity with the aboriginal peoples and their anti-hydroelectric development struggle, and to support the environmental preservation of the North. In opposition to these efforts, the regional Inuit government, headed by the Inuit-controlled Makivik Corporation (set up to manage funds accorded by the JBNQA) negotiated an agreement in principle with the province of Québec, which granted development rights to Hydro-Québec on Inuit land around Kuujjuaq, in order to secure a financial base for Inuit self-government. The deal was never ratified, however, since the entire Great Whale project was put on hold in the fall of 1994, much to the relief of a large segment of the local community. Thus, Kuujjuaq and Whapmagoostui have had to contend with a range of political economic shifts, threats of large-scale development, and permanent and potential alterations to their lands and community.

The buildings in Great Whale River—from the corrugated iron church built at Little Whale River in 1879, to the army-base airport built in 1955, complete with an aging hangar, to the municipal council office from which the Inuit community is run—reflect its historical circumstances. The stories of those who lived through these changes are kept for the most part as oral histories in the Cree and Inuit languages in Whapmagoostui and Kuujjuaq, respectively. Most of the non-Native residents, who live primarily in the non-Native sector located ‘on the hill’, have not lived in the community long enough to have experienced these changes, since it is mainly a transient population, and very few stay longer than a few years. The majority of these residents work as administrators, secretaries, health and education professionals, and police and business people, and thus hold most of the higher-paying, white collar jobs in Great Whale River. Although some non-Native residents have lived through the transition period of the 1960s-70s (during which time the Québec government took over administrative control from the federal government),1 none have had the intention of retiring or spending the rest of their lives in
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1 At the time of my research, I knew of four non-Native residents who had been working in Great Whale during this transition period. Two of them had been teachers in the early Federal school, and had spent some time away from the community before recently returning—one to continue teaching, and the other to work as a secretary for a Québec government office. Of the other two, one woman had kept the
Great Whale River, with the possible exception of those few who have married into the Inuit community (although even they rarely came with the intention of staying). In the following section, I will give a brief review of the four ethnolinguistic groups in Great Whale River and the three distinct communities that they form.

3.1. GEOGRAPHIC SPACE AND SOCIAL SPACE

Great Whale River is socially and geographically divided into two worlds: an indigenous world composed of Cree and Inuit and a Euro-Canadian qallunaat world, separated physically from the former by an abandoned airstrip. Euro-Canadians occupy the site of the abandoned air force base, just east of the airport on a small hill above Whapmagoostui and Kuujjuaraapik. Housing in this section is provided by employers, such as school boards and the provincial and Federal government. A few private sector employees and entrepreneurs also rent or own houses there.

3.1.1. KUUJJUARAAPIK AND WHAPMAGOOSTUI

Much of what distinguishes Whapmagoostui from Kuujjuaraapik physically is the by-product of the JBNQA, which divided up the lands (known as Category A lands) into two separate municipalities. As shown in sketches from the late 1940s (see Map 3), Cree and Inuit historically lived separately from one another when temporarily residing in the settlement during the summer months. Inuit tents were clustered just west of the trading post and church, while Cree tents lay to the northeast. With the introduction of government housing programmes in the early 1960s, however, Cree and Inuit houses were integrated into the new settlement. During the 1960s and 1970s, the two groups also shared health services and the school, although these were separated under the Agreement.

The Cree community of Whapmagoostui is home to a few non-Natives married to Cree and a few other primarily unilingual anglophones employed as managers of a privately-owned convenience store, as nurses, and (in one case) as a live-in babysitter. This community is also home to the anglophone Anglican Church minister and his family. The hockey arena, where members of all groups come to skate or play hockey, is located here as well.
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same government job, and raised her two children in the community. The other man has gone from holding a government job to becoming a local entrepreneur. He has also, in the meantime, married an Inuk and now lives in Kuujjuaraapik.
Kujujuaapik, which is the primary focus of this language study, was, at the time of my fieldwork, home to a small minority of unilingual anglophones (employed by the Northern Store); bilingual francophones and unilingual anglophones married to Inuit women; a few Cree women married to Inuit men; an English-speaking mixed Inuk/Cree man, who did not speak Inuktut; an anglophone missionary, who spoke some Inuktut and Cree; and a majority of Inuktut-speaking Inuit, who had varying degrees of Cree, English, and French language proficiency.

During the time I conducted my fieldwork in Kuujjuaraapik, there were eight Cree women married to Inuit men, one francophone woman married to an Inuk man, and six francophone men and one anglophone man married to Inuit women. In most cases these couples were permanently settled and raising families in the village. Other non-Native residents of Kuujjuaraapik included four or five employees of the Northern Store, who lived adjacent to the store, continuing a practice established during the fur trade. There was also a Protestant missionary who was renting an old government-issued Inuit house (which would have been common before the new housing implemented with the JBNQA).

3.1.2. The QALLUNAAQT QUARTER

The part of town where the qallunaat live is sometimes referred to as ‘the hill’ or the ‘army base’, but there is no particular name for this community. In terms of the numbers of non-Native residents, it is relatively large compared to other Inuit villages, albeit small in terms of absolute numbers of people. The terms ‘White’ or qallunaat refer to all non-Native residents, who are unified by their economic and social position in the settlement, their relatively ‘temporary’ status, and their relationship to the South. While these categories tend to present a homogeneous view of the community (as with other ethnically defined categories such as ‘Inuit’ or ‘Cree’), there are smaller differences and divisions within the group. The vast majority of the non-Native population spoke French, while about 15% were either unilingual English speakers or speak English and languages other than French. Most French speakers were Québécois (that is, French-speaking Canadians born in Québec). Others, however, came from elsewhere in Canada and from a variety of places where they have either learned French prior to moving to Québec (including France, Haiti, and Vietnam) or where they had picked up French as a second language since moving to Québec (including people from Ireland, England, Bulgaria, and India). Of the relatively small non-francophone group, most came from Québec and other parts of Canada, while a few were from the United States and India. Although place or language of origin might shape the way in which informal social networks develop, they do not determine who
associates with whom. While those who did not speak French were obviously excluded from francophone networks, there were mixed networks which developed in a variety of combinations of francophones, anglophones, allophones, Inuit, and Cree. (These are discussed in more detail in chapter 4.)

The size of the qallunaat population fluctuates depending on work and construction projects in the area; and (according to one relatively long-term resident) can reach as high as one hundred and fifty residents. The majority live in the old base settlement, which is shared with a small number of Native residents. A few Inuit have opted to live in this area if their workplace (such as the school) provides housing or if they live with someone employed in one of these sectors. Some Cree also live in this area, either because of employment housing or housing shortages in Whapmagoostui. Despite the mixed population, for the purposes of this study I will refer to this settlement as Poste-de-la-Baleine to distinguish it from the two other communities of Kuujjuaraapik and Whapmagoostui.

3.1.3. POSTE-DE-LA-BALEINE AND KUUJJUARAAPIK

Poste-de-la-Baleine and Kuujjuaraapik are socially, ethnically, and linguistically distinct, even though they are separated by a mere ten-minute walk, and share services, amenities, and governance, which brings members of all four languages and linguistic groups together. The two communities are distinct, not only with respect to the social and cultural practices of community members, but with respect to the languages used to negotiate the value and meanings of these practices within each community. In Kuujjuaraapik, social and cultural life functions primarily in Inuktitut, with the aid of the local FM station which relays personal messages to family members and friends, and acts as a forum for community discussion and announcements (see chapter 4, §2 for discussion). The importance attached to family relationships, historically constructed social networks, and community events (in which everyone, Inuit and non-Inuit, are welcome to participate), is created and maintained through Inuit cultural and linguistic practices. Despite the fact that non-Inuit are welcome to participate in community events (picnics, community games, Christmas activities, etc.) relatively few actually do, perhaps because such activities take place in Inuttitut. In Poste-de-la-Baleine, social occasions such as dinner parties and outdoor activities (such as cross-country skiing or camping trips) are usually planned in
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2 The term ‘allophone’ has a specific meaning in Québec, describing those whose first language is neither English nor French, and hence fit into the ethno-linguistic categories of neither ‘anglophone’ nor ‘francophone’.
small groups, and are usually exclusive events (by invitation only). In addition, links to the South, related to work, leisure (such as summer homes) and family ties, means that the primary interest for many non-Native temporary workers is not local. Ethnicity, as it is used in this thesis is a fluid category; nevertheless, both ‘Inuit’ and ‘Non-Native’ social groups, as we shall see, have been historically, socially and linguistically constructed, and constitute distinct ‘ethnic’ groups.

Regarding the places of employment in the two communities, most employers are located in Poste-de-la-Baleine, where one finds the main government offices and services: Hydro-Québec, adult education, Québec Government offices (known as the MMSR or Ministère de le Main-d’oeuvre et de le Sécurité de Revenue), Employment Canada, post office, police station, provincial Court House, fire department, hotel, coffee shop, private construction and maintenance businesses, the Social Club (founded in 1966 as the Great Whale River Community Association Ltd.), and the airport. The rest of the employers of Inuit workers are located in Kuujjuaarapik. These include social services, the school, Municipal Council, Northern Store, Co-op (formally known as la Fédération des coopératives du Nouveau-Québec), corner store, FM radio station, and gymnasium. The Inuit nursing station was located in Poste-de-la-Baleine until 1996, when it moved to a new building with the Cree Health Board, located between the gymnasium and the Whapmagoostui Band office.

In spite of the physical separation of Kuujjuaarapik and Poste-de-la-Baleine and the boundaries drawn along historical, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural lines, residents of one community use the services of the other. These sites are among the ones where intercultural communication takes place. Indeed, an important feature of the community is the variety of relationships established between Native and non-Native and Cree and Inuit in informal settings. What is sociolinguistically significant about these cultural ‘border crossings’ is that they are almost always negotiated in English. That is, except in the case of Inuit elders, communication between Inuit and others usually involves the Inuk speaking to the francophone, anglophone, or Cree in English. And while French and Inuititut are the languages of choice for speakers of these languages, social constraints and historical patterns of language use prevent outsiders from learning or using them.

3.1.4. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE THREE COMMUNITIES

The relationship between the Inuit, Cree, and non-Native communities is complex. For centuries, Inuit have inhabited the coastal region and remained culturally and linguistically distinct from their Cree neighbours further inland. In addition to cultural and linguistic
distinctions—Inuit and Cree belong, respectively, to the Eskimo and the Algonkian language families, which are unrelated—Inuit and Cree harvest different types of resources from distinct geographical regions. The Inuit harvest large sea mammals, seafood, ducks, geese and ptarmigan, and caribou and vegetation from the Hudson Bay and the area surrounding its shores north and south of Kuujjuaapik; while the Cree harvest forest mammals and freshwater fish in the wooded inland areas north, south, and east of Whapmagoostui, in addition to ducks and geese.

Kuujjuaapik and Whapmagoostui are separated by more than language, culture, and harvesting practices. A geopolitical boundary between these two communities was drawn up in the JBNQA, and now separates Kuujjuaapik and the shores of the Hudson Bay from Whapmagoostui and the area inland along the river. Most of the non-Native settlement—including the airport, post office, adult education centre, government offices, police, and court services—now lies on Inuit land, although it serves both communities. The JBNQA has led to further separation with respect to social services (including schools and health care) and to such visible differences as those in housing style. Two school boards were set up: the Inuit Kativik School Board and the Cree School Board. As a result there are two schools in Great Whale River, which both run programmes from kindergarten (pre-kindergarten in the Cree school) to secondary 5 (grade 11).³ Two health boards were also set up, which meant two separate clinics in the community until a joint project between Kuujjuaapik and Whapmagoostui brought them together under one roof in 1994.

Housing has also been implemented quite differently in Inuit, Cree, and non-Native communities. Inuit houses are built in the same style that one finds in Inuit communities across Nunavik, on foundations above ground to cope with the permafrost found in the more northern settlements. Water is delivered and sewage is picked up by trucks driven by Inuit municipal council workers. Cree houses, on the other hand, resemble the styles of other Cree communities further south, and are equipped with basements, running water, and sewage systems. There are also a few older federal government houses, originally built for Cree and Inuit in the 1960s. A few are still inhabited, some completely abandoned, and a couple of the earlier (quite small and flimsy-looking) structures are used as storage sheds behind some of the Inuit homes. The qallunaat community occupies a range of houses and government buildings. Many of the older structures from the army base have been

³ However, the Kativik School Board differs from the Cree School Board in its approach to language instruction. Regional control has provided the Kativik School Board with the opportunity to produce materials and offer unilingual Inuititut instruction for the first 3 years of schooling. Parents then decide to put their children into either the French or the English stream. The Cree school provides Cree instruction for the first two years only, and then switches to English instruction. Both schools provide limited language instruction in the respective native language in the higher grades.
renovated, and other types of housing constructed as the need has arisen. There are a few relatively new bungalows for Cree School Board teachers, which lie adjacent to the housing for Kativik School Board teachers. Row houses and bungalows for government employees are found further north, along with a few private houses and mobile homes for local entrepreneurs, and one or two Cree families who could not be housed in Whapmagoostui. There are also a few houses near the airport, which house some of the airline staff and air traffic controllers.

Despite the obvious differences between the non-Native and aboriginal communities of Kuujjuaрапik and Whapmagoostui, there is also a history of interaction, cooperation, and exchange between them, which has perhaps been little noticed by outsiders. For example, there are subtler forms of interaction within the community: celebrations and other interactions between families, especially those with mixed Cree, Inuit, or non-Native couples, and within mixed families; mixed participation in sporting events, such as boys' hockey teams, which include Cree and Inuit, and to a lesser extent non-Native players; friendships constructed through the work-place; and visiting between communities when someone is sick. There were historical relationships between Cree and Inuit in trade, in camps, and among school children before the James Bay Agreement separated them. While these types of relations are not obvious, given the 'distinctness' of the communities, anyone living in Kuujjuaрапik can become aware of them over time.

The two Native groups are also linked through a common historical relationship with the trading post at Great Whale and with the non-Native 'visitors' or 'occupiers' of their land, who have come to trade, work, teach, or proselytize (or a combination of these). Europeans have brought material goods, values, and practices, some of which have been integrated into and are now identified as part of indigenous cultural practices (such as writing in syllabics, producing popular music in Inuttut, etc.), and some of which have been used as a means of adapting to modern Southern culture (such as speaking English or French, and working with computers and other technology). The integration or 'mixing' of modern practices with 'traditional' pursuits has constructed new forms of aboriginal identity, which have not weakened the sense of 'Inuitness' or 'Creeness' or other forms of aboriginal identity (Dorais 1997).

A syncretization of Native and non-Native elements may also be observed, to a lesser extent, among Euro-Canadians who have lived for extended periods of time in relatively isolated Northern communities. Non-Native 'Northerners' might find themselves set apart from or at odds with Southern Canadian norms in their adoption of certain indigenous practices, particularly for coping with the environment (clothes, sleds, 'country food', etc.), and perhaps even of certain values of the local community (to the extent that
they have been integrated into that community). However, many of these adopted practices and values, when evident at all, remain superficial, given the transience of the non-Native population; yet it has been common in non-Native communities in the Canadian North for a small but significant group to be ostracized by other members of the community for adopting Inuit ways (Brody 1975). This construction of new Euro-Canadian identities nevertheless does not weaken non-Natives’ attachments to certain Southern practices or their sense of being positioned as ‘Qallunaat’ in the Canadian North.

In Great Whale River, the historical development of the relationships and patterns of interaction within and between groups has become a defining feature of this quadrilingual community. The fact that Inuit and Cree have settled in the same community at all is an artifact of colonial contact. Similarly, the fact that the non-Native community is isolated and located ‘on the hill’ is a result of the history of the North American military in the region, and of inequitable economic development. The distinct separation of the Inuit and Cree communities, which is now even more pronounced than it was just over a decade ago (with different styles of housing, separate schools and clinics), is a direct result of the JBNQA. History and politics have shaped both the physical and social geography of the settlement: its physical appearance and the patterns of interaction between groups, which through specific forms of social interaction develop their own sense of ‘community’ in their separate sectors of Great Whale River.

3.2. LANGUAGE USE AND SOCIAL PROCESS IN GREAT WHALE

In the late twentieth century, globalization processes have increased communication networks, unifying indigenous peoples in general and Arctic peoples in particular. Within Canada, aboriginal peoples have united on a national level to deal with issues relating to the federal state, while individual First Nations have simultaneously been working at the local level to negotiate their own land claims and relationships with governments. In Québec, recent francophone mobilization and articulations of nationalism have prompted interests in northern natural resources, such as hydroelectric power, in part for export to the United States in order to provide an economic base for the province. This has resulted in organized resistance by First Nations, some of whom do not want such industrial development on their lands, and by others who wish to negotiate in order to have a share of the profits. In Arctic Québec, new forms of Inuit nationalism and new articulations of ethnic identity have been fostered with the goal of having a say in development, and of protecting the interests of people faced with two colonial powers and two socially and politically hegemonic languages.
Over time, minority languages either persist and develop, or undergo processes of shift and rapid change as they fall out of use. In Nunavik, the unifying tendencies of Inuit ‘nationalism’ or self-government and the regional control of schooling have had significant consequences for language use. While two main language varieties have been chosen and developed as standard Ungava and Hudson Bay varieties, local, non-standard varieties persist. In Kuujjuaraapik, two varieties of Inuititut are in use: a non-standard localized language variety and the standardized (mostly Hudson Bay) forms used in schools, written media and regional political organization. Despite the introduction of standardized forms, however, the Inuititut spoken in Kuujjuaraapik has persisted along with other cultural practices associated with Inuit identity. Language loyalties and attitudes can thus be local, national, or global, depending on the political and social positioning of the speaker. By the same token, the dominant languages of French and English (i.e. those languages that provide access to jobs, and other valued state resources) are firmly entrenched in the power structure of the community, and have a high symbolic value for members of all four language groups. While one might feel an attachment or ‘loyalty’ to a local variety of Inuititut, one can at the same time see the utility in learning standardized Inuititut, English and/or French.

In the social lives of the Inuit, Cree, French, and English speakers inhabiting the eastern Hudson Bay coast, language has become an articulation of place, ‘difference’, identity, and politics. In Kuujjuaraapik, the local variety of Inuititut has remained intimately linked to the historical continuity of the Kuujjuaraamiut (Inuit of the Great Whale River area of Northern Québec). In addition, a significant number of the older members of the Inuit community speak fluent Cree, some even being able to read it. This is a direct result of Inuit and Cree sharing camps and trading with each other and of Cree aiding Inuit earlier this century, mostly further south along the coast (this was already discussed in §2 and will be developed further in chapter 2). English is linguistically dominant, given its association with both the colonial past and the post-colonial present. In more recent years, French has assumed an important place in local businesses and in government and judicial matters, as Québécois interests in Nouveau-Québec have increased.

Despite the wide use of Inuititut demonstrated in the institutions and community life in Nunavik, there is widespread concern about Inuititut language maintenance in political, institutional, and community circles. Understanding how and why a minority language persists and what is the place of Inuititut in the speech economy of Great Whale River can help those involved in Inuititut language education and in the promotion of its use. This includes understanding the value of symbolic resources at the local, national, and global levels; and understanding their place historically and in emerging social structures. In
particular, this type of knowledge can be used in Inuit and non-Inuit teacher training programmes to make language teachers aware of the social and political context in which they are teaching (Patrick 1994). This is especially important since in the foreseeable future the school board will continue to rely on non-Native teaching staff, and continue to train Inuit personnel to teach in Nunavik schools. The ultimate goal for educators is to work towards a more equitable society in Inuit communities, where ethnolinguistic 'difference' does not necessarily lead to ethnic stratification.

3.3. A LINGUISTIC TOUR OF THE VILLAGE

The distinctive sociolinguistic character of Great Whale River can be perceived from even a quick tour of the settlement (see Map 2). As a non-Native visitor arriving at the airport in Great Whale, you are likely to be greeted with commotion and chatter in the small waiting room of the airport. On one side is the Canadian Airlines counter, where you might find the manager, ticket agent, and security personnel speaking French with a few non-Native people preparing to fly South. You might hear the Inuk ticket agent speaking in English to a Cree passenger, and then switching into Inuittitut to talk to a friend. She might then switch into French as she helps the last people to check in for the next flight. Meanwhile, on the other side of the room, Inuittitut is being spoken as Inuit just arrived from Montréal arrange their flights with Air Inuit to take them to Sanikiluaq (on the Belcher Islands, just west of Great Whale) or to villages further north. The entire waiting room is filled with French, Cree, Inuittitut, and English, as people have gathered to say hello or good-bye, or to arrange flights from the airport.

If you take the road down from the airport, past the gymnasium and into the Inuit village, you will arrive at a pale yellow pre-fabricated building about the size of a supermarket in Southern Canada, which was called the Hudson Bay Company until 1987 and is now called the Northern Store. You hear some Cree being spoken between a salesperson and someone buying a wristwatch. At the back of the store you are served in English as you wait to have a cheque cashed. You take one last look around; and then head outside, where you find yourself standing across the road from a trailer used by social services.

Inside the trailer are an Inuk and a non-Native woman; they have been working all morning, seated at separate desks. The telephone rings, and the non-Native woman answers in English. After answering a couple of questions, she hands the telephone over to her Inuk assistant, who has been busily completing her paperwork in English. The telephone conversation continues in Inuittitut.
Continuing east down the road, you see the Municipal Office to your left, just before you reach the school playground. As you approach the secretary’s desk you are greeted in English. A couple of people behind you are discussing something in Inuttitut in front of the computer. The secretary excuses herself as she answers the telephone in Inuttitut, and then takes a request, also in Inuttitut, for water delivery. She promptly relays the Inuttitut message by radio to the water delivery truck, hangs up the receiver, and then asks you again in English how she can help you. You introduce yourself, state your business, and tell her how long you intend to stay in Kuujjuaraapik. You ask if you might talk to the mayor, and she replies that he is in his office next door. He seems to be discussing an administrative matter in English with his non-Native francophone assistant. English is both of their second languages, and as elsewhere in Kuujjuarappik it has become the lingua franca of French, Inuit and Cree speakers.

On your way back to the non-Native part of town, you again pass the gymnasium, a large new building with three courts—ideal for volleyball, floor hockey, or badminton tournaments, or impromptu games organized by the gymnasium staff. Depending on the season, you may want to warm up by going inside and seeing who is playing what, or which team is winning in a tournament which may involve Cree and Inuit visiting from other towns. You notice that all the written information at the gymnasium is in English. The man who seems to be in charge is francophone, but he deals with his Cree and Inuit staff in English. The gymnasium might be scheduled for badminton, and you may notice a couple of francophone women playing badminton together, and conversing back and forth in French; or a group of teenaged Inuit girls playing on the other court, and conversing in Inuttitut.

After leaving the gymnasium, you might head up to the non-Native part of town to get a cup of coffee at the coffee shop, or eat a meal at the small auberge—both of which you can do making use of either English or French. If you go to the post office you can be served in four languages; if you have a question to ask at the police station, you might have the option of being served in four languages as well, depending on which constable is on duty. However, if you go to the bar, you are again limited to French or English, and have little choice about where to sit once you are served: the segregation of the bar into different groups and social circles is perhaps more pronounced than anywhere else in town. After work, one long table near the entrance is usually taken by Québécois, with a smaller table of English-speaking teachers toward the back, an Inuit group off to one side, and a few Cree off to another. A couple of pool tables off in the smoky room to the back may have one or two non-Native players among a much larger group of Inuit. Music is playing, and there is once again the din of four languages.
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As you sit down you might feel that your tour is complete, although there are a few major sites that we have overlooked. One is the Inuit school, where Inuittitut is heard in the office and in the halls, and among the students, support staff, and some of the teachers. A mixture of French and English may also be heard, depending on which non-Native teacher is talking to whom. Another is the Inuit nursing station, where the French-speaking staff will be using English with the patients and with the Inuk interpreter. A third is the arena, located in Whapmagoostui, which, like the gymnasium in Kuujjuaraapik, is shared by all groups. During the evening you might find a mixed group of boys—Cree, Inuit, and one or two non-Natives—playing hockey. Finally, there is the courthouse, where court staff talk among themselves in French, but hold court in English (virtually everyone’s second language). If an Inuk or Cree interpreter is present, the francophone judge or lawyer might speak to the interpreter in English, who will then translate into his or her native language; but such use of interpreters is not very frequent.

Your tour would also miss some of the local community activities in the village such as picnics, community games, and the hunting and butchering of beluga whales at the mouth of the river in early summer. Community radio is also transmitted daily from the local FM stations. All these activities would be conducted in Inuittitut if you were visiting Kuujjuaraapik and in Cree if you were visiting Whapmagoostui.

3.4. CONTEXTUALIZING THE RESEARCH SITE

Power relations in northern Québec have developed out of historical patterns of colonial domination and resistance, and are manifested in the more recent political struggles for nationhood that I discussed at the beginning of this chapter. (I shall be treating these historical issues at greater length in chapter 2). Initially, European traders and missionaries held power in the region in as much as they had access to Western markets and control over the flow of European goods and values into the region, including literacy and European morality and spirituality. The trader, in particular, held immense economic power since he could fix the prices of furs and issue or deny credit to hunters and trappers. Throughout the 20th century, power shifted to federal and provincial government officials and entrepreneurs interested in land development and servicing the burgeoning community. In the 1970s, Inuit and Cree groups mobilized to counter the years of uncontested power and control over their lands and people. By the early 1990s, this mobilization had not only led to a redefinition of what sorts of material and symbolic resources were of value in the community and in institutions, like the school, but had also fueled an ongoing political battle over who had access to and control over resource development and over the
distribution of wealth generated on the lands that Inuit and Cree have inhabited for centuries.

3.4.1. SETTING THE SCENE: ABORIGINAL POLITICS IN THE 1990s

This study has its origins in the fall of 1989, when I worked in a small adult education centre in an Arctic Québec settlement of 200 people. I had never lived in an aboriginal community before, and had limited conceptions of the Inuit way of life and the Canadian ‘North’. This experience forced me not only to rethink my assumptions and goals about education, but to face head-on the effects of the colonial enterprise from which Canada had grown and expanded as a nation state. While trying to understand the educational setting and the needs of my students, I found that it was crucial to consider the larger social and historical context. This context comprised ‘traditional’ activities like hunting, fishing and collecting eiderdown, a close-knit and vibrant community life, in addition to some difficult social problems which were the legacy of rapid social change. Amidst questions about what to teach, how to teach and the reasons for teaching lay a social, political and linguistic reality that I wanted to understand in order to carry out my duties as an Anglo-Canadian teacher effectively.

This experience, and my interest in linguistic minorities in general, led me to pursue doctoral studies in language, power and ethnic relations as they have been constructed and played out in the Canadian political landscape. When I began this work in the fall of 1990, aboriginal issues, perhaps more than ever before, were informing and shaping Canadian political discourse and public opinion. As a researcher, I became an active and critical consumer of print, television and radio media relating to the political and historical relations of First Nations and the federal and provincial governments in Canada. My views were therefore, undoubtedly shaped by the very ‘public’ forum in which aboriginal issues were now discussed, especially as I became more aware of the processes of representation and the production of dominant ideologies that shape public opinion. Because of the sheer magnitude of the media attention on these issues when I began this research, it is worth spending some time examining the political climate of the early 1990s.

In September 1990, Canada was in the midst of one of the most publicized and alarming political confrontations between aboriginal peoples and the Canadian state. The confrontation became popularly known as the ‘Oka Crisis’ although aboriginal spokespeople have been quick to point out that it was not so much a ‘crisis’ from their perspective as but one more event in a history of armed government intervention in
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4 Parts of this section are based on Patrick 1993.
Mohawk affairs. The events of the Oka-Kanesatake conflict unfolded just outside of Montréal, Québec and escalated into the killing of a police officer and the blockade of a major commuter bridge into the city—events which brought unprecedented media attention.

Oka is the name of a predominantly francophone Non-Native community situated beside the predominantly anglophone Kanesatake Reserve of the Mohawk First Nation. This latest dispute started over the proposed expansion of a golf course and a housing development by the municipality of Oka, on property claimed by the Mohawk First Nation—a claim which dates back to 1717 (Rochon and Lepage 1991: 45ff; Alfred 1995). The Kanesatake-Oka conflict began in March 1990 when the Mohawks blockaded a road leading to the land to be developed. In July, the Québec provincial police force (Sûreté du Québec) was sent in to dismantle the barricade, and an officer was shot, at which point the Canadian Army was brought in to attempt to resolve the conflict. The media was immediately there, giving us up to the minute coverage of the military standoff. As one writer summarized it, ‘every night at the top of the news, and day after day on the front page of the newspaper, we were shown images of masked warriors facing uniformed police and soldiers across razor wire’ (Klassen 1991).

The stand-off lasted 78 days, and by the end many Canadians were jolted into realizing that the frustrations of Native peoples over land issues and ineffective government bureaucracies were real (see e.g. Rochon and Lepage 1991). Although it was not the first time the army had been used to quell a domestic political ‘crisis’ (the ‘October Crisis’ in 1970 saw the War Measures Act put into effect to deal with the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) kidnappings in Montréal), there was a sense of disbelief that Canada, with its international reputation as a ‘peace-keeping’ nation, would go so far as to use military force over an extended period of time to suppress Native resistance within its own borders.

The Oka–Kanasatake conflict was just one political confrontation that set the stage for the 1990s. Other less sensational conflicts were brewing around constitutional issues and the place of First Nations and Québec within Canadian society. In June of 1990, a constitutional accord referred to as ‘Meech Lake’ (named after the lake resort where it was drawn up) was brought before the provincial governments in order to bring the province of Québec into the Canadian Constitution (in 1982, the Canadian constitution was repatriated without the consent of Québec). The Meech Lake accord granted status to Québec as a ‘distinct’ society, but ignored the ‘distinctiveness’ of aboriginal peoples and their inherent right to self-government. Just before the deadline in which it had to be passed, it was quashed on two counts: disagreement that Québec should be constitutionally entrenched as a distinct society, and disagreement that the inherent right to self-government of aboriginal peoples would not be included.
On October 26, 1992 a national referendum was held in which Canadians were asked whether they agreed 'that the constitution of Canada should be renewed on the basis of the agreement reached on August 28, 1992'. This second agreement, known as the 'Charlottetown Accord', was to have brought Québec into the constitution and would have entrenched aboriginal rights to self-government. Despite the support of the three national political parties, all the provinces, and the Assembly of First Nations, the majority of the Canadian public voted 'No' in the referendum—perhaps because of their disillusionment with federal politicians at that time.

The constitutional wrangling which Canadians were drawn into in the early 1990s is perhaps most significant for the political space accorded aboriginal peoples. However, after many months of national news coverage of constitutional committee reports, regional public conferences, and a series of public hearings in which all Canadians were encouraged to participate, constitutional fatigue set in. In the midst of the constitutional hearings, another set of hearings got underway, this one conducted by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Beginning in August 1991, this Commission had a large (sixteen point) mandate to hear from both Native and Non-native participants about issues concerning aboriginal peoples of Canada, with an emphasis on reconciliation between Native peoples and Non-Native governments. The final report, of over 4000 pages, was released over five years later.

In the Overview of the First Round of public hearings organized by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, it was reported that there was 'almost universal' support 'for the concept that Aboriginal rights are inherent' and opposition 'to the federal government's policy of seeking to extinguish these rights through its Comprehensive Claims Process' (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples 1992: 36). In this same document, Elijah Harper, the Aboriginal Member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba who was partially responsible for quashing the earlier Meech Lake accord, explains the concept of 'inherent' right by saying that

[S]elf-government is not (something) that can be given by any government, but rather...flows from our Creator... Self-government... is taking control and managing our own affairs, able to determine our own future and destiny... able to establish our own institutions, language, culture, health, education... and providing economic development and social development in our reserves... It has never been up to the governments to give self-government. It has never been theirs to give. (Government of Canada 1992: 37)

Self-government was a term most Canadians would have been familiar with in 1992, and probably hard-pressed to define. It was, and still is, at the heart of many of the political struggles being waged, although the concept means different things to different aboriginal groups depending on their own historical, social and political circumstances. There is not
only variation in the specific reasons for negotiating self government, but also in the arguments set forth to justify it.

In 1993, when I began my research in Great Whale River, political struggles in Canada and the question of self-government had become a part of everyday conversation. Not only were the Inuit and Cree struggling for some form of self-government in northern Québec, they were fighting for the aboriginal communities of Kuujjuaapik and Whapmagoostui, and the livelihood and the heritage of the people there. In 1989, the Québec government announced the second phase of the massive James Bay hydroelectric project—‘James Bay II’ or the ‘Great Whale Project’. Construction for the project was ready to begin, pending an environmental review—a review mandated in the 1975 land claims agreement known as the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement (JBNQA).

In order to understand what was at stake in the early 1990s in northern Québec, we have to understand the circumstances which led up to the signing of the agreement and its effects.

In 1971, the Québec government announced the first phase of the James Bay hydroelectric development project on what the Cree and Inuit considered to be their ancestral lands. The presumed negative consequences of this large-scale project on a way of life, with few proposed benefits to local aboriginal communities, mobilized the Cree and Inuit to try to obtain control over their lands, which included control over future resource development and social institutions in northern Québec.

The political struggles of Cree and Inuit in the early 1970s involved organizing themselves formally and initiating a court battle to seek a legal injunction to halt the project. Although the Cree and Inuit initially won the case in a landmark decision, it was quickly overturned in the Quebec Court of Appeal (see Richardson 1975). This pushed the federal and provincial governments to negotiate a settlement with the Cree and Inuit as quickly as possible. In 1975, the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA) was signed by all four parties (Government of Québec, 1976).

The nature of the JBNQA, its impacts and its interpretations have been controversial and complex (see e.g. Vincent and Bowers 1988; Patrick and Armitage, forthcoming). In Arctic Québec, the agreement has shaped the political, economic and institutional landscape. The effects on education in the region were particularly dramatic: the Agreement permitted the Inuit to form the Kativik School Board and legislated the teaching of Inuittitut, French and English. Health services would now be administered by Inuit, and the Kativik Regional Government (KRG) was formed to govern the region. In addition, compensation was awarded for the loss of land due to flooding from hydroelectric dams. The Inuit used this money to form Makivik Corporation, the economic arm and arguably the most
powerful component of the regional government, with a mandate to promote economic development in the region. Compensation also went toward the Hunter's Support program, which provided hunters with payment for fish, ducks, geese, caribou, seal and other game bought by the municipalities and shared by the community. Through such a program, successful hunters are given the means to continue hunting and pursue more "traditional" activities within the wage labour economy. In addition to all these developments, the agreement prompted the beginning of a Nunavik sovereignty movement, and set in motion the political, economic and ideological means to form an independent "territory" of Nunavik.

Plans for James Bay II were well mapped out, and included the diversion of rivers, and the flooding of lands just north and inland of Great Whale River. The river itself would be diverted and reduced to a small stream. The well-travelled waterways along the shoreline would be permanently altered, and the effects on wildlife and the surrounding environment remained unknown. The project would also entail the construction of a road, a large airport and the importing of thousands of male workers from the south. Although there could be benefits from such development, the potential negative effects on the community were equally great, if not greater. There were enough environmental, cultural, historical and social reasons to want to stop the project—not the least of which was the sense that jobs would not necessarily be going to local Cree and Inuit.

The resistance campaign mounted against the Great Whale project endured, in various forms and with varying force, for almost five years. The struggle initially united Inuit and Cree and their supporters, but became more complicated with the revelation that Inuit leaders in Makivik Corporation were attempting to negotiate a settlement. The situation in the community was at times tense and uncertain, and complicated by the fact that Québécois nationalist sentiment was also on the rise. The failure of the Meech Lake constitutional accord, and the subsequent failure of the national referendum in 1992 to instil the faith of both Québec and aboriginal peoples in the constitution of Canada did little to dampen the political tension in Great Whale River.

During the time of my fieldwork, a multi-million dollar environmental impact study was released, which had involved years of research and input from all the coastal communities that would be effected. It was immediately contested by the Cree and Inuit, not only for its controversial assessment of the environment, but for the rather weak assessment of the social consequences, and for its failure to acknowledge the real material and symbolic values associated with 'traditional' land-based activities. Within eight months after I left the community, the project was cancelled by the Québec government. It seemed as if the tireless campaign against the project and the Québec government, waged primarily
at potential American consumers of electricity, had taken its toll. This campaign, coupled with increased conservation efforts among American consumers, resulted in the cancellation of key American contracts with Hydro-Québec (although the campaign surely played a significant role, it is unsure to what extent it led to these cancellations). These cancellations meant that the financial returns of the project were uncertain, especially when combined with the unsure economic projections, and the potential financial costs (see McCutcheon 1991, pp. 187-188). Whatever the reasons for the cancellation of James Bay II, those most concerned about the dramatic environmental and social impacts of the area could now relax, at least for the time being.

In a political climate such as this, who holds power and how this power is maintained and contested become important everyday issues with real social effects. It is not surprising then, that where national, provincial and indigenous interests collide, and new ‘national’ and political identities emerge, language itself becomes a site of political struggle. Social groups and ethnic identities are constructed and reproduced through historical processes of colonial domination and resistance, ideological processes of representation and stereotyping, and linguistic and institutional practices of everyday talk. In this political economic analysis of language use, social identities and the ways in which they are constructed are key elements in the interplay between language and power. By examining the construction of ‘ethnicity’ as a social category, and the role that historical relations of language, power and ideology play in this construction, we can begin to see how social identity and power are related to everyday language use, and to the vitality of four languages in Kuujjuaraapik.

4. THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE CHOICE: THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS

In order to understand what goes on at the ‘micro’ level of interaction and in what ways these practices might be linked to broader political economic processes, it is necessary to link our political economic study to a more ‘micro’-oriented sociolinguistic study of language use. One approach to this goal is to link ‘the (micro) study of face-to-face discourse strategies’ with ‘studies of macrohistorical processes’, as discussed by Susan Gal (1989: 351). This involves analysing the mediation between conversational utterances, inferences, and ‘structures in interpersonal power relations’ on the one hand with the ‘exercise of institutional power in which language is also a constitutive element’ on the other (Gal 1989: 350).

Thus sociolinguistic processes, such as language choice, are not isolated from the larger political, historical, and institutional context. Speaking subjects, each positioned with
respect to gender, ‘race’, ethnicity, and social class, bring certain historically constituted forms of knowledge and attitudes to a given interaction. Drawing on their linguistic repertoires, and operating within a specific speech economy, speakers make language choices which are mediated by other discourses or ideologies produced in the larger political economy and pertinent to particular speech settings. Through such practices, speakers produce, reproduce, and transform ethnic relations and boundaries, which in turn have political and economic consequences.

The linking between the face-to-face interaction of everyday language practices and larger historical and social processes can help further our understanding of how social relations of inequality are reproduced and at times transgressed (as in the ‘anti-racist’ practices of intercultural communication, as described by Hewitt (1986) and Rampton (1995)). Investigations in interactional sociolinguistics have often been described in terms of the ‘speech economy’ and the ‘linguistic marketplace’ (Gumperz 1982; Bourdieu 1977; Woolard 1985; Heller 1992, 1994). In a given speech economy, (permeable) social boundaries are constructed through symbolic practices of which language is a key element. These ethnic or social boundaries then serve to limit or constrain one’s access to valued material resources and other symbolic resources (Heller 1992). Linguistic and other symbolic resources that are allocated or distributed in, for example, families, communities, schools and peer groups constitute speakers’ verbal repertoires, which are then meaningfully and strategically drawn upon in social interaction. This verbal interaction produces and reproduces social groups; and the boundaries created, through language and other symbolic markers, impose constraints on one’s access to other important resources, such as jobs, forms of knowledge, and friendships.

4.1. Investigating language choice: Defining the terms

This study draws on a body of recent research in anthropology and sociolinguistics—including that of Gal (1988, 1989); Grillo (1989); Heller (1988, 1992); Hewitt (1989); Irvine (1989); Luong (1988, 1990); Martin-Jones (1989, 1990); and Woolard (1985)—that focusses on the role of language in structuring social reality and in producing, reproducing, and resisting relations of dominance and inequality in gender, class, and race relations. In addition, the study appeals to the notion of a heterogeneous ‘speech community’, as drawn from (among other sources) the writings of Bakhtin (1981) and Volosinov (1973). These authors view signs as ‘multiaccentual in that different ideological frameworks

\footnote{The notion of (homogeneous) ‘speech community’ involving a shared set of norms of language behaviour derives from the work of Gumperz (1968, 1982).}
intersect in the meanings of the same linguistic signs' (Luong 1988: 251). That is, the same linguistic forms, signs, and symbols may have different meanings for different speaking subjects within the same speech community. Language and discursive practices are thus seen as potential sites of sociopolitical struggle and resistance against dominant practices found in contexts of cultural or economic hegemony. These contexts include institutional spheres (e.g. schools, courts, and museums) and the larger political realm where national (or emergent national) groups—in this case the Canadian government, Québec and aboriginal peoples—struggle over control of economic and material resources.

The research to be reported can be seen as interdisciplinary in nature, inasmuch as it takes into account historical processes and political economy and their relation to everyday language practice. Linguistic and symbolic practices, according to this view, are seen not as epiphenomenal structures and relations, but rather as crucial components in the structuring of social identity and power relations in society.

The focus in this study is the use of dominant and minority language forms by various social groups and individual speakers in political, historical, and economic terms. As mentioned at the end of §1.1, this involves viewing linguistic resources as a means to access other material and symbolic resources. It also involves viewing language as 'a major element in... the construction of 'difference' both within and between countries... [and as] one differentiating criterion, enmeshed with others in complex ways, in the formation of nation-states' (Grillo 1989: 2). As such, language becomes 'the subject of intense ideological speculation and the site of intense political struggle' (ibid.). Viewing language as a site of political struggle forces us to focus on the social context of a minority language and to recognize the connection between linguistic interaction in institutions and in the community and the power relations embedded in the social reality of speaking subjects; and between individual and community values toward language and language policy as articulated by regional administrations.

In order to understand why certain languages are used in institutions, or why particular languages are spoken in different settings at different times, it is necessary to explore the meanings of various languages and language varieties for various speakers. Understanding language choice requires an examination of the 'background knowledge' that speakers bring to a communicative event and the verbal repertoires (or 'range of discourse strategies') that speakers draw on in interaction (Heller 1989).
4.1.1. ‘BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE’ AND LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

‘Background knowledge’ is a broad term. I take it to mean ‘real world’ knowledge, which includes personal, social, and cultural knowledge, and the feelings and views that one has about the participant(s) in the interaction and the social context in which the interaction is taking place. ‘Background knowledge’ also includes expectations about appropriate language use and knowledge of how to make inferences based on what other people do and say. Gal (1988: 246) considers these ‘conversational inferences’ to be ‘very much like Gricean implicatures’—that is, implications deduced from utterances based on our general understanding of acceptable and efficient conversational practices—but ones that ‘usually center [on] the speakers’ relationships, (ethnic) identities or conversational intentions.’

‘Language attitudes’, as the term is used here, are part of ‘background knowledge’, which—as just noted—refers to what speakers draw on in face-to-face communication. Language attitudes are views towards a language or language variety, including how one conceives of its usefulness and future within the ‘speech community’. An analysis of attitudes in this study includes an analysis of the ideologies that serve to reinforce and perpetuate certain views among Inuit-, French-, and English-speaking subjects. In this sense, we can examine the nature of ideologies or discourses, which influence and shape how speakers view both language use and language education within a given speech economy.

4.1.2. SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND SOCIAL PROCESS

Another aspect of the analysis of language use in face-to-face communication involves the analysis of social structural constraints and how these are linked to social process. Traditionally, social structure has been analysed within such domains as political, legal, educational, and family organizations. These domains are interconnected by both institutions and individuals operating under various constraints imposed by, for example, political, religious, and legal authority and family responsibility (e.g. marriage, kinship ties). The question raised by a sociolinguistic theory concerned with social process is how these constraints operate within processes of human interaction, agency, and social change.

Giddens (1984) views social ‘structure’ as ‘rules and resources recursively implicated in social reproduction’. That is, ‘institutionalized features of social systems have structural properties in the sense that relationships are stabilized across time and space’ (p. xxxi). According to this view, ‘structural properties’ of institutions are constructed through the routinization of interaction of knowledgeable agents—knowledgeable in terms of their
ability both to understand the intentions of their actions and to draw on their stock of practical knowledge. Thus social structures or properties are maintained and reproduced through the actions and interactions of knowledgeable actors or agents. At the same time, however, this highly regularized activity produces 'unintended consequences' by the participants in interaction. These unintended consequences are regularly 'distributed' as a by-product of regularized behaviour reflexively sustained as such by its participants' (p. 14). One of the goals of this study is to examine the regularized patterns of interaction in a particular community and both the intended and unintended consequences of these processes.

4.1.3. 'Speech economy', 'Cultural capital' and 'Symbolic Domination'

The type of sociolinguistic investigation described above explores the 'speech economy' of the setting, where language, as a form of cultural capital, constitutes a symbolic resource used to gain access to other symbolic and material resources. The speech or communicative economy, in which language varieties are produced and distributed, 'is a direct function of the socio-ecological system in which it is embedded and is directly responsive to changes in that system' (Gumperz 1982: 43-44). More specifically, a set of communicative options is made available to speakers which is established and used in 'networks of relationships by which participants are tied to other residents of the area'. The examination of these social networks and the conventional and innovative speech patterns used within them is one way in which we can 'directly study the mechanisms by which the socio-economic changes [i.e. increased contact between groups through government policy, transport, industry, etc.] affect the verbal repertoire of speakers' (ibid., 44).

Other theoretical notions, such as 'cultural capital', 'symbolic domination', and 'linguistic marketplace' have been developed by Bourdieu (1977, 1982). In the linguistic marketplace, language is tied to economic and political arrangements, and in a narrow sense, 'represents a form of social and cultural capital which is convertible into economic capital' (Milroy & Milroy 1992: 3). In Bourdieu's sense, those who maintain power in our society transmit a specific form of 'cultural capital' to their children, in the form of bourgeois values. (Everyone in a society possesses 'cultural capital' of one form or another. It is not all valued equally, and forms of capital (material and symbolic resources) are unequally distributed. One element which makes a 'speech community' a community is a consensus regarding the hierarchy of values placed on different forms of cultural capital, regardless of whether people actually possess valued capital or not.) These values, which include the encouragement of reading and writing, ensure that these children will perform
well in a school system, and gain the best forms of employment in a society that values this kind of knowledge. Related to this is the notion of ‘symbolic domination’, which Woolard (1985: 739) takes as equivalent to the Gramscian notion of cultural ‘hegemony’ or ‘the legitimation of the cultural authority of the dominant group.’ The ‘underpinning of linguistic hegemony’ is seen by Bourdieu as a ‘linguistic market’, which is ‘integrated under the sponsorship of the state’ (Woolard 1985: 740). Woolard expands upon the notion of linguistic market, based on her fieldwork in Catalonia and on other sociolinguistic studies of minority (or working class) language maintenance, and argues that an ‘alternative marketplace’ may exist ‘in which alternative or opposing linguistic forms are generated and maintained’ and which does not operate by the rules of a single dominant linguistic market (p. 740).

In the ‘alternative marketplace’, non-standard vernacular forms are used and maintained through positive and negative sanctions imposed by community and peer groups, which may or may not constitute resistance to dominant linguistic practice. These sanctions in effect serve to define and maintain linguistic and ethnic boundaries. In Labov (1972), working class male speakers were found to use the non-standard features in their speech (such as not pronouncing post-vocalic /r/), even when they were shown to regard the standard form as superior. Basso (1979) found that the Western Apache language has been maintained to a considerable extent in Arizona, because of the negative community values placed on Anglo-American speaking styles (considered to be rude by Apache standards, and consistently ridiculed through complex joking mechanisms). Woolard (1985: 744) mentions other specific examples of negative sanctions placed on speakers of dominant language varieties. In her study in Barcelona, she notes how adolescents reported to her that Castilian speakers ridicule their peers who attempt to speak Catalan. Woolard also recalls a study by Gal (1979: 106) that describes how a woman has been ridiculed by fellow villagers for using standard rather than local Hungarian forms in speaking to the researcher; and reports on a similar instance in Milroy (1980: 60-61) where a boy is ridiculed by friends for shifting his speech style toward the standard in a recorded interview.

In this study, I will address the extent to which a dominant linguistic market regulates language use, and the question of whether an alternative marketplace is operating in this community. To extend the metaphor of the market: what does speaking Inuktitut, Cree, French or English ‘buy’ an individual, in terms of valued resources within the community; and how are these resources distributed? To what extent is the minority language operating within an alternative market? And what is the nature of this market in terms of who participates, in what activities and by what rules?
Another topic of this study of language use and language choice is the attitudes of speakers towards certain languages and language varieties. These attitudes do not arise in a vacuum, but are formed and shaped by various historical, political, cultural, and institutional processes. Historically, English was the language of colonization in the Canadian Arctic and in particular the language of the Hudson's Bay Company and trade. It was also the language of an assimilative policy of schooling, of western medical practices, and of the judicial system. In Québec, English was the language of economic domination until the 1960s, when the rise of Québec nationalism and a francophone middle class eventually led to the domination of French in the economic sphere (Handler 1988; Levine 1990). Inuit and French have persisted despite these forms of domination, in part because of their link to cultural activities and to forms of interaction that have served to construct ethnicity and ethnic identity.

4.1.4. 'ETHNICITY'

'Ethnicity', as the term is used here, refers to an emergent form of social organization based on a constellation of shared practices and interaction among members of social networks who form ethnic groups. My use of the term draws on Hall's (1992) notion of 'new ethnicities' (adapted by Rampton (1995)); and recognizes a diversity of cultural and symbolic practices and subjectivities. Ethnic boundaries are permeable and ethnic categories and therefore not fixed. Hall characterizes the politics associated with the construction of 'new ethnicities' as one which works with and through difference which is able to build those forms of solidarity and identification which make common struggle and resistance possible but without suppressing the real heterogeneity of interests and identities, and which can effectively draw the political boundary lines without fixing those boundaries for eternity.


Ethnic groups are fluid constructions, formed and maintained through boundaries which develop in opposition to other groups and which serve to separate members from outsiders. Boundaries are constructed through social interaction, which allows or prevents inter-ethnic communication in certain sectors. Within the group there is a shared view of cultural identity and cultural differences in relation to other groups. At the same time the group can sustain a good deal of diversity. According to Barth (1969), an ethnic group inhabits an 'ecological niche' where the social group and boundary are constituted in
material, social, and political conditions. Symbolic and material cultural practices (e.g. language, kinship, religion, dress) and beliefs and attitudes (including those toward language) are taken up in different ways, and shaped by the processes of boundary formation and maintenance.

4.1.5. ‘Power’

In this study, I use the term *power* in a general sense to refer to the interests that an individual or a particular social group holds that make a difference to the lives of other people or to the world. According to Lukes (1986: 5), these include interests in the locus of power and in the process of making the difference in question as well as in the outcomes of that difference. The exercise of power results in the advancement or realization of particular desires, beliefs, and goals, or in a resistance to these outcomes. These outcomes serve the interests of the powerful, and become significant when they affect people’s welfare, limit freedom, secure collective goods, or play a role in the distribution of desired resources.

In this study, exercising power can be understood as a means of acquiring, controlling, and allocating valued material and symbolic resources ‘in a context of relative scarcity and competing claims’ within a given community, situated within a wider global economic market (Lukes 1986: 11). Thus, specific linguistic resources are controlled, allocated, and used by certain groups to gain access to other forms of power through valued material resources and other symbolic resources. One’s ability to access valued material and symbolic resources that serve one’s interests derives either directly or indirectly from political and economic sources (as we will see in this study). In addition, we will see how dominant forms of power, particularly in colonial and other oppressive social processes, are maintained and legitimated through ideology and other discursive means.

4.1.6. ‘Discourse’ and ‘Ideology’

Both *discourse* and *ideology* are terms at the intersection of language and power which have myriad interpretations and uses. Discourses, as referred to in this study, ‘are the complexes of signs and practices which organize social existence and social reproduction’ (Terdiman 1985: 54-56). Terdiman further suggests that ‘no dominant discourse is ever fully protected from contestation’. Discourse is thus ‘a site of struggle. It is a terrain, a dynamic linguistic and, above all, semantic space in which social meanings are produced or challenged’ (Seidel 1985: 44).
In this study, I define ideology, following Eagleton (1991: 45), as 'a body of meanings and values encoding certain interests relevant to social power... [which is] more specifically... unifying, action-oriented, rationalizing, legitimating, universalizing and naturalizing.' Ideology in this sense is not restricted to dominant forms of social thought, but is considered to be a matter of 'discourse'.

Very often, [ideology] refers to the ways in which signs, meanings and values help to reproduce a dominant social power; but it can also denote any significant conjuncture between discourse and political interests.... Dominant ideologies, and occasionally oppositional ones, often employ such devices as unification, spurious identification, naturalization, deception, self-deception, universalization and rationalization.... [But] ideology is [also] a matter of 'discourse' rather than of 'language'—of certain concrete discursive effects, rather than of signification as such. It represents the points where power impacts upon certain utterances and inscribes itself tacitly within them.

(Eagleton 1991: 221-223)

Ideology is thus a key element in the construction of political, historical, cultural, and scientific discourses. My appeal to this notion accordingly reflects the idea that certain dominant views and beliefs serve the interests of particular groups, through processes of 'obscuring and naturalizing' social reality, and through processes of constructing social reality through discourse. These processes may function to uphold dominant views by convincing a large majority of people of the inevitability and 'correctness' of a certain position; or they may serve the interests of oppositional groups and constitute an oppositional discursive practice and a form of resistance.

4.1.7. LANGUAGE CHOICE IN KUUIJUARAAPIK: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

The theoretical assumptions presented in this and the following chapters provide one way of understanding how language choice operates at the local level in Kuujjuaapik, giving us a clearer picture of the reasons why certain language varieties are used, the social and political effects of this usage, and the ways in which and reasons why language varieties are linked to inequality and to political struggle (as in the movement toward self-government described earlier in this chapter). Crucial to explaining how language is linked to relations of power in Kuujjuaapik is an examination of the political economic history of the region, and the production of legitimating ideologies which serve to naturalize and justify the colonial process. Furthermore, language is linked to power through the
mechanisms of social boundary formation, which are at play in the construction of ‘ethnicity’, social networks and social ‘difference’. The development and persistence of certain language practices and patterns of interaction, the meanings associated with these practices, and the resources that they access are all potential areas of investigation in a study of language choice in a multilingual community. Language use, whether situated locally, institutionally, or historically, is constituted in relations of power.

5. Methodology

One way to investigate language practices is to conduct ethnographic fieldwork that includes fieldnotes from participant observation, interviews, and a language survey (in the form of a written questionnaire) as sources of data. Because of the complex political and economic nature of language practices, and their link to historical processes and the construction of ethnicities, this is the method that I have chosen for this study, which is based on twelve months (May 1993 - July 1994) of collecting these various forms of data in Great Whale River, Québec. I have supplemented these accounts of day-to-day language practice with historical analysis (of written documents and other historical data), which serves to situate language practices in relation to historically constituted relations of power and colonial history. Historical analysis thus finds a prominent place in this study of face-to-face interaction, helping to explain the historical relation of language to colonial expansion, state formation, political economic dependence, and the production and development of the legitimating ideologies that accompanied these processes and that inform current language practices.

One dimension of social organization that I do not focus on in this study is gender. Although gender identities are constructed through similar processes as ‘ethnicity’—through cultural and linguistic practices that articulate social meanings associated with ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’—the construct does not figure prominently in my analysis. Despite the fact that gender is relevant to the social organization of Great Whale River, particularly with respect to the economic domains or niches in the community (as will be discussed in chapter 2, §2.1.2), and to the domains of language use (as discussed in chapter 4, §3.1), it is not central to my overall argument presented here: that cultural and linguistic practices historically produce and reproduce social boundaries, within which particular ethnicities, and the social and cultural identities and values associated with these, are articulated. Certainly gender plays a key role within these socially ‘bounded’ groups (providing a large part of the heterogeneity within these groups), and within the political economy of the region (regarding both employment and practices in the dominant wage
market and the alternative ‘traditional’ harvesting market). In addition, gender plays a significant role in the formation of social networks, and in the nature of the ‘border crossings’ which occur between speakers of different social groups. However, a more in-depth analysis of what these particular roles involve, and the social, political and economic effects that they have, will have to be developed in future research.

5.1. DOING ABORIGINAL RESEARCH

In recent years a shift has occurred in the way that anthropological research is carried out in aboriginal communities. For one thing, there has been increased interest in research issues from First Nations organizations and from local community members, which stems from ‘the weight attributed to ethnographic evidence in land claims negotiations, concern by Native peoples about language loss, and attempts to introduce cultural history and oral literature into northern classrooms’ (Cruikshank 1993: 134). What follows from this, as Cruikshank (1993: 134) notes, is that anthropologists

no longer have the power to decide unilaterally where and how they will do fieldwork.

Instead, research strategies negotiated locally and based on a model of collaboration are replacing more conventional models of university-initiated research.

Research in aboriginal communities is collaborative in the sense that one works with local people to specify the terms of the research, and that local community expertise is used to help carry out the project. Collaborative research addresses local community and institutional concerns, and includes input from institutional and local committees with interests in the project (Warry 1990). It is virtually impossible to conduct research in Nunavik, and elsewhere in the Canadian North, without explicit permission from the local community council, and in most cases, from an aboriginal organization or institution that has interests in the project.

In the case of this study, I initially sought permission from the Kativik School Board in 1992 to undertake a short term research project in Kuujjuaapik on how non-Native teachers adapt Southern-based teaching methods to Northern classrooms. This project was then approved by the local school committee, and resulted in a case study of one classroom in which second language literacy instruction was succeeding through a range of instructional methods rather than one set method (Patrick 1993). After this brief introduction to the community, I sought permission for a larger scale sociolinguistic project on dominant and minority language use in Kuujjuaapik. Because of its larger scale, the
planning of this project involved meetings with members of the Kativik School Board in Dorval, Québec; a meeting with the school board research committee in Kuujjuaq; and a joint meeting with the municipal council and the school committee in Kuujjuaqapik.

The school board was an obvious choice for a ‘partner’ because of its interest in Inuitut language maintenance issues and its previous involvement in community-based language surveys on the domains and frequency of language use (Taylor et al. 1993; Taylor and Wright 1989). This previous work had been collaborative in the sense that non-Native researchers developed research questions with Inuit programme directors at the school board. In addition, Inuit personnel (including members of the school board and municipal council, translators, and interpreters) helped implement the study in the community and gather the results. Most importantly, however, is that the results of these studies have been used in Inuitut language teacher training programmes, their findings about language use and the research reports published from them having become important in teacher training classrooms. Teacher trainers have seen the need to increase the language teachers’ awareness of minority language use and maintenance, in particular, the importance of Inuitut for Inuit, and for maintaining the language.

Collaboration between researcher and ‘researched’ is important given the history of Northern research, which has been marked by the ability of non-Native, Southern-based researchers to choose research topics and to voice their views and interpretations away from the communities studied. At the same time, however, research must often be legitimized through affiliations with university-based researchers and practices, and thus linked to the wider political economy of knowledge and research, in order to be useful in policy and land claims issues. These realities of research and power mean that the need for university-based studies will continue for First Nations communities seeking support in land claims and policy issues.

For this study, I submitted a proposal to the Kativik School Board in November 1992, suggesting that I collaborate with it on a language survey in Kuujjuaqapik and that I supplement this with long-term ethnographic research on language use in the community. In April 1993, I was invited to a meeting in Kuujjuaq to meet with three members of the school board’s research committee (one member was absent but I had met with her previously at the school board in Dorval). Discussion between committee members was conducted in Inuitut, with translations into English for me and the non-Native member present; and everything I presented in English was translated into Inuitut by one of the committee members. The committee made three key points about the research: (i) The research questionnaire would be developed in English by two of the research committee members and myself, and translated into Inuitut and French by the school board. (ii) One
of the research committee members would accompany me to Kuujjuaaraapik, to meet with the school committee and municipal council in order to gain local input into the project and the issues at stake. (iii) I would present my results to the school board, and these could then be used in the teacher training programmes run by the school board in collaboration with McGill University.

5.2. THE RESEARCH SITE

I chose Great Whale River as a research site because of its unique sociolinguistic, political, and economic characteristics. The first of these I have already described in this chapter. What makes Great Whale River economically and politically unique is its status as one of the principal settlements on the Hudson Bay coast, and its sizeable Native and non-Native population, the latter employed by the government or involved in small businesses. Since my primary research interest is in ethnolinguistic interaction and in the construction and maintainence of ethnic and social groups, this particular community seemed to be an ideal site—particularly for long-term sociolinguistic research, since none had been attempted in the community before. Nor had much anthropological work had been conducted in or published on Great Whale River since the late 1950s (Honigmann 1952; Balicki 1959), aside from a recent study conducted by a medical anthropologist (Adelson 1993).

On the day on which I arrived in Kuujjuaaraapik in May 1993, I had a meeting with Inuit members of the school committee and the municipal council. This meeting was conducted entirely in Inuititut; and in order to save time and to maintain the flow of discussion, we agreed that careful notes would be taken by the bilingual Inuk woman who introduced me to the council, and that we would go through the details of the meeting together the next day.

A number of important issues emerged during this meeting. There were concerns about language teaching, and about whether Inuititut, French, and English were being well taught in the school. There were also concerns about the maintainence of Inuititut, and the loss of the local way of speaking. As far as methodology was concerned, I would be required to submit a proposal to the council in writing, translated into Inuititut; and was urged to hire local bilingual people to help me distribute the questionnaire and to help those who needed assistance to fill it out in Inuititut. (I was also given permission to stay in one of the Kativik School Board-owned houses in the non-Native sector—the regular school teachers were on summer vacation, and many of these houses were empty—until I could find accommodation in the Inuit community itself.)
During the course of my fieldwork, I spent about one month living in a house in the non-Native section of the community; a few weeks with a young Inuit family, on the edge of the Inuit community near the airport; and the rest of the time in a house in the centre of Kuujjuaaraapik, living with an Inuk elder and his two grandsons. These different living arrangements brought with them different perspectives on various aspects of life in the community.

Researchers' living arrangements impose certain constraints on whom they associate with, the types of questions that they ask, and the material and experiences that they gather, in order to find answers to these questions. One of their effects is to position the researchers in the community, with respect to both their ethnic allegiances and to the power structure of the community. Thus they can affect who the researcher has access to for interviews and discussion, and what sorts of information interviewees feel free to give. During my short stay in the primarily non-Native community of Poste-de-la-Baleine, I became familiar with this part of town, and had access to discussion on a variety of topics in a non-threatening atmosphere. When I moved into the Inuit community of Kuujjuaaraapik, I came to recognize the geographical divisions in Great Whale River and the effects of geographical distance in shaping these two communities. I now had a feeling of being physically and socially separated from the non-Native community, and was introduced to a community life which I had not been aware of while living 'on the hill'. This included frequent visiting between family and friends, and organized hunting, fishing and berry-picking excursions.

In general, researchers need to be aware of how they are politically and socially situated at the research site. This includes an awareness of the researcher's political and linguistic position; and an acknowledgement of the learning process during research. In my own case, I am sympathetic to the cultural and political aspirations of both Québécois and Inuit, and the continued daily use and maintenance of both French and Inuit in this process. Significantly, however, I sympathize with the Québécois goal of self-determination only to the extent that it recognizes, in turn, the legitimate political aspirations of Inuit and Cree. My sympathy for both 'sovereignist' movements is rooted in an historical understanding of political, economic, and cultural difference—a matter which will figure prominently in this study.

Admittedly, however, I could manage only the most basic conversation in Inuit, and could not carry out interviews in the language. I thus relied on Inuit personnel to interview elders and translate the texts into English. My French, on the other hand, was fluent enough to allow me to use French comfortably in informal conversations and in interviews—although the fact that my French was not native-like might have led some
interviewees to choose to be interviewed in English. With younger adult Inuit and non-Native people, I used English and French; and with children (who often visited the house where I was staying), I would use Inuititut phrases that I had learned, and English and French with those learning these languages in school. Although I made a determined effort to learn and use Inuititut, and supported its use and maintenance in principle, I was not able to use it as much as I would have liked. Regardless of my linguistic ability, however, I came to realize that I was positioned as a White (qallunaat) 'Southerner'; and the ethnolinguistic divide between the Inuit and myself was one that had been historically and culturally constructed, and which ultimately restricted my access to linguistic and cultural knowledge and understanding in the community (see Marcus 1992 for a personal account of this issue in the Australian context).

5.3. FIELD NOTES

The investigation of language use and of the reasons for particular language choices required thorough documentation of observational data. Throughout my period of fieldwork, this type of observational data was recorded in field notes. I wrote up my field notes daily, documenting the following three types of information, which were particularly relevant to the analysis: (i) observations about language behaviour and the circumstances of this behaviour; (ii) comments from people concerning language, language use, attitudes towards speakers of various languages, and social relations present within and impacting on the community; (iii) observations about the social relations between various groups and speakers and about the general social organization of the community. This last set of observations included those about the distribution of symbolic (including linguistic) and material resources among community members.

Initially, I took note of the language used and the way in which things were said in order to look for patterns of conventional language use. I also noted routine language use in the community, including the participants in and the outcomes of particular interactions and the social conditions under which they took place. This information, I felt, would lead me to understand the patterns of language use, and to be able to recognize any aberrations from the norm which would require further explanation.

My observations also involved an analysis of speech events with a view to their consequences for those involved. I observed various communicative settings in the community, in order to find situations in which the interaction had important implications for at least one of the participants in it; or in which language choice was relevant for access to material and symbolic resources, which included institutional domains, such as
commercial workplaces, the municipal council office, the court room, the nursing station, government offices such as welfare and social services, and the school.

The observations of actual language use recorded in my field notes (which detailed which language was used, what was said, and how it was said) were coupled with informal comments from various people about the languages used in the school and in other situations, and—even more important—attitudes toward the languages spoken and the speakers of those languages. As described earlier, identity and the feeling of ‘belonging’ to one social group are constructed in opposition to another group. Language is a significant construct of one’s identity in that it defines one’s relation to those inside and outside of one’s group; and permits or denies access to particular social networks that have meaningful consequences for speakers.

One limitation of my research methodology regarding the linguistic observations is the lack of interview data with the participants who took part in the interactions. While I am able to offer my own analyses of particular speech events and possible reasons for their occurrence, I have to rely on my own personal experience and informal discussions with various speakers from the four language groups, rather than formal, organized interviews with the actual participants in the interaction. Part of the reason for this omission of formal interview data was the fact that much of what I observed had been experienced by me personally under different circumstances, and with particular social and psychological effects. Thus at times I felt the pull of solidarity and the pressure to include someone from one group at the risk of alienating someone from another. I also experienced exclusion from a social group, and witnessed others being excluded (such as in the staff room at the school, where the use of English in the presence of older Inuit speakers, and French or Inuit in mixed non-Native and Inuit company excluded certain speakers). This experience helped me make sense of the observations, although in hindsight, I could have possibly gained more insight from arranged interviews with those directly involved in the interaction. Such participant involvement in analysing language use will have to be considered in future research.

5.4. THE LANGUAGE SURVEY

The language survey consisted of a written questionnaire based on questions developed for surveys in other Nunavik communities. The language survey was given to each person in Kuujjuaarapik over the age of 18 and to all of the Secondary 5 (grade 11) students in the English and French streams (i.e. those in the last year of high school).
In order to conduct the survey effectively, I hired local assistants to help distribute the questionnaire from household to household, and to help people who needed assistance in filling out the questionnaires. This was crucial for some elders who were not familiar with the questionnaire format and for those who needed help reading and answering the questions. In many households questionnaires were left to be filled out, and then picked up later, usually by myself. I then gathered the surveys, and took them to McGill University in Montreal to have the results compiled and analysed in the same manner as that developed for other language surveys in Nunavik. This involved the direct assistance of Don Taylor in the Department of Psychology and two research assistants who had experience working with the data.

5.5. INTERVIEWS

During the course of my fieldwork, I conducted a total of thirty-seven interviews. In general, the interviewees chosen represented a cross-section of the people in the community with respect to age, occupation, and gender. (Of course, people’s participation in these interviews also crucially depended on their willingness and availability to be interviewed.) In all, there were four sets of interviews conducted for this study. In each case, different methods were used to decide who would be interviewed and in what language. The four types of interviews are described below.

5.5.1. INUIT ELDERS. In order to conduct these interviews I worked with Sarah Hunter, an Inuk teacher who agreed to conduct the interview in Inuitut with a tape-recorder, and then work with me on the translation. Our interviewing proceeded as follows. Sarah would contact one of the elders from a list of possible interviewees that we had compiled, based on a list that I had obtained from the municipal office. We would then discuss the direction of the interview and the sorts of questions Sarah would ask. We would both go to the house of the elder to be interviewed and I would set up the tape. Interestingly, the majority of those interviewed were women who Sarah felt comfortable talking to; in the end, we had interviewed a total of five women and one couple. We would then spend some time translating the tapes. We would both listen to the recording, Sarah would translate orally, and I would type her translation into my computer. Although this process was time-consuming, it was valuable in that Sarah could contextualize parts of the interview in the process of translation.

These interviews were supplemented by a large number of interviews previously conducted and published by Avataq Cultural Institute (the Inuit cultural organization in
Nunavik) in the late 1970s in Kuujjuaraapik. (These interviews are available to the public, and a set is kept in the Great Whale River Community Library). The topics and points of discussion differed somewhat. Most of the Avataq interviews focussed on specific questions about the past, such as games that were played, life in the camps, coming to trade at the post, and other experiences. The interviews conducted by Sarah were oriented towards memories about contact with English, French, and Cree speakers and about settlement in Kuujjuaraapik. Both sources became valuable texts in the historical analysis of trade and economic shift undertaken in this study.

5.5.2. INUIT INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED IN ENGLISH. The second set of interviews involved those Inuit who had attended school in the early 1960s, initially in Kuujjuaraapik, and then in Churchill and in various Southern cities (including Ottawa, Toronto, and Winnipeg). These people held various positions in the community—in the municipal council office, in the school, and in government offices. They were chosen based on their availability and willingness to participate. Questions focused on their personal history and experience of schooling and language learning, their current views on language used in their workplace and in the community, and their current concerns about language use and language education. Those interviewed included one woman and three men who worked at the municipal council, one man who worked at the school, one man and one woman who worked in the government offices, and two women who worked for Canadian Airlines. I also conducted one informal interview (not tape-recorded) with a woman who worked as an interpreter at the nursing station. In total there were ten interviews, reflecting a fair cross-section of work places and gender.

5.5.3. NON-NATIVE INTERVIEWS. The non-Native people interviewed formed two groups. Those in the first group held positions related to the hiring and training of local people in local offices and businesses or positions in which they dealt regularly with the public. Those in the second group had lived for an extended period of time in the community, and could bring their greater experience to bear in describing relations between Natives and non-Natives in the community. Interviews were conducted in French or English, depending on the preference of the interviewee. In total, five out of ten interviews with non-Native francophones were conducted in English. Interestingly, three of these francophone interviewees lived in either Kuujjuaraapik or Whapmagoostui and were married to Inuit or Cree women. The other two interviewees conducted most of their work in English. Thus, all were very comfortable speaking English, and may have chosen English to accommodate my own linguistic abilities. The other francophones preferred to be interviewed in French.
In total, I conducted 12 interviews, which were representative of employees and managers in various workplaces in Great Whale River. These included the following (M = male; F = female; A = anglophone; F = francophone): the director at Hydro-Québec (M, F); the chief of police (M, F); the Adult Education counsellor (F, F); three provincial government employees (F, F; F, A; M, F); a local entrepreneur (M, F); a store manager (M, A); the Post Master (M, F), and the Regional Post Office Director (M, A); Municipal office employee (M, F); and a Protestant missionary (F, A).

5.5.4. TEACHER TRAINERS AND INUIT TEACHERS. The last set of interviews was conducted during a week-long session at a teacher training programme in Inukjuak during the summer of 1993. During this week, I was able to attend several courses and meet with and interview personnel who had been involved in teacher training for some time. (This programme is unique with respect to the level of aboriginal involvement and the use of Inuititut as the language of instruction and thus deserves to be documented in more detail in a later study.) For my purposes here, I took advantage of the occasion to interview as many teacher trainers (both Inuit and non-Inuit) and Inuit teachers as was possible given the time constraints. Some of the discussion on Inuititut language use and its role in the future of Nunavik had direct relevance to this study. All but one of the interviews were conducted in English; in the one exceptional case, I used an interpreter to interview an Inuk teacher.

In all, four teachers and four teacher trainers were interviewed, all of them women. (As it happens, no men were attending this session of the teacher training programme; and although there were two non-Native male instructors present, they had not been involved in implementing or running the programme). Teachers were asked questions about their reasons for choosing to become teachers, their teaching experiences, and what they have gained and how they have developed personally from the teacher training programme. In some cases I asked more specific questions about Inuititut and interviewees’ views on its use and maintenance, and on the development of language curricula and the Inuititut teacher training programme. I directed more detailed questions about how the programme had developed and how it operates today to teacher trainers and of those who had been involved in the programme for many years.

In all four types of interviews just described, the interviews were tape-recorded (unless the interviewees asked that they not be). In many cases, the number of interviews depended on who was available for interviewing: some people did not want to be interviewed, while others did not have the time, or opportunities to meet simply did not arise. Although not all the interviews are quoted in this study, they were all transcribed,
and served to inform the arguments and conclusions drawn in this study. Some of the interview data will be valuable for further research.

In this study, I have chosen to maintain the anonymity of those interviewed. I do indicate, however, their occupation or age (or both), their gender, and their ethnicity. In the case of Inuit elders, I have indicated whether it was my own interview or an interview conducted by Avataq. A list of the Kuujjuaraapik elder interviews published by Avataq is given in an appendix.

5.6. HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Historical data are an important part of this study. Although a large part of the data comes from elder interviews, as described above, archival documents, including early accounts of contact (Graburn 1969), Hudson's Bay Company records (Francis and Morantz 1983), and the journals of Rev. E. J. Peck provide useful sources of European discourse on the Inuit they encountered. Further historical information about the community and a chronology of more recent changes are found in the writings of the American anthropologist John Honigmann (Honigmann 1950, 1951, 1952, 1962).

6. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The rest of this study is organized as follows. Chapter 2 maps out the colonial history of Arctic Quebec, describing the political economic shifts in the region and their economic and cultural consequences for the Inuit, and the place and value of language varieties within this history. This chapter also provides an analysis of writings and images that have served over the past 400 years to frame and represent the Native 'Other' and construct particular notions of ethnicity. It seeks to demonstrate how certain stereotypical images of Inuit have changed over time, coinciding with and serving to legitimate certain political economic shifts.

Chapter 3 further explores the complex political economic reality of Nunavik, and the process of colonization in the latter half of the twentieth century. This involves an examination of the development of the dominant and 'alternative' linguistic markets in Arctic Quebec; the growing importance of French and Inuktitut in the administrative, political, and economic spheres; and the resulting competition between the two languages and English in the dominant Southern-based linguistic marketplace. Included in this
examination is a discussion of the paradoxical position of Inuititut in the alternative ‘traditional’ linguistic market, where local linguistic and cultural practices are used to legitimate Inuit mobilization; and the transitional position in Arctic Québec of French, which residents of Kuujjuaraapik perceive as important, despite their continued reliance on English in intercultural communication and in the majority of workplaces.

Chapter 4 discusses language use in Kuujjuaraapik, based on the results of a language survey that I conducted in the community and the analysis of ethnographic data. This chapter will reveal the dominance of Inuititut and English and the transitional position of French in the community, and show how language proficiency levels in particular age groups mirror the political and economic changes in the region. The chapter will also suggest that language choices in face-to-face interaction serve to construct ethnic boundaries and social groups. Within these groups, linguistic practices (symbolic resources) are used to define and control the cultural, social, and economic value of other material and symbolic resources and are thus crucial in constructing social identity and in maintaining permeable boundaries between ethnic groups. Language choice is thus bound up with articulations of cultural ‘difference’ and with political struggles for the control over valued material and symbolic resources. Finally, this chapter will demonstrate how language choice serves to define, include, and exclude social players in Kuujjuaraapik; and how these articulations of language, ethnicity, and social identity have become linked to larger political and economic struggles, both local and national.

Finally, chapter 5 will offer a summary of the preceding chapters of the study, and of the political economic analysis of language use discussed in this thesis. This includes drawing together the importance of colonial history, and historical political economic relationships and shifts in constructing and maintaining social difference and cultural values of particular symbolic and material resources.
CHAPTER 2

HISTORY AND REPRESENTATION
OF THE HUDSON’S BAY INUIT, 1610-1975

In a political economic analysis of language use, one avenue of research, according to Susan Gal, is to show ‘how speakers respond symbolically to relations of domination between groups within the state, and how they understand their historic position and identity within a world capitalist system structured around dependency and unequal development’ (1988: 247). In this chapter, I will be examining the historical positioning of Inuit in relationships of ‘dependency and unequal development’ within the world capitalist system. I will be making use of the notion of a multi-locale ethnography, as proposed in Marcus 1986, which links local events to larger systems; and of an anthropological version of world-system theory, as developed in Wolf 1982, in terms of which I discuss the history of economic and intergroup relations between Europeans and Inuit in the era of the fur trade in Arctic Québec.

Wolf (1982) sees history as a network of connections that link continents, societies, economies, and social actors in what he calls ‘spatially and temporally shifting relationships, prompted in all instances by the effects of European expansion’ (1982: 17). While Wolf’s work concentrates on (the material aspects of) European expansion in the spread of colonialism, one can also see European contact with indigenous populations as setting in motion the spread of ideological and discursive practices which are relevant to the history of ethnic relations and language use in Great Whale River. Some of these practices, which can be linked to the intellectual developments of the Enlightenment period, were vital to the rise of nationalism and the nation-state. These include not only certain practices of moral regulation (see Corrigan and Sayer 1985 for discussion) but also, as Anderson (1981) has pointed out, the rise of the print media, the greater standardization of language and prose style, and the provision of education and higher rates of literacy—practices instrumental to the development of the ‘imaginary community’ in nationalist consciousness. Hobsbawm (1990: 59-62) makes a similar point in noting that language is seen ‘as an important element of proto-national cohesion’ (p. 59), and ‘one among several criteria’—among which are symbolic, ritualistic, and other collective practices—by which people indicated belonging to a human collectivity’ (p. 62).

In this chapter, I will follow two lines of historical research. One involves a mapping out of the colonial history of the region, including its political economic shifts,

1 Parts of this section are drawn from Patrick 1994.
their economic and cultural consequences for the Inuit, and the place and value of language varieties within this history. The other, which expands upon this political economic approach, includes an analysis of the historical writings and images used to frame and represent the Native ‘Other’; and seeks to demonstrate how certain images or stereotypes of Inuit have changed over time, and how these changes coincide with and have served to legitimate certain political economic shifts. Through such an analysis, we can come to understand how dominant, legitimating ideologies or discourses about the Inuit have been constructed, and how in the process of legitimizing colonial practices and domination, these stereotypical images have served to construct notions of ethnicity in terms of ‘ethnic absolutism’ (Gilroy 1987; Rampton 1995).

‘Ethnic absolutism’ is an essentialist view of culture, which perceives ethnicity as composed of homogeneous, static ‘ethnic essences’ that define who one is and shape one’s character. Ethnicity is thus seen to have ‘an exclusive emphasis which hides all the other social categories which individuals belong to’, such as age, gender, class, and residence. Ethnic absolutism obscures the often complex and contradictory relationships of solidarity and conflict ‘across a range of category memberships’ (Rampton 1995: 8). It is, therefore, a discursive process that reduces individual members of a particular ethnic group to oversimplified, homogeneous definitions or constructions of ‘who they are’; and are most frequently produced and reproduced in writing, film, and other media.

These mass-produced, -distributed, and -consumed versions of ethnicity are crucial targets for investigation, since they can play a part in the conceptualization of ‘self’ and ‘other’, and have played a role in legitimizing Western domination over particular ethnic groups. Stereotypes also shape attitudes of members of one group toward another, and in this sense can constitute certain forms of the ‘background knowledge’ that speakers bring to face-to-face interaction. With this second line of historical research, I will thus attempt to analyse how images and representations are related to political and economic arrangements, and how they can mislead and obscure by constructing limited and narrow versions of ethnicity.

The chapter will be organized as follows. §1 will offer a general historical overview of the Hudson’s Bay Inuit, and will be followed by a series of chronologically ordered sections (§§2-4) about the different periods in this history, each period reflecting a different kind of political economic organization. Each section will consider the socio-economic and political circumstances of the period that is its particular focus, and the dominant representations of Inuit in Euro-Canadian writings during this period. §2 covers the 17th and 18th centuries, and draws on the writings of Henry Hudson’s mutineers, written early in the 17th century, about their first encounters with Inuit, and on subsequent portrayals by
early Hudson Bay traders of Inuit who refused to 'co-operate' in the system of trade. §3 covers the late 19th century, a second period in Hudson's Bay Inuit history, in which trade relations stabilized, but in which local forms of Inuit spiritual practices, in the forms of shamanistic activities, were still popular (although being undermined by Christian missionaries). This section draws on missionary discourse—in particular, the writings of the Anglican missionary Rev. Edmund Peck, noted for his introduction of a writing system for Inuttitut. §4 covers the 20th century, which has seen the arrival in this region of English-speaking Canadian government officials, teaching and medical personnel, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; followed by the American Army; and by southern Canadian entrepreneurs and French-speaking Québec government officials, teaching and medical personnel, and Sureté du Québec police. Not surprisingly, this period is associated with a complex array of images and stereotypes of Inuit and other aboriginal groups in Canada, ranging from the film Nanook of the North to later stereotypes produced and circulated through the mass media.

History writing is socially and politically situated: what is recorded, written, and said is contingent on the social and historical circumstances of data gathering, telling, and writing. My analysis is thus not an exhaustive one, since it is based on available documents of different periods, as produced by explorers, traders, missionaries, government officials, and anthropologists. Despite the limitations of these data, they can still help us to understand the ideological and material aspects of the larger world system and the development of attitudes of one group of speakers toward another. This is fundamental to understanding at least one way in which the political economic context might be linked to the formation of collective ethnic group identities, which are produced and reproduced in face-to-face linguistic interaction.

1. HISTORY, CONTACT, AND REPRESENTATION

In order to understand the social, political, and economic values placed on Inuttitut and other languages in Great Whale River today, it is important to examine the social, economic, and political conditions of contact, and the implications that this contact has had for aboriginal peoples. Collectively, the European and Euro-Canadian settlers formed part of larger institutions such as churches, the Hudson's Bay Company, and the Governments of Canada and Québec (Brody 1975). Each of these institutions was conditioned by its own ideological configurations, which respectively included proselytizing, making money, and controlling populations within established borders to maintain sovereignty and reinforce ideological legitimacy.
The first in a series of economic shifts in Arctic Québec began with the early 'explorers' to the region, who were seeking resources that could be profitably exploited by England. This was the start of contact with the aboriginal peoples inhabiting the areas around the Hudson Bay, and the beginning of the historical processes that would lead to the founding of the Hudson's Bay Company in 1670; the establishment of trading posts throughout the region known as Rupert's Land; conflict between France and England over control of this region; and finally the emergence of a sovereign Dominion of Canada, loyal to the British Crown, which brought aboriginal and French-speaking peoples under its authority. These processes of nation-building have continued into the late 20th century, as French-speaking Québécois have mobilized to form their own sovereign nation; and as both Canadian and Québec efforts to legitimize their 'sovereignty' have produced interests in 'Nouveau-Québec', allotted to Québec in 1912 in a federal-provincial agreement. The late 20th century has also produced a movement for aboriginal nationhood and sovereignty within Canada. Throughout these periods of change, images of the Inuit changed as well.

The political economic processes mentioned above, coupled with the changing images and representations of the Inuit, are linked to shifts in relations between European Canadians and Inuit since contact. The images and stereotypes produced by Europeans (which do not correspond to the Inuit way of looking at things) have served to justify the particular form of power that the Europeans have been interested in exercising during particular periods. These periods, including particular political economic arrangements and the images and stereotypes of Inuit produced by European Canadians at that time, will be described in this chapter as follows:

The first period of contact involved European attempts to convince the Inuit to trade with them. We will examine this period first through the accounts of the first 'explorers' to the Hudson Bay region (mentioned above), and later with the accounts given by Hudson's Bay Company traders and stories passed down from this time. Inuit resistance to these attempts is portrayed as violent and savage, not only toward the Europeans, but later, in the eighteenth century, also toward the Cree. The images of the 'savage Eskimo' and the hostility between the Inuit and Cree serve to justify the European presence to 'civilize' and 'improve' the 'savage' condition of the indigenous population.

In the former half of the nineteenth century, Inuit are finally brought into the fur trade with the Hudson's Bay Company (who had been trying unsuccessfully to engage Inuit in trade for almost a century). At this point, the image of the violent savage Eskimo is

2 This area included vast territories extending from Labrador to the Rocky Mountains and from the Red River settlements to the Canadian Arctic of the northern Hudson Bay. The area was named after Prince Rupert, a cousin of King Charles II of England and the first governor of the Hudson's Bay Company.
replaced by the image of the child-like savage. The ‘innocence’ and ‘poor, heathen’ condition of the Inuit justifies further civilizing forces, such as moral intervention and the introduction of the Bible (and hence access to literacy and to the ‘Word of God’) by the missionaries.

In the twentieth century, the images change once again, to those of the ‘noble, child-like savage’, epitomized in the film Nanook of the North by Robert Flaherty, and the ‘happy, industrious Eskimo’, portrayed in Nanook and in other popular sources. By this time, European traders, who had become dependent on the Inuit for trade (and also for mail delivery, food, and guides; see Francis & Morantz 1983: 168) wanted to see the ‘noble’ industrious Inuit way of life on the land, the established ‘partnership’ between trader and ‘Native’ and the large profits for the Hudson’s Bay Company continue. Thus there was concern on the part of Europeans at that time that modernity, and the move toward possible sedentarization and the loss of ‘traditional’ hunting practices, would affect this relationship between the fur trader and the Inuit. Worries about these impending social and economic changes and the ‘loss’ of a ‘traditional’ way of life prompted, to a certain extent, the romanticization of this ‘past’ to accommodate Western notions of romantic heroes (Francis 1992: 16ff.). In addition, there was the omnipresent risk of famine as fur-bearing animals became scarcer, and the fur trade weakened because of depleted resources and changing markets and competition in Europe. This romanticized image of the ‘noble’ Inuit past thus served to mask European responsibility for their part in creating dependence on the fur trade, and for the life-threatening situation in which some Inuit found themselves. Modernity and ‘progress’ were following their ‘natural’ course, and there was little that one could do to alter the social and economic changes that the Inuit were about to face. Thus, modernity and ‘progress’ were threatening the ‘noble’ and ‘heroic’ existence of the Inuit.

In the twentieth century, famine did occur, and the Inuit, according to elder narratives, did not feel that the European Canadians were of much help. In addition, many non-Native observers at the time, including anthropologists and government workers, continue to emphasize the historic hostility between Cree and Inuit (perhaps to justify their continued ‘civilizing’ presence in the area) despite the many instances (recorded in elder narratives) of friendly relations in trade and sharing between Cree and Inuit. After the Second World War, with the collapse of the fur trade and the concomitant starvation and increase in disease among Inuit, the federal government begins to take a greater interest in the region. (This interest stems not only from the discourse of citizenship, which holds the federal government responsible for its citizens, but also as issues of defence, the Cold War, and conflict with Americans over control of the north assume greater importance). At this point there is interest in helping the starving Inuit, by settling them into communities where
they can be both 'helped' and controlled. In addition to this, Inuit also serve as a necessary labour pool for the construction of the Army base, and undergo a final economic shift to wage labour. Permanent settlement is thus the result of various political and economic responses to the collapse of the fur trade, the rise of the Cold War, assertions of Canadian sovereignty and the inability of Inuit, under these particular political and economic conditions, to sustain a full-time subsistence life.

A set of complex images of Inuit created by European Canadians accompanied this shift from life on the land to settlement and wage labour (a full analysis of which is, however, beyond the scope of this study). These included images of Inuit (and 'Indians') as helpless, poor, illiterate victims, who have lost their traditional skills and knowledge. These images have justified the government's continued paternalistic attitude toward the Inuit, despite the fact that Inuit have continued to engage in 'traditional' activities (even after settlement and the introduction of wage labour); and even though they have sought, more recently, to run their own institutions and political economic affairs. As Francis and Morantz (1983: 171) note, after almost three centuries, during which the fur trade flourished and then collapsed, and after all of the political economic changes associated with these developments for eastern James Bay and Hudson Bay Cree (and the Inuit), distinct Inuit and Cree cultures persist, 'very much attuned to and dependent on living off the land.'

This complex history of contact, colonization, and resistance will be presented in the following sections of this chapter. The history of more recent Québécois and Inuit political mobilization, and what this means for language use, will be presented in chapter 3.

1.1. EARLY HISTORY: EXPLORERS, TRADERS, AND THE INUIT

Early portrayals of Inuit, as we shall see, were largely negative ones, which produced a seventeenth century stereotype of a savage, cunning, and treacherous 'Eskimo'.

3 This, as we will see, can be traced to contact between dominant, materially superior explorers and traders and groups of Inuit who did not ask to be 'discovered' or traded with in the first place, to the early Inuit mistrust of the powerful Europeans, and their initial resistance to European economic dominance and reluctance to enter into the fur trade. In discussing contact and its effects, it is important to look at how Europeans portrayed the 'Other' and to understand what is being emphasized through these images and representations, how these inform attitudes and change over time, and what has been omitted or obscured in the process.

The image of a treacherous Inuk might surprise those familiar with the happy, smiling 'Eskimo', industriously driving a dog-sled to a snow house. While the 'violent' Eskimo stereotype has not been popularized in either North American or European twentieth century culture, it was a major component of the stories told by Europeans when they first encountered the Inuit.

We can see this image in the first Western account of the 'Eskimo' as a Native 'Other', as provided by Abacuk Prickett, one of the mutineers on Henry Hudson's ill-fated 1610 voyage in search of a shorter Northwest trade route to Asia.4 Prickett describes a group of Inuit camped on some islands along the northeastern coast of Hudson's Bay, whom the mutineers 'met and befriended' (Graburn 1969: 78):

They made great joy with dancing, and leaping and stroking of their breasts: they offered diverse things to our men, but they only took morses teeth [ivory tusks] which they [sic] gave them for a knife and two glass buttons: and so receiving our men they came on board, much rejoicing at this chance, as if they had met the most simple and kind people in the world. (Prickett in Asher 1860: 128; cited in Graburn 1969: 87)

Here the Inuit are seen as joyful and eager to greet the men in the large boat bearing goods that they have never seen before; and there is camaraderie on the boat, an exchanging of objects, a display of the simple wonders of the Western world to the Natives, and—significantly—no hint of danger:

Not one of [our crew] had any weapon about him, not so much as a sticke, save Henry Greene only who had a piece of pike in his hand: nor saw | any thing that they had wherewith to hurt us. [Two men] had looking glasses and Jews trumps, and bells, which they were shewing the people. The savages standing round about them, one of them came into the boats head to shew me a bottle...

Yet this image of innocent, child-like people is suddenly transformed into one of brutal, dangerous, sneaky, and murderous 'savages':

another stole behind me at the sterne of the boat...but suddenly I saw the legge and foot of a man by me. Wherefore I cast up my head and saw the savage with a knife in his hand,

---

4 As we shall see, this account bears striking similarities to accounts of Natives encountered by Europeans much further south.
who strooke at my breast over my head: I cast up my right arm to save my breast, he wounded my arm and stroke my body under my pappe.

(ibid., 129; cited in Graburn 1969: 87)

Four men are killed with knives and ‘bows and arrows’ during what appears to have been an ambush:

While I was thus assaulted in the boat, our men were set upon on shore. [Two men] had their bowels cut out and [two others] being mortally wounded came tumbling into the boat together ... [another] manfully made good the head of the boat against the savages, that pressed sore upon us. ... The savages betook them to their bowes and arrowes, which they sent amongst us, wherewith Henry Greene was slaine out right and Michael Perse received many wounds.... I received a cruelle wound in my back with an arrowe... [the savages] ranne to their boats [but did not follow].

(ibid., 130-31; cited in Graburn 1969: 88)

This is not the only violent encounter between Europeans and Inuit in the early days of contact. Graburn (1969: 77), for example, notes that four members of the crew who sailed with Frobisher to Baffin Island in 1576 were killed by Inuit; and that more fighting between Inuit and his men occurred when Frobisher returned in 1577. Similar stories were described and recorded in the eighteenth century 'all along the Labrador coast'—enough that the ‘Eskimos became known as warlike and treacherous savages', even though many subsequent encounters with Europeans involved no violence (Graburn 1969: 88-89).

Returning to Prickett’s account, at least two aspects are worth noting. One is that it juxtaposes two competing images of Inuit: one of the innocent, simple, child-like Native; and the other of the treacherous, brutal savage. Each image, moreover, is a highly exaggerated one, arguably conforming to European expectations of the inhabitants of the foreign, mysterious land across the sea. The other is that, despite the ‘idyllic scene’ that Pickett paints, initial contact between Hudson’s crew and the Inuit presented ‘an example of good interracial relationships, each group being friendly with and confident of the other’ (Graburn 1969: 87), this is not an encounter between equals. Graburn paraphrases part of Prickett’s narrative before the murders:

The Eskimos gave every appearance of being friendly; so, as a gesture of confidence, an Eskimo came aboard the ship while one of the Englishmen went into the umiak [large Eskimo boat] and back to the Eskimo camp. At the camp this man showed the Eskimos
that his gun could kill more murres [birds] than their snares. The Eskimos greeted the small boat that carried more men to their camp. (Graburn 1969: 87)

The Europeans have both a superior boat (which has allowed them to reach the New World in the first place) and superior weapons for hunting. So begins the introduction of technology and way of organizing, structuring, and viewing the world which will come to dominate encounters with the Inuit.

If ‘early relations with these strangers were ambiguous’ for the Inuit, and ‘often ended in disaster for one or both groups’ (ibid., 88), it had as much to do with the desire for new technology and food sources which would reduce hardship as it did with the fear of and resistance to the intruders possessing these resources. The colonial encounter was ultimately one between unequals in terms of technological resources and the ability to use these resources to represent the ‘Other’. While savagery juxtaposed with child-like innocence could be exaggerated in European discourse, the superior hunting and local technological expertise of the Inuit ensuring their survival could be ignored. Speaking of this unequal relationship, Hall (1992) notes:

The Europeans had outsailed, outshot and outwitted peoples who had no wish to be ‘explored’, no need to be ‘discovered’ and no desire to be ‘exploited’. The Europeans stood vis-à-vis the Others in positions of dominant power. This influenced what they saw and how they saw it, as well as what they did not see. (Hall 1992: 294)

European representations of the people and places they encountered obscured the power relations inherent in these encounters, and played a key role in the processes of conquest, colonization, enslavement, and political economic dominance of the New World. In the emerging colonial system, representation of the peoples encountered in voyages went hand in hand with the way in which these peoples were treated and their lands exploited. How they should be treated in the colonizing process ‘was directly linked to the question of what sort of people and societies they were—which in turn depended on the West’s knowledge of them, on how they were represented’ (Hall 1992: 309).

Early representations of the New World, as exemplified by Prickett’s narrative, often pitted simplicity, closeness to nature, and innocence against savagery and depravity.

It was as if everything which Europeans represented as attractive and enticing about the natives could also be used to represent the exact opposite: their barbarous and depraved character.... There were disturbing reversals being executed in the discourse here. The
innocent, friendly people in their hammocks could also be exceedingly unfriendly and hostile. Living close to Nature meant that they had no developed culture—and were therefore ‘uncivilized’. Welcoming to visitors, they could also fiercely resist and had war-like rivalries with other tribes... At a moment’s notice, Paradise could turn into ‘barbarism’. Both versions of the discourse operated simultaneously. They may seem to negate each other, but it is more accurate to think of them as mirror-images. Both were exaggerations, founded on stereotypes, feeding off each other. (Hall 1992: 306)

Although the Arctic was never portrayed as Paradise, the Inuit were described in the discourse of the early seventeenth century as ‘innocent, friendly’ people who could become irrationally hostile. The production and circulation of these dominant ideologies legitimated European dominance and power over the Inuit in the system of trade, and the dominance of English in the newly created speech economy. This dominance involved access to a larger share of material resources and to the symbolic resources that legitimated this power. In this way, then, the production of these images helped to perpetuate and justify the presence of Europeans to ‘civilize’, ‘educate’, and ‘lead’ the dangerous and yet childlike ‘savages’. As we shall see, this seventeenth-century stereotype changes as political economic relations stabilize.

1.2. THE HUDSON’S BAY COMPANY AND THE ‘HOSTILE ESKIMO’

According to ethnohistorians, Cree gathered in the summer at the mouths of the Great and Little Whale rivers well before the arrival of the Hudson’s Bay Company post, to kill white whales (Honigmann 1962: 7). Following Hudson’s voyage in 1610, more ships arrived in pursuit of material resources that they could exploit for England’s benefit and their own. After the founding of the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1670, posts were set up wherever it was felt they would be profitable and would not be in direct competition from France. These motives prompted the Hudson’s Bay Company to construct a post in Richmond Gulf in August 1749, about 100 kilometers north of Kuujjuaraapik, among Cree and Inuit who had not yet entered into direct trade with the Company. At Richmond Fort, as it was called, prospectors attempted to mine copper and lead ore found in the area, but were sent home after two years ‘since for a Considerable time they have had no Success nor no prospect’ (Hudson’s Bay Company records; cited in Francis & Morantz 1983: 68).

---

5 The sources for this section are Graburn 1969: 78-86; Honigmann 1962; and Francis & Morantz 1983. All rely on Hudson Bay records as sources of information. At times, however, dates are inconsistent across these different sources. In these cases, I have relied on Francis & Morantz, since its focus is the history of the fur trade.
By 1752, the Hudson’s Bay Company started whaling at Little Whale River, about 25 km south of Richmond Fort, since this seemed to be more lucrative than engaging in the fur trade at that time. The post manager at the time noted that the Cree of this area preferred to hunt caribou or deer rather than trap furs for trade; and the Inuit had little to do with the post for quite a long time. The Whale fishery succeeded through the efforts of Cree men, their families, and their canoes. In 1752, for example, the fishery employed fifty men and their families and twenty-five canoes. The hunters were paid in brandy, tobacco, and other trade items—half when they caught a whale, and half at the end of season. This way, as the trader noted, ‘they Cannot go away till ye Season is Over’ (Francis & Morantz 1983: 73).

From records kept at the time (see Francis & Morantz 1983), the original Hudson’s Bay Company post at Richmond Fort appears to have served Cree who were either already engaged in the fur trade at the more southern Eastmain post, or to have attracted Cree who were not really engaged in trapping at all. In 1756, in an attempt to engage in more trade with the Cree and Naskapi (an inland group who were primarily hunters of caribou), a post was opened at Little Whale River. Trade had been attempted with Inuit prior to this, but (as discussed in the following section), relations between the Inuit and the Whites and Cree at the post, according to reports, were not good. Eventually, poor weather conditions, which often restricted the whale hunt, proved to be too unpredictable; and this, combined with the scarcity of fur-bearing animals in the area, led to the closure of the posts in 1759, when the Hudson’s Bay Company post manager in Little Whale River received orders from London to leave the site. Most of the fur trading posts for the company at this time operated south of the 55th parallel, where beavers were more plentiful.

The Hudson’s Bay Company whale fishery reopened in 1791 at Great Whale River for a short time. During the next fifty years, this post alternated with a post at Fort George (now Chisasibi) further south and with a post at Little Whale River until it became permanent in 1857. Inuit continued to refuse to participate in trade until 1840, when an Inuk Hudson’s Bay Company employee from the south of James Bay was hired to entice Inuit into the trade. These efforts succeeded, and years of distrust of and hostilities toward Whites and the Cree, who traded regularly at the posts, ended.

According to various observers, the Cree and Inuit have always been, and to some extent still are, hostile toward each other. Graburn (1969: 92), for instance (paraphrasing Balikci 1960), refers to the Cree as the ‘long-time mortal enemies’ of the Inuit. Since the eighteenth century, descriptions of social relations between the groups have often highlighted hostilities and warfare, despite the subtle, friendly, and peaceful relations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (to be described in §2.3).
The origin of Cree-Inuit hostility has not been agreed upon by ethnohistorians, although Hudson's Bay Company records tell of Cree from the south of James Bay (the 'Albany and Moose Indians') heading some five hundred miles north on 'Eskimo hunts'. These hostilities are part of the history of their people that Inuit elders are familiar with, and is also echoed in historical studies over the years:

Inuit and Creees used to have battles with each other when they first met. The Inuit fled to the north and Inuit fled on the ice heading to Belcher Islands. That's where they are today. People headed north to flee the Indians and settled up north. Creees and Inuit killed each other and the Inuit first fled to the islands. The Creees went as far as Salluit looking for Inuit. That is how far Creees reached up north. I don't know if they still acted like this [when I was very young], but I can remember being scared of Inuit and Creees fighting. I think it was a family feud. I was scared, and I think this is why I remember that Inuit and Creees killed each other... way in the past.  

(Imuk Elder M; SM; Avataq n.d.)

Only Kohlmeister and Koch (1814) state that the Indians and Eskimos of Ungava traded with each other, but even they admit that this was the calm between storms and that trading often broke up into fights and killing. Even these early attempts at trading were probably the results of the influence of the whiteman in the south of the area.  

(Graburn 1969: 76)

Given the Cree advantage of possessing muskets through trade, the Inuit found themselves at a disadvantage, and were either killed or captured (and taken south to James Bay to Fort Albany; see Map 2). One explanation of these raids, as noted by Francis and Morantz (1983: 76), was that the Inuit were thought to have magical powers, and were seen as responsible for periods of illness or famine among these more southern Indians. As such, this warfare seems to have been motivated not so much by the desire of the Cree to

---

6 Interviewees will be identified by their position in the community, by their gender (F or M), and by their initials (some of which have been changed to ensure their anonymity). Interviews published by the Avataq Cultural Institute will henceforth be indicated by 'A'. It should be noted that although gender does not figure prominently in the historical analysis to follow, it is significant with respect to the domains of cultural practices, such as hunting or the gathering of seafood. The gender of the interviewee is particularly relevant in the narratives and discussion of 20th century hardships (§ 2.1.2).

7 Kohlmeister and Koch were Moravian missionaries from the Atlantic coast of Labrador who set out to explore Ungava Bay by boat. They went up the Koksuak River to a site which was to become known as Fort Chimo (Kuujjuaq). The Moravians first established outposts in Labrador in the 1770s, which had the dual purpose of establishing trade and bringing Christianity to the region. The missionaries were also key in preparing the groundwork for writing an Eskimo grammar in the early nineteenth century, which the Anglican missionary Rev. James Peck was able to use in his own writings and translations of English into Inuititut.
acquire Inuit goods or territory as by their desire for protection from misfortune in order to safeguard their own survival as a community. The hostilities may, however, have been exacerbated by alliances between Europeans and Cree, some of which arose from specific conflicts involving Inuit and early Hudson's Bay Company posts. For example, some of the feuds and acts of retaliation could have also resulted from an earlier alignment of Cree with Hudson's Bay Company traders and whalers and from particular incidents between Inuit and individual white traders.

Honigmann (1962) recounts one such incident, which took place in the early mining settlement established in 1749 at Little Whale River. Honigmann notes that this settlement 'included at least one house', but that the actual trading post was established at 'Richmond Fort', to the north. The incident in question, as described below, was reported in a letter by one of the prospectors in charge of the Little Whale River settlement:

an Eskimo 'troubled' the place in the winter of 1754. Soon thereafter a party of 'near Fifty Esquemaux with their dogs and great Sledges' showed up. In his letter... Mr. Henry Pollexfen says: 'I endeavoured as well as I could to make them understand by signs that there was another great house just by where they might Trade such things as they had, which was boots, hairy deer skin Cotes and such like.' (Honigmann 1962: 8)

Pollexfen and his men went out hunting one day, foreseeing no danger in leaving a boy at the house at Little Whale River unattended (Francis & Morantz 1983: 74). In their absence, however, the house

was plundered by Eskimos and the boy kidnapped. Not a pot was left to drink out of, not a knife to cut with, nor a kettle for cooking. The white men immediately left for Richmond Gulf. During their absence Eskimos again broke into the house. They threw out pork and 'Pease,' cut up the beds, and did 'all the Damage...Possible (except Burning it). ' The body of the boy was found by Indians in the spring of 1754. (Honigmann 1962: 8)

Two other versions of this story were recounted by Euro-Canadians to an anthropologist working in Great Whale in the 1950s (Honigmann 1962: 8). One of these includes the following details: (i) the Eskimo attack was motivated by the rape of Eskimo women by two free traders, and their angry husbands attack the post in revenge; (ii) the post manager feared a general uprising from the Inuit and attempted reconciliation by visiting their encampment with a group of Indians; and (iii) the Eskimo men fled and left the Indians to attack and kill the women and children. The other version, recounted by
Harold Udgarten, a Hudson Bay employee born at Moose Factory in 1875, who spoke fluent Inuit and spent most of his life living among the Inuit of Great Whale River. His version excludes the detail of the rape, and is thus similar to the account given by Pollexfen; but reports (i) that there was more than one attack on White employees at Little Whale River; and (ii) that the post manager used Indian assistance against the 'predatory Eskimo' (Honigmann 1962: 8).

The significance of these stories about Eskimos attacking the post lies not so much in their accuracy as in how they have been retold in person and then reproduced in print. The points emphasized in these stories help us to understand the historical construction of the interrelationships and the tensions between the groups that were in contact at this time. In particular, they suggest that these acts of aggression may have been more than merely brutal acts of violence and plunder. Although the actual circumstances are impossible to reconstruct, the different versions reveal how relations of power are constituted in the colonial process. They serve as examples of how stereotypes simplify and naturalize complex relationships between ethnic groups, by attributing and highlighting particular ethnic properties or character traits to groups and thus defining their members accordingly. In addition, the construction of hostility between Inuit, Cree and Europeans served to justify European colonial intervention into the region to 'pacify', 'civilize' and stop the violent fighting.

The first version (recounted by the Hudson's Bay Company employee) tells us about a savage Inuit attack on an innocent Hudson's Bay Company employee who was simply doing his job at the post. The second version describes one manifestation of the brutality associated with colonialism and the responses of the Inuit faced with this brutality. It also reveals relationships other than that of victimizer/victimized by highlighting Cree collaboration with the post. The third version reconfirms this collaboration and the resultant division between groups that are subordinately positioned in the colonial process.

All three versions appear to be typical constructions of colonial discourse, in the following respects: First, the Hudson's Bay Company (together with its social and economic practices) is itself portrayed as 'innocent', although traders (whether they were working for the Hudson's Bay Company or not) could be brutal.8 Second, the indigenous groups are portrayed as either 'enemies' or 'friends': the Inuit (who happen to engage in active resistance to the Hudson's Bay Company) are portrayed as savage, while the Cree

---

8 Although I have no official documentation of trader brutality in the vicinity of Great Whale River, there were instances of traders attacking Cree further south at Fort George, when the North West Company entered into competition with the Hudson's Bay Company in 1805-06. These attacks on Cree by the North West Company traders were used to deter Cree from trading with the Hudson's Bay Company (see Francis & Morantz 1983: 108-109).
are portrayed as benignly welcoming and siding with the post. Thus, a certain image or character trait was assigned to a particular group depending on how well its members served the Company and contributed to its accumulation of profits. This point is brought home by consideration of a 1793 incident that appears in Hudson’s Bay Company records, in which six men attempting to reopen the post at Little Whale River were killed by Inuit. As it happens, suspicions that they might have been killed by Cree—who were likewise reluctant to trade at that particular post and were apparently viewed there as being as ‘savage’ as the Inuit—were laid to rest only almost fifty years later, when an Inuk woman present at that time confirmed that the attackers had been Inuit.

What is important to note, then, is that the Native groups in these stories become unidimensional and reified, and the complexities of the relations between colonizer and colonized become obscured. The stereotype of the ‘savage Eskimo’, as first produced in the early seventeenth century and then reproduced in the eighteenth century, served the interests of the colonizer. If the ‘Eskimo’ were both so violent and unpredictable and so innocent and childlike, then any ‘civilizing practices’ that effected material and ideological change could be justified. Attempts to draw Inuit into trade were not successful until the early nineteenth century (more specifically, when the post moved to Great Whale River in 1813), and trade did not become systematic until 1840, with the establishment of a post at Fort George, about 180 kilometers south of Great Whale River. Euro-Canadian accounts of Inuit accordingly continued to describe them as ‘savage’ well into the nineteenth century—all the while that non-Native traders and the ‘Indians’ of the Hudson Bay and James Bay regions were, of course, displaying similar degrees of ‘savagery’.

Reasons for the reluctance of Inuit to engage in trade has been attributed to the historical animosity between Inuit and Cree, as described above; and the perception that the Cree were aligned with the Europeans and their trade. As Francis and Morantz note:

[D]uring the eighteenth century homeguard Indians from the Albany and Moose rivers frequently made excursions north to the Richmond Gulf area to attack the Inuit. It is possible the Inuit believed white traders were allies of the Indians, a belief which might account for the incidents at Little Whale River in 1754 and 1793. Because they were disruptive to company activities, the northern raids were discouraged at the James Bay posts, but nevertheless they continued until the end of the century when employment as inland voyageurs left no time in the summer for the southern Indians to persist in their

---

9 Although they engaged in more passive forms of resistance, such as preferring to hunt ‘caribou’ for food and clothing rather than trapping marten and beaver for the trader. On this, see Francis & Morantz 1983.
northern sorties... [In 1815, the Hudson's Bay] postmaster realized that as long as this enmity between Indian and Inuit continued, the Hudson's Bay Company would receive no trade from the Inuit. (Francis & Morantz 1983: 118)

With persistence—and the help of an Inuk employed with the Hudson's Bay Company at the south of James Bay, and perhaps brought south in one of the 'homeguard Indian' attacks on the Inuit—the Inuit were eventually convinced to trade.10 Once this process was underway, the subsistence economy began a shift toward being coopted into the market economy. This process involved an eventual alignment of certain Inuit not only with the trading post and its managers, but with missionaries who began to arrive in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

1.3. THE FUR TRADE AND THE FORMATION OF PARTNERSHIPS

White people first started to arrive north by boat. As they arrived, Inuit killed them. The Whiteman [then] became partners with the Inuit and the Cree, and used to receive news [from south] only through dog teams and boats. The only source of information was by writing. Inuit used to travel by dog team to Moose Factory from Great Whale to get mail....

(Inuk Elder M; SM; A)

Wolf (1982) notes that alliances or partnerships between Europeans and aboriginal groups were forged when it was in the interest of the Europeans to ensure their trade routes. Wolf writes that in Southern Canada, the desire for furs on the part of both the French and the English resulted in each of them forming alliances and trade patterns with particular indigenous groups. These groups served as intermediaries or middlemen between native trappers and European traders, and maintained a more-or-less equal trade partnership. This balanced relation, however, 'soon gave way to imbalance' when the lessening of hostilities between French and English resulted in a decline in the 'politically motivated flow of goods from European authorities to native American allies' (ibid., 194). Indigenous trappers 'came to rely increasingly on the trading post not only for the tools of the fur trade but also for the means of their own subsistence.' The trader would advance them goods, which meant that even more labour would have to be devoted to trade, in order for them to repay the goods. This system of advancing guns, ammunition, and comestibles against future

10 Despite the lack of documentation on the exact means by which the Inuit were brought into the fur trade, it would be safe to assume that they were likely offered gifts (brandy or other goods), as was the usual practice of the Hudson's Bay Company until up until 1865 (see Francis & Morantz 1983: 169).
commodities 'tied the native Americans more firmly into continent-wide and international networks of exchange, as subordinate producers rather than as partners' (ibid.).

While the same processes were at work in the Canadian Arctic, the details of the partnership and the alliances forged between the European colonialists and the Cree and Inuit were somewhat different. Despite early rivalries between French and English in the Hudson Bay area (from 1685 to 1713), English has been dominant in the region since then, and the Hudson's Bay Company has developed, over time, the loyalty of both Cree and Inuit trappers (Graburn 1969: 79).

Competition arose, however, in the twentieth century, when Révillon Frères, a Montreal-based trading company, set up posts to compete with the Hudson's Bay Company. Révillon Frères had only limited success breaking the Hudson's Bay Company's long-established monopoly in northern Québec, despite their efforts to set up posts in and secure missionaries for such places as Port Harrison (now called Inukjuak), about 250 miles north of Kuujjuaq. Recognizing the link between missionaries and trade—namely, that missionaries helped to increase the volume of trade by offering services that were valued by the trappers, who had become dependent on the missionaries for spiritual guidance—Révillon Frères established contact with the Anglican Church, offering transport and accommodations. In a letter to the Bishop of Moosonee, dated 1 March 1915, an English manager of Révillon Frères writes:

Dear Sir,

I received this morning your letter of Feb. 25th and was very pleased indeed to learn you have been able to secure a missionary for Port Harrison. We expect our steamer will leave Montreal about the same date as past years, viz., between July 15 & 25th and we can offer passage on this boat. Taking into consideration the fact that it was on our representations that you proceeded to secure a missionary, we will make no charge for his transportation & will charge you only the same as we pay to the S.S. Co. for meals, viz $1.00 per day.

He goes on to say that the missionary can stay in the agent's dwelling, 'which I can assure you, is a very comfortable one... [and] whatever charges are made will be strictly moderate.'

For whatever reason, the missionary never arrived in Port Harrison. In a letter to Rev. E. J. Peck dated 24 February 1916—almost a year later—Rev. W. G. Walton of Great Whale discusses this issue:
Let Port Harrison alone for a time. There are people there I know but not many & Revillon Frères want the missr. for trading influence where the people come nearly always to W.R. [Whale River] each spring.

The historical presence of the Hudson's Bay Company, coupled with its alliance with the Anglican Church since the mid-eighteenth century, made it difficult for Révillon Frères to survive. The competition between the French and English companies ended in 1936, twenty five years later, when Révillon was bought out by their competitor. This was not without consequence for some Inuit, who in the meantime had been trading with Révillon Frères. As Dorais (1979: 71) notes:

This event caused some hardship to Révillon's former patrons who in certain cases, were denied any credit, as a measure of reprisal, by the Hudson's Bay Company. For many Inuit, it was a clear demonstration of the omnipotence of the English company.

An Inuk elder in Kuujjuaaraapik, recalling the turnover, notes the threats directed at those who traded with the 'French' company:

My brother used to communicate with the traders and could even read newspapers. That's how they learned that the French fur traders were going to be leaving. We were told that by my brother. They used to be warned that there wasn't going to be anyone to trade with them. We were warned by the Hudson Bay people that we were not going to eat anymore bannock, we won't get any more flour. (Inuk Elder F; LF)

While European contact led to a shift in economic activity for the Inuit, who began to trap more and hunt less in order to buy food and new equipment, the stability of this system of exchange allowed some autonomy for Inuit families. Yet this period is more obviously characterized by the unequal power relations that arose between trader and trapper, and the resulting dependency of the latter on European goods. A 'putting-out' system resulted in which Hudson's Bay Company traders advanced goods to Inuit, who had to repay their debts in furs. The dependency of Inuit on guns, ammunition, food, and tobacco from the post meant that returning to a life of subsistence independent of western market fluctuations was no longer an option.
1.4. Nineteenth Century: The Arrival of the Missionaries

As time went on, religion was spread across the region. Inuit as far as Ivujivik went to Great Whale to see the Reverend. I have heard Inuit from Ivujivik travelling by dog team to Chisasibi to see the Reverend and for church services....

I don't remember people arriving from the north but I have seen people arriving from Sanikiluaq for church services. (Inuk Elder M; SM; A)

The shamanism was halted by the missions whether they were Creees or Inuit. The missions stopped them because they thought the shamans were more powerful. (Inuk Elder M; BW; A)

The arrival of missionaries in northern Québec is significant for a number of reasons. First, missionaries introduced schooling to the Inuit, in a process similar to that found in other colonial situations. That is, Christian teaching involved discursive practices of moral regulation and a condemnation of shamanistic practices or ‘conjuring’. Missionaries also developed and taught Inuit syllabics in order to allow Inuit to read passages from the Bible. They preached Christian morality, including the consequences of misconduct or departure from this moral code; and promoted the training of Inuit teachers to carry on religious teachings and spread Christian beliefs when priests were not available.

Missionary practices were not independent of trade practices, nor were they isolated from the colonial practices that guided European expansion. Missionaries in northern Québec were linked to Hudson’s Bay Company posts, which gave them not only access to the Inuit who would gather there to trade, but a means of transportation, in the form of company boats. This also meant that news and goods from England and other parts of Canada were more readily available. The work of missionaries and their view of the people they worked with were influenced by colonial discourses which emphasized the impoverishment and childlike qualities of the ‘heathen’, European superiority as regards technology and literacy, and the social-Darwinian notion that progress lay in imparting these ‘advances’ of European know-how to the ‘backward’, underdeveloped indigenous peoples.

In what follows, I will briefly examine the role of missionaries in colonizing the New World and their link to trade; and then focus on the area around Little Whale River and Great Whale River, where missionary contact with Hudson Bay Inuit first began, paying particular attention to the practices and writings of Rev. Edmund J. Peck, who was the first permanent missionary in the area, and significant to the history of the Hudson Bay
Inuit because of his role in the institutionalization of ‘schooling’ and of Inuittitut literacy, which permitted the rapid spreading of Christianity.

1.4.1. MISSIONARY DISCOURSE

Early missionaries in the New World engaged in moral and political discursive practices that were bound up with the political economic effects of trade. Bitterli (1989) describes the relationships established between indigenous populations and European traders and missionaries as based roughly on a process of supply and demand. Although ‘what the missionaries had to offer was seldom really in demand’, their offers of ‘eternal life’ and ‘more solid advantages such as political prestige and technical know-how’ (ibid., 40)—deriving from their association with European traders and their possession of European metals, clothes, foodstuffs, books, and other goods—as well as their ability to communicate in Inuittitut and to train a few Inuit ‘assistants’ led to their acceptance among the wider group. In providing goods, both symbolic and material, the missionaries were performing a function much like that of the traders—although in exchange they received ‘souls’ and Inuit converts rather than raw materials or slaves, and practised their trade through peaceful means.

Historically, missionaries were not independent of the colonial infrastructure. The Portuguese and Spanish of the sixteenth century ‘described the propagation of the Christian faith among the heathen as an objective which justified colonization in terms of international law’; and missionaries henceforth remained ‘exponents of European culture and ultimately dependent on material support from ecclesiastical institutions and from the colonial administration’ (ibid., 45-46). Bitterli (1989: 47-48) notes that it is

beyond question that the welcome extended to missionaries by non-European peoples was due not to their teaching but to their presents and technical skills.... [The] manifold cultural and structural links with the colonial power, sometimes glossed over in missionary reports, were not weakened by the missionaries’ frequent sharp and responsible criticisms of colonialism. It is significant that their criticism was generally aimed at inhumane treatment of the non-European peoples, while failing to question the assumptions that made such treatment possible. Thus, it was a very long time before

11 Although missionaries were not always excluded from profit-making. As Bitterli (1989:47) notes, there is some disagreement ‘as to how far the missionaries operated a sideline as profit-oriented traders’, although the degree to which they did so ‘no doubt ... varied from place to place'.

75
forced labour for Indians, or the slave trade and the slave economy, were challenged and systematically opposed by either Catholic or Calvinist missionaries.

In northern Québec, missionaries followed the trading posts, which in general arrived much later in the Ungava region than in Labrador or the trading territories further south. Although a post in Little Whale River was established in 1749, the first missionary contact in the area began only in 1859, with the arrival of the Rev. T. H. Fleming and J. Horden (Marsh 1964). Horden apparently baptised Inuit at this time, and trained an Inuk named John Melucto to preach to the Inuit who would gather at the trading post in the spring and summer. Horden also adopted the use of the syllabic script developed around 1845 by Rev. James Evans, a Methodist missionary who lived among the Cree at Norway House further south. Horden translated ‘the Lord’s Prayer, the Creeds, and some hymns’ in his early efforts to convert the Inuit who would come to the post at Little Whale River.

Despite these early developments, there would not be an established Anglican mission until Rev. Peck arrived in 1876. A church built of corrugated iron was completed in 1879, and the first service was conducted by Mr. E. Richards on 26 October of that year. Peck often held services in English and ‘Esquimeaux’ during the day, and commented on how his ‘good helper Melucto’ spoke after he did (Rev. E.J. Peck, journal entry, Sunday, 15 May 1881). The church stood at Little Whale River until the early 1890s, when Great Whale River, because of its better access to trappers, became the focus of trade activities. The church followed the trading post activity and was moved by Peck and a small group of Inuit (Barger 1984, also recorded in Peck’s journals).

Peck devoted a lot of time to learning Inuititut, since missionaries believed that the ‘Natives’ could have access to the ‘word of God’ more directly in their own language. With the help of a grammar book already compiled by Moravian missionaries on the Labrador Coast, he was able to carry on Horden’s work and translate parts of the Bible. He also eventually wrote more detailed grammars of the language, such as the Eskimo grammar (1943) and Eskimo-English dictionary (1925). In addition, he taught the syllabic system to Inuit, which they learned and spread relatively quickly. Peck, like other missionaries of his time, encouraged Inuit to teach each other, thus spreading knowledge about reading and the Bible even further.

The spread of literacy and biblical knowledge was so effective that the use of syllabics by Inuit along the Hudson Bay coast preceded other missions established in the late 1800s (see Crowe 1991: 146 for discussion). Although it is said that by the beginning

---

12 Peck consistently refers to Inuit and their language as ‘Esquimeaux’, which he often shortens in his journals to ‘Esqx.’
of the 20th century most northern Québec Inuit had become Anglican, it is not known to what extent Christianity was practised, nor to what extent Inuit beliefs might have been incorporated into the new Christian ideology. What is known is that Inuit were converted to Christianity in their own language, and did not need to learn the language of the church or trader. In addition, their language was given a distinctive orthography, although one similar to that used by their Cree neighbours.\footnote{The syllabic systems for Cree and Inuit are similar but not identical: because Cree’s phonological system is different from Inuit’s, Cree syllables are used in slightly different ways to represent the different sounds. They are therefore not mutually readable.}

The introduction of a formal writing system for Inuit, developed by the early missionaries of Northern Québec, would have effects which Peck and others would never have imagined. Inuit (including its orthography) has become a significant symbolic resource in the construction of Inuit identity and an important element in the construction of Inuit political, educational, and bureaucratic structures. Particularly in the domain of education, the written form of Inuit, which already existed in religious (and later bureaucratic) texts, justified its place as a written language to be taught in schools. Inuit literacy has fit in well with Western concepts of education and with the Western belief that literacy is good,\footnote{Stairs (1990) cites a UNESCO document that states that literacy leads to good things like ‘increased productivity, a greater participation in civil life and a better understanding of the surrounding world; and should ultimately open the way to basic human knowledge’ (UNESCO, in the British Committee on Literacy, 1976: iv).} necessary for development (Street 1984: 183-88), and associated with greater intelligence and higher cognitive skills (Olson, Torrance \& Hildyard 1985). In order to understand the importance of this symbolic resource for Inuit in Kuujjuaapik in the late twentieth century, it is important to understand the political and economic conditions under which the teaching of literacy was initiated by the early missionaries, and the growing dependence on and importance of Europeans in the Inuit way of life.

1.4.2. SHIFTING STEREOTYPES: THE ‘POOR HEATHEN EQUIMEAUX’

In the summer of 1885, Rev. Peck returned to Little Whale River to continue the work of the Anglican church in converting the Inuit to Christianity. Christopher Fenn of the Anglican Church in London gave Peck the following instructions on 20 May 1885:

You are going forth dear brother... to a field of labour where you will often be isolated from Christian society, or at least from intercourse with any other Christians than those who are but infants in the faith, some of whom perhaps though men in years are rather
childish than childlike, and too often are rather a burden and care to the missionary than a help and support to his Christian life.

This passage presents the view from London at the time that non-Christian peoples were, in one sense at least, dependent children in the missionaries’ care. They are ‘infants in faith’ and more ‘childish than childlike’. These images are key elements in missionary discourse, and were coupled with further images of ‘poor’ and ‘impoverished’ heathen souls, as exemplified in the following quotations from Peck’s journals, four years previously:

[February 1881]
The little privation endured seemed nothing compared to the joy of doing even a little for these poor creatures.

[5 May 1881]
... Another band of Esqxs arrived during the day. One of this party I had never seen before. The poor fellow was in a sad looking plight. But though he looked so miserable I soon found out that he had taken the trouble to learn several of the syllabic characters from the other Esqxs and his knowledge of some of the leading truths of Christianity somewhat surprised me.... It shows the Gospel is spreading.

On 28 July of the same year, Peck arrives in Great Whale and writes that ‘the people seemed glad to have me with them again, especially the poor Esqxs.’ Ten years later, in April 1891, when Peck returns to Little Whale River to dismantle the church, he comments again on the Inuit he encounters: ‘These poor people, I am sorry to say, do not show much desire for instruction but I did what I could to teach them.’

Thus the Inuit are ‘poor creatures’, ‘sad-looking’, and ‘miserable’. These images continue well into the twentieth century, as demonstrated by the following excerpt from a letter dated 24 February 1916, from Rev. W. G. Walton, the missionary at that time, to Rev. Peck:

If things develop at Belchers we must have a man, and let the man come here for a year first to learn something of the people and language.... The conditions of the people there are appalling. Any temporary help we give only gives relief for a time and soothes our conscience but we must do something more definite and practical if we could save these the poorest of all Eskimos. The man at G.W.R. who trades for H.B.C. is dead to all feeling and
so long as he gets the foxes, cares not what becomes of the hunter or how he lives. I could fill pages of what I know but we are helpless.

Interestingly, the term ‘poor’ as used by the missionaries is ambiguous, since one can be spiritually poor for not embracing Christianity, but also physically and materially poor—lacking the food, clothing, and tools necessary for survival. What the missionaries had to offer, however, would end only the first kind of ‘impoverishment’. Missionaries could hope to convert Inuit to Christianity, and transform their indigenous belief and value system through the introduction of Western ideological practices and teachings; but they could not directly transform the people’s impoverished material living conditions or the harsh practices of traders who refused to issue them credit when they needed it.

Missionary discourse played a powerful legitimizing role in the colonial process. Converting indigenous people to Christianity and introducing Western values compatible with the capitalist enterprise were considered necessary first steps in ‘improving’ their way of life (even if they never asked for ‘improvement’). Once the Inuit were engaged in trade, and no longer a threat to the traders and the posts, they were presented not as ‘savage’ but as ‘poor’, and thus to be enriched through Christianity. From a Western perspective, the work of missionaries represented progress and ‘morality’ in a world increasingly linked by trade.

From what can be gathered from Peck’s journals and life work, he was a devoted missionary. If he thought of the Inuit around Great Whale as children, he also understood how much his survival and work depended upon their hunting and travelling skills.

In his journal, Peck recounts his trip to Little Whale River, during which he and his Inuit travelers stopped to make tea with an oil lamp. He wrote detailed descriptions of how the Inuk hunter waited patiently in exceedingly cold temperatures for a seal to appear through a hole: ‘How they stand the cold or why they are not frozen I cannot say, one thing is certain I could not stand it neither had I any desire to try’ (21 February 1881). Peck observes later that the Inuit eat seal raw. The Inuit, he writes, claimed that it was ‘remarkably heating to the system. They also say that after eating a good meal of seals flesh they can endure the cold much better than if they eat other kinds of meat’ (Thursday, 24 February 1881).

The journey between Great Whale River and Little Whale River was about 60 miles, according to Peck; and usually took between 12 and 14 hours by dogsled, and up to 18 hours in bad weather. Upon returning to Great Whale River during one trip, Peck learns that some Inuit have killed three polar bears with knives, and comments: ‘the courage of the Esqu. in such matters is surprising. They seem to have little fear in attacking any animal
they may meet with providing there is some little chance of their killing the game" (journal entry, 2 March 1881).

Peck also recounts some of his journeys with Cree and Inuit guides to and from the missions along the northern James Bay and Hudson Bay coasts. On 17 May 1881, he writes about his departure the next day to Fort George (now Chisasibi):

[I shall] proceed as far as Cape Jones by a sled and dogs and I shall there wait for some Indians who have been told to meet me. With these I shall probably walk across the Cape and then take a canoe the rest of the journey. As there will be some few Esqu to the south of Great Whale River I hope to see them and if possible spend some time in their company.

En route, Peck describes spring seal hunting on the ice. He then waits with his Inuit party at Cape Jones for the Cree to arrive. Because the ice has not broken yet, the Cree are unable to travel by canoe and are about two and a half weeks late in arriving. Peck is once more dependent on Inuit hunters for game and for news about the arriving Cree. As his own supplies diminish, he is thankful for the goose and fish provided by the Inuit, which help him and his assistant to survive the ordeal.

As Peck travelled between Fort George, Great Whale River, and Little Whale River he would preach to Inuit and Cree along the way. At the posts, he would regularly meet with whoever was visiting at the time, and make determined efforts to talk to unfamiliar new arrivals. Peck kept brief notes of this work in his journal, and would often comment on what he perhaps felt to be the more important aspects of his missionary duties. Inuit (or ‘Esquimeaux’ as he would write) were to abandon ‘evil’ non-Christian practices and beliefs, and were to adopt Christianity in order to enrich their ‘impoverished’ existence. For Peck, teaching, and encouraging those whom he has taught to teach others, was one of the most important aspects of his work, which the following excerpts show:

[Monday, 21 February 1881, noting the arrival of some Inuit at Great Whale River]
Some of this party are encouraging. They have learned to read and they pay attention to what they hear. Others are far from being as one would wish. They do not oppose the Gospel but they seem to have little concern for their soul’s welfare. These are a class which call for deepest sympathy, and most earnest prayer. O! That I might feel and pray for them more.
[Monday, 14 March]
Some more Esqx arrived during the day... Spent much of my time in teaching. These Esqx being very ignorant and sad to say in some cases indifferent. I have to try and do my best so that they may be improved.

[Monday, 4 April]
Some Esqx arrived in the evening. I was glad to see them and to speak to them concerning their souls. One young fellow whom I had never seen before had almost learned to read and he had some knowledge of Christianity. It appears that he had met another Esqx, who had done his best to instruct him. This is a cheering fact. May such teachers be increased a hundred fold.

[Saturday, 9 April]
Visited the Esqx in their iglos [sic] and spoke to them concerning Jesus and the power of His blood to pay for all their sins. I also taught them the syllabic characters. Besides speaking to the people I also spent much time in teaching them to read. Experience (though limited) teaches me that those who have no help while away generally fall back to their former state of ignorance.

[Monday, 11 April]
Busy with literacy work, teaching Esqx etc. A party of Esq arrived during the day. As I had reason to fear that some of these still clung to their conjuring practices I spoke to them upon the matter. They stated that they had abandoned their evil practices of late. Whether this is true or not time alone will tell. It is hard to look the dark side of the matter but evidence is sadly against them.

[Friday, 15 April]
Had a long conversation with an Esqx who had been a conjuror but who is still clinging to other evils. I told him that he must leave his evil ways if he wished to be saved. He did not seem to like this at all and gave no answer until pressed on the subject. This mans [sic] sensual habits are a terrible hindrance to his salvation. Almost every year he takes a wife and then forsakes her for some one else. Truly Satan has many tools with which He ruins immortal souls.
[Saturday, 16 April]
One of the Christian Esq\x{a} spoke to his fellow countrymen about the Saviour in a very forcible manner. This man is I believe truly converted to God and he tries to do what he can for the souls of others.

[Tuesday, 3 May]
Some more Esq\x{a}s arrived during the day. Among these was one of the leading sorcerers. I spoke to him upon his evil ways and he seemed to show some desire to turn to Jesus. Among other things he said that he had not practiced conjuring for the last winter. This is cheering news indeed. I hope it may prove true.

[9 May]
One man [arriving with others] had met a Christian Esq\x{a} who was a convert from one of the Moravian Mission Stations on the Labrador coast; from him he learned a simple prayer.... It shows that the labours of our Moravian Brethren have an influence far beyond the bounds they may imagine.

[May 12]
One of the Christian Esq\x{a}s named Thomas Fleming accompanied me and he spoke very forcibly in confirmation of what I said. This man has undertaken to teach the Esq\x{a}s during my absence.

[Saturday, 14 May]
Several [Esq\x{a}s] have mastered their little books and seem to take pleasure in reading them. ... Nothing gives me more joy than to know that several can now read for themselves.

[17 June, in Fort George]
Busy the greater part of day in visiting and teaching the Indians. Found them all very willing to listen and to learn the syllabic characters.

[Saturday, 30 July]
Vessel from Moose arrived which of course caused no small stir and excitement. Had the Indians and Esq\x{a}s together in the evening and visited many of the Indians in their tents.

Before the post was moved to Great Whale River around 1890, Peck spent most of his time in Little Whale River, where he held classes to teach children the syllabic...
characters, and held services in 'Esqxl one in Indian and a short service in English.' According to Peck's journal entries, he diligently worked to convert the 'poor' heathen Inuit, holding meetings, lessons, and preaching. He also met with repeated resistance to his teachings. This, however, he never directly stated, talking instead about their poor souls and about how they were ignorant, had little concern with their welfare, and were not interested in learning. Clearly the task of converting Inuit to Christianity in the late nineteenth century was not a simple process.

Peck was the first missionary who resided for an extended period of time in the vicinity of Kuujjuaapik. In his journals and in the letters he kept, one can see how missionary discourse was constructed and how the image of the savage 'Eskimo' was transformed into either that of the 'good' Inuk (such as his 'good helper Melucto', whom he writes about in his journal), who helps Peck with his religious teachings and so forth; that of the 'poor' Eskimo—the heathen, unconverted innocent and 'childlike'. The latter Inuit are 'poor creatures', 'sad-looking', 'miserable', and living in 'appalling conditions'. But they are not savage. Once a system of trade had been regulated, and the Inuit had been co-opted into the world economic system, their savageness disappeared. The image of the savage, which had also been noted by early Hudson’s Bay Company traders, seems to coincide with a people resisting co-optation and cooperation with the uninvited traders in the early stages. Once a political economic shift is well underway, the images too seem to shift.

Peck was also one of the first educators who devoted a good deal of time to teaching and to instructing others to teach syllabics—and thereby the parts of the Christian Bible that he had translated. Missionaries like Peck introduced modern educational discourses to the North, which included formalized teaching, reading, and writing. Ironically, despite their conversion practices, which included discipline, moral regulation, and condemnation of Inuit spiritual beliefs, missionaries brought a writing system to the Eastern Arctic which has become distinctly 'Inuit'. Essential to this process was a belief in literacy and development as progress and as a common 'good'. Missionaries thus set the groundwork for the processes of modernization and of formalized, secular education that would follow in the twentieth century.

2. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: THE INUIT AND CANADA

The twentieth century heralded a whole set of economic changes, shifts in political power, and new types of images and stereotypes about the Inuit. During the time of the fur trade's dominance, the Europeans had control of the market; as the demand for North American
furs decreased in England, and during times when animal resources were scarce, many Inuit were unable to survive by trade. The collapse of the fur trade brought with it a significant economic shift for the Inuit, who had come to rely on the patterns of hunting and trapping and on trading their harvested goods for European goods at the post. This period of reduced trade revenue and scarce animal resources brought with it great hardship for many Inuit families, which even included starvation for some of them (as will be discussed below).

According to some elder narratives, aid from the Canadian government appeared, at first, to be slow, but began to speed up after the Second World War. The first series of changes involved the introduction of Canadian government services such as health care, policing, welfare, pensions, and family allowance benefits. These policy changes altered the shape of the community, with an increased presence of government workers, construction of houses and other forms of infrastructure, and a shift toward Inuit dependence on financial benefits that served to help them through harsh winters when hunting was scarce. These policies were justified in terms of Canada's increasing need, in expanding and developing as a nation state, to legitimize its national status by patrolling, controlling, and conducting scientific research on the land and the people within its borders (for further discussion see §2.5). This process also involved the implementation of federal programmes and benefits, which, in the context of the discourse of citizenship, applied to everyone in Canada. In the Canadian Arctic, this process of nationalization and affirmation of Canadian sovereignty included everything from understanding Arctic weather systems to knowing exactly how many people lived where and in what circumstances.

The Canadian government had been present in Great Whale River since the installation of a meteorological station in 1895. At that time, a geologist, working for the Geological Survey of Canada, noted that about eighty Inuit were coming in to trade in late winter, many of them from the north and from Belcher Islands, and then leaving for their summer hunting grounds in April or May (James 1985: 31). These hunting patterns continued up until the 1950s, through different periods of government intervention in the lives of hunters and their families.

From 1922 there was medical aid, in the form of the the eastern Arctic Patrol, which would arrive by boat in response to reports of infectious diseases, such as tuberculosis, in the area. The RCMP offered its services in 1940, introducing permanent law enforcement and Euro-Canadian judicial practices to the region. In 1947, the federal government introduced family allowance cheques and old age pensions to the Inuit. In addition to the economic effects on families, these bureaucratic processes meant that proper record-keeping,
such as recording official birth dates, became a means of increased control and tabulation of the population in the region (see Smith 1993).

The next big shift, which would permanently alter the political economic landscape of Kuujjuaarpik, was the construction of an army base in 1955 and the introduction of wage labour. The base was, in fact, a radar station for the 'Mid-Canada Line', built as part of an agreement with the Northern Radar Air Defence (NORAD). The base was completed in 1958, the same year that education and more permanent health services arrived in the community. The construction project also included an airport and an air strip (which in 1963 would become managed by the Québec government).

The range and complexity of the changes that affected Inuit during the twentieth century make any discussion of them a rather involved one. A useful way to organize the relevant issues, given the concerns of this study, is in terms of the following three topics: (i) Euro-Canadian images of Inuit during the period up to the construction of the army base and the introduction of wage labour into the economy (which, for reasons which will become clear, will include the early twentieth century stereotypes presented in the film *Nanook of the North* and other media); (ii) Inuit perceptions of change during the time of the construction of the base and afterwards; and (iii) the implementation of government policy as documented by Honigmann (1951, 1952)—an anthropologist who visited Great Whale in the late 1940s and early 1950s—the examination of which will serve as a way of bridging the discussion of Euro-Canadian perceptions of the Inuit and the Inuit’s own perceptions of themselves and their changing environment. (A fourth topic, the competing role of languages in relation to these economic changes, in the last few decades of this century in particular, will be discussed in chapter 3.)

2.1. *Nanook* and the 'Happy Industrious Eskimo'

Stereotypes, as we have already seen, are part of historical processes and change over time. They also change depending on the political economic circumstances of their creation. The stereotypes of indigenous peoples created by European settlers in North America have varied with time, place, and the political conflicts associated with particular times and places. Images of the 'savage Indian' were based on conflicts between settlers and Indians that were popularized in the images of the Wild West Show (which toured Canada in 1885), in popular fiction, and in Hollywood westerns (see Francis 1992: 89-96). As regards the latter, Francis (1992) notes that

---

15 Radar sites were built at various points along the 55th parallel, including one other site in Quebec, namely Schefferville.
movies aimed to amuse, not to edify: they used Indians for their entertainment value, chiefly as villains. Hollywood Indians attacked wagon trains, scalped soldiers, slaughtered settlers and generally created mayhem wherever needed by a script. Little thought was given to historical or cultural accuracy.  

(Francis 1992: 105)

During the same period of cowboy-and-Indian movie production, another genre of Hollywood film, the Mountie movie, was adapted from popular fiction. In these, Canada offered a backdrop for the action, and the writers of both novels and scripts simply produced westerns with Mounties in the saddle instead of cowboys. Though the image of the force was usually positive, filmmakers were less than scrupulous when it came to accuracy. Canadian history was rewritten to satisfy the demands of Hollywood.  

(Francis 1992: 79)

Hollywood westerns created not only historical, but also social myths about indigenous peoples and their relations with the armies, police officers, and settlers moving in on their land. The Indians represented in popular culture were imaginary: they both reflected and reinforced the values and ideologies associated with European settler culture, rather than the social reality of North American indigenous peoples. In other words, these images produced and reinforced the ideologies of Western superiority, judicial authority, and civility.  

2.1.1. TWO IMAGES OF THE 'ESKIMO'

Two principal stereotypes were operating in popular culture at this time. One situated Indians in the past, as brave, naturally virtuous, and noble savages on the verge of extinction. The other pictured a tomahawk-wielding ignoble savage, which reaffirmed settlers' views of indigenous peoples as dangerous obstacles to civilization. These views coincided with the expansion and colonization of the western frontiers of Canada and America. The resistance of indigenous peoples to this expansion was transformed into stereotypes of an imaginary Indian enemy, which in part justified expansion into this territory. These stereotypes also served to construct ethnic boundaries distinguishing settler from Native.

As we have seen earlier in this chapter, Inuit were also represented as cunning, treacherous savages at a time in history when they were not yet integrated into a system of
world trade. As Dyck (1991: 36) notes: ‘Europeans created and manipulated the myth of
the savage as the necessary counter-balance to their myths of themselves and their prized
civilization.’ Thus, the European image of the ‘savage Eskimo’ had more to do with
European culture than with Inuit cultural and social life. Reproduced in art and literature,
and based on European ‘Wild Man of the Forest’ folklore (an indigenous European
‘savage’), the ‘New World savage’ was an easily accessible image to Europeans in the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (see Dickason 1984).

As we also noted earlier, the images of Inuit based on these early encounters with
Europeans were those of innocent and child-like savages. Both these representations and
those of the ‘ignoble’ treacherous savage in European high culture were direct products of
rationalism, the theory of evolution; and the ‘science of mankind’—discourses that
positioned Europeans as more ‘advanced’ and ‘civilized’ than those of more ‘primitive’
cultures (Hall 1992: 310-314). This positioning of New World peoples, according to
European discourse, in a state of innocence legitimated the arrival of Christian missionaries
to convert these non-believers; likewise, their position as ‘primitive’ and lower on the
social-evolutionary scale justified their being colonized and brought into the modern world.

By the late nineteenth century—when European trade had already stabilized, the
Inuit no longer posed a threat to colonial occupation of their territory, and they were
becoming Christians—images of the ‘Eskimo’ created by Europeans had changed. The
treacherous savage had given way to a new and powerful twentieth century stereotype: the
noble yet child-like ‘Eskimo’. Brody (1987: 19) remarks that while the ‘cunning, warlike
Indian’ was being produced in writing, painting, and film, ‘the “Eskimo” smiles from the
sidelines’. The documentary film Nanook of the North captures this contrast. Released in
1922 to an international audience, the film represents the life of Nanook, a hunter and
patriarch living on the eastern Hudson Bay coast. The film was made by Robert Flaherty,
an explorer and cartographer who lived for a time in the vicinity of Inukjuak (about 350
kilometers north of Great Whale). Unlike the Hollywood stereotype of treacherous
Indians battling with settlers over prized farmland in the United States and southern
Canada, Nanook embodied the image of a noble, heroic Eskimo, innocent of the modern,
technologically advanced world. The interdependency fostered between Europeans and
Inuit during the fur trade, and the dominant role of Europeans in its maintenance and
impending collapse, are nowhere to be found in these images. European traders and
merchants, who changed the way of life of Inuit, are thus absolved of their responsibility
in the decline of the ‘traditional’ Inuit way of life. The ‘Eskimos’ in these images are on
their own—hard-working, happy and heroic—faced with the inevitable cultural pressure of
modernity and Western influence.
Brody (1987: 21) notes how the character of Nanook 'was marketed as the irresistible hero of a Shakespearian love story, a man pitted against the most ferocious odds imaginable, brave, courageous and in some sense doomed by the tragedy intrinsic to a life in such a place.' Nanook of the North epitomized the West's appetite for a view of the 'simple' people who lived in a harsh, barren land. The film tells the tale of a stoic, strong, 'noble' hunter, surviving and battling against a relentless winter—against Nature itself. The Inuit in this film are not the poor, dirty, and child-like heathens of the 19th century, but hard-working, diligent, and wise. This romanticized portrayal is undercut, however, by the less positive antics of Nanook as he is faced with the modern technology of the gramophone. In one scene, Nanook is mystified by a gramophone disk and bites it, with wonderment and disbelief. Thus Nanook is at once a brave, courageous savage and an innocent, child-like Eskimo. This dual characterization of Nanook as both noble and 'cute', coupled with the portrayal of life in an exotic northern land, assured the movie international success.

Thus, with Nanook of the North, the Inuit went from violent savage to noble yet innocent savage. It is no accident that the Inuit of the 20th century, fully co-opted into a relatively stable trade relationship, but constantly threatened by the instability of European trade markets and poor hunting conditions, would be portrayed as happy, smiling, and hard-working Eskimos, threatened with the 'loss' of their noble and heroic way of life. Modernity and technology, according to this myth, would destroy this way of life and the ability and desire of the Inuit to provide valuable fur resources for the Europeans.

Significantly though, the meanings that Western audiences might have attached to the portrayal of Nanook, were not likely to have been the same meanings attached to it by the Inuit whom I encountered during my fieldwork. For example, for some Inuit currently living in Kuujjuaraapik, the meanings associated with the romanticized 'past' and the images of bravery and endurance were secondary to the portrayal of 'traditional' practices associated with subsistence living. While viewing the film, one Inuk viewer commented on the respect she had for the survival skills displayed by Nanook and his family; and showed a genuine interest in the earlier way of life, as described in the film, of Inuit living just north of Kuujjuaraapik. During interviews that I had with elders about their recollections of the past, many acknowledged the ingenuity of their ancestors in coping with often harsh conditions. Some of those interviewed in Kuujjuaraapik, born at the time that the film was made, comment on the skills of their parents:
I think of my Mom when I throw away duck skin because she used to save everything. We are only here today because our forefathers and mothers were ingenious at keeping us alive with what they had. That is why we are here today. (Inuk Elder F; AA)

When Qitsuk and her family came here, I came here with them. Because we could work hard all the Inuit people survived. They were even some tents made of fish skin. It was mostly widows or women who weren’t married, their tents were made of arctic char skin (iqalupik). The other skins were light too because they had light windows made of thinner seal skin or the ones that are scraped more. They said that when the rain came down they made a lot of noise because they were very dry, the fish tents. Qimisuliapik was a woman who I remember living in a tent like that. Qimisuliapik survived by herself by going from one body of water to the next, but going over land (she caught lots of char to build her tents and to survive, people would go among trees in winter, but still in tents). (Inuk Elder F; MW, parentheses indicate additional information supplied by the translator)

Inuit were ingenious people. If they weren’t we wouldn’t be alive today. There were many Inuit who pulled through such difficult times because of their skills and knowledge, like the people of Sanikiluaq. My mother explained that ropes were attached to the sides of their tents to keep them in place in the wind. (Inuk Elder M; PS; A)

Seen in the light of such narratives, then, films like Nanook of the North serve to highlight the tension between mythologizing the past and accurately portraying traditional Inuit knowledge and survival skills.

Despite the film’s ability to capture the ingenuity of Inuit in coping with their environment, its perspective (like its director) is not a Native one; and its characters and themes clearly reveal this. The film’s ‘man against nature’ theme, coupled with its portrayal of Inuit as having a child-like ignorance of technology, as reflected in Nanook’s bewilderment with the gramophone, produces and reproduces dominant stereotypes and ideologies about Inuit. Euro-Canadians are thereby ideologically positioned as those with power—a social group that has access to resources in the North and can produce the images that represent Inuit to others. Whether it is early explorers recounting tales of ‘savages’, missionaries saving poor ‘heathen’ souls, or twentieth-century scientists, anthropologists, or film-makers constructing their theories and images of the Inuit, the category of ‘Inuitness’ is constructed and defined historically through the acts of representation of ‘(Euro-)Canadianness’—in other words, through a process of defining ‘Self’ and ‘Other’. 89
Over time, the image of the ‘savage Eskimo’ was replaced by that of the ‘smiling, happy Eskimo’. The latter image was one of the hardworking and good-natured Inuk, who had happily adapted to a harsh land remote from the productive, fertile land familiar to the Western imagination (see Brody 1987: 15):

The Eskimo makes his and her appearance with a smile. Imposed on the stereotypical background of impossible terrain and intolerable weather is an eternally happy, optimistic little figure; a round, furry and cuddly human with a pet name; a man or woman who amazes and delights our European representatives with innocent simplicity. Gorge themselves as they might on raw meat and blubber, a stereotypical Eskimo of the impossible north wages his battle against environment in astonishingly good humour. Ironically, this stereotype of the Eskimo conforms to a puritanical ideal. In the farthest north, fatalism and an unremitting workload in the face of grim circumstances seem to be accepted with a cheerfulness that could be held up as a model to every factory worker in the newly industrial world. (ibid., 19)

Once Europeans decided that the land was virtually uninhabitable for immigrant populations, and once patterns of trade were settled (with the Hudson’s Bay Company, Révillon Frères, and other free traders), Inuit lost their association with savagery (unlike the North American ‘Indian’ of the western frontier, whose lands were desired and fought over for settlement by Europeans). Yet the stereotype of simplicity and innocence remained, and was reproduced in stories and images designed for European and North American audiences.

2.1.2. STEREOTYPES AND THE REALITY OF HARDSHIP

The stereotype of the simple, impoverished, yet happy and hard-working ‘Eskimo’, as just described, was countered by the reality of hardship in the years leading to the Second World War. The collapse of the fur trade economy (caused by a lowered demand for North American furs in Europe), and the subsequent unavailability of credit at the post, coupled with poor hunting conditions and the scarcity of game, led to periods of starvation and illness for some families. Significantly, it was often the women who would go hungry if the men were away for extended periods of time. The importance of men within family units—and the precarious position of women and children when a male head of household was absent or when hunting was difficult—is emphasized in the following passages:
We were poor after that without a father, Agnes was married already. We used to go around looking around for people who were cooking. We had eyes behind our head, looking for food. And people would provide for us. If people caught a seal we would always get a little bit of fat, a little bit of meat. Still we went out looking for people. We weren’t fussy about what we ate because we had so little. Our mom used to feed us skins, and we didn’t have any nice clothes on our bodies.  

(Imuk Elder F; AA)

We used to spend summers here and went back to our camps in the fall. Once we were there and we didn’t have anything to eat. The hunter of K’s family caught a seal but they didn’t bring us any meat. We didn’t have any men left in our family then. That family who ignored our hunger almost starved to death a few weeks later. After that they shared their food with us.  

(Imuk Elder F; JM; A)

The sharing of food from a successful hunt was crucial to survival, especially when animals were scarce and when families lost a male head of household. When men were absent, or were unsuccessful in hunting larger animals, families also sustained themselves by fishing, hunting small game, and gathering mollusks and edible plants. Although family units were generally dependent on men for larger animals and for the European goods received in exchange of furs and skins, women who lost their husbands sometimes learned how to hunt larger game if they did not remarry. Women also hunted smaller animals, such as ptarmigan, as recounted below:

Men went hunting as soon as the homes were settled. Never missed a day of hunting, but still never ate for days at a time. Not a morsel did they swallow food for days and days.... My father and others hunted seals in the middle of winter, being away for few days before they came back home. Men and women who did not hunt seals searched for ptarmigan. When someone was lucky enough to kill one, it was eaten by everyone!! After having returned home with one seal, hunters went back to hunt all over again. We stayed outside playing all day and going in only when absolutely necessary.  

(Imuk Elder F; EF; A)

The general welfare of people would also worsen when fur prices dropped—a situation not infrequent in the fur trade economy, in which the price of fur was linked to the fluctuations of world markets. Between 1925 and 1935, when times were good and prices for furs were high, trappers were well equipped to feed their families and own large dog-teams. However, during the leaner years of the late 1930s and throughout the war years,
the economic plight of the Eskimo trappers was serious' enough that ‘in the 1940s there was starvation among the Caribou Eskimos west of Hudson’s Bay’ (Brody 1975: 22-23). Survival under these conditions meant relying on harvesting what was available, and according to one elder, eating lichen as he had observed Cree doing:

We got so hungry in winters that we would boil some water and drink it for warmth and eat tea leaves. We also had to eat skins, our own boots when we got really desperate. Dog back then was real food to us. We were often desperately hungry that whenever I hear anyone complaining of hunger now I’d say that he or she is exaggerating. Seal skin when eaten could satisfy appetite. We also ate lichen [black sunburst lichen] by boiling it. It could satisfy hunger as well. I like the taste if they were boiled in fat better than when boiled in water....

(Inuk Elder F; LM; A)

One day Saima left us and there weren’t any other family but ours when they left.... I was still small but I wondered how we were going to survive without them.... I used to see Indians eating black lichens by cooking them. After Saima and his family left us, we roasted lichen over a stove and ate them.

(Inuk Elder M; PS; A)

Coupled with the experiences of hunger and poverty among Inuit during the 1930s was the rise in tuberculosis and other diseases. Some of these experiences have been recorded in the narratives of elders:

People didn’t have disease that are here today, for example, tuberculosis.... Disease is everywhere and I think we got them from white people. Long ago, there wasn’t such a thing as tuberculosis. No one was sick before white man came to the north. The only sickness Inuit used to have is infection and they died from it. The infection was cut off from the skin with a knife and if any luck, they survived....

(Inuk Elder F; AN; A)

There is also a time when we lived in Qikiqtajuaq. These days I wonder how I saved all those people we were living with there. They all had measles. I took care of my neighbours and my family. I gathered firewood alone for everyone in the fall. I was a strong person that time.... During those dreadful days I picked mussels along the coast while it was still free of ice. I saved everyone by feeding them a few mussels I could find. I gave each person one tiny mussel and everytime I did, I felt satisfied. It was like giving them a whole meal, one tiny mussel each with a bit of fat.

(Inuk Elder F; JM; A)
Many Inuit died in winter in the place where polar bears were hunted. There was a disease which killed many people. There was a group of people going bear hunting for the whole winter in that place. They were almost wiped out by the disease... Mary's grandparents died from that disease while living on that island. So did Napaartuk's wife and daughter.

(Inuk Elder F; JM; A)

Throughout northern Québec and Labrador, the poor physical health of the Inuit caused concern for missionaries and 'other White colonial agents' such as government officials and health care workers (Brody 1975: 24). Those Euro-Canadians residing in northern communities could see firsthand the disastrous consequences of the epidemics, which were greatly reducing the Inuit population. Responding to these appeals—out of a sense of moral responsibility regarding the protection of aboriginal peoples, as entrenched in the nineteenth-century Indian Act (Miller 1991: 110ff.)—the Canadian government offered medical services, administered by personnel who travelled from community to community by boat during the summer months. Those diagnosed with tuberculosis were sent to southern hospitals, sometimes for a few years.16 An Anglican missionary writing in May 1956 in The Arctic News, a publication of the Anglican Diocese, notes his shock at the extent of the tuberculosis epidemic. In Povungnituk, a community about 500 kilometers north of Kuujjuaraapik on the Hudson Bay coast, 'one of the nearer camps was depleted to about one-third its original size'; 'some 74 Eskimos were labelled for immediate evacuation to hospitals a thousand miles away!'; and in the area between Port Harrison (now Inukjuak) and Povungnituk, 'some 107 natives in all were evacuated to hospitals' in Moose Factory, Toronto, Québec, Hamilton, or Edmonton (Gerber 1956: 10).

The precarious state of those living on the land was made worse by the decrease in game and the scarcity of furs to trade for European goods at the post. The Inuit had become dependent on trade; and when there was little or nothing to trade, they faced severe hardship. These circumstances of dependency on an unstable resource, coupled with concerns over health, heralded a new era of government policy and control over the northern region. We will be turning to this subject in §2.4 below.

2.2. IMPLICATIONS OF TWENTIETH-CENTURY STEREOTYPES

16 It should be noted that although I emphasize the role of dominant discourse and ideologies legitimating unequal relations of power between Southern-based society and the Inuit, in certain cases, dominant discourses (such as the sense of moral responsibility) tend to constrain the actions of the dominant group to the advantage of the Inuit. (Although, as we shall see in §2.4, some elders recount that government aid was late arriving, and at times not very well administrated). 93
We moved to Kuujjuaarpik when my father died. When we arrived here I saw igloos and tents, around that slope there... The church bell was so loud to our ears unaccustomed to such sounds. I remember people praying in a church quite well. People from out of Kuujjuaarpik were wearing dog skin parkas, pants and mittens. There were also people wearing sealskin clothing and some wearing duckskin pants. I remember those people well. The priest that time was Ajuqirtuirjaq, one of the first ministers. I thought he was talking to people with rage.

(Imuk Elder F; MC; A)

Images of igloos and tents, dog skin parkas and sealskin clothing are images from the past—from a time to which one cannot return. For many non-Inuit, these images—idealized and exoticized in films such as Nanook of the North—also tend to define what it means to be an Inuk today. In other words, such images have reified Inuit culture, by presenting practices as ‘objects’ locked in history. As such, they have—to a certain extent at least—produced and maintained ideas or ideologies among non-Inuit regarding both how Inuit used to live and how they ought to live today. Thus an ‘Eskimo’ puzzle (figure 1), recently hidden inside a German chocolate, can tell us a great deal about how the West views a people which has been stereotyped since the 17th century. As Brody (1987: 171) notes, Inuit in certain regions might still build snow houses, travel by dog team, hunt seals with harpoons, move from camp to camp, eat raw meat, and dry fish in the sun. But these same Inuit might also live in prefabricated houses with running water, stereos, refrigerators and microwave ovens, drive skidoos, hunt with rifles, and shop in supermarkets. He notes the ‘great disappointment’ of non-Inuit ‘when we discover that those whom we expect to be traditionalists turn out to drive pick-up trucks.’ He also notes the fundamental paradox that certain non-Native people feel when these same people, who have adopted so many Western ways, are ‘talking loudly about special rights’ (ibid., 173).

The ‘disappointment’ of Euro-Canadians as regards their expectations of Inuit is more complicated than the realization that Inuit do not live in igloos and do not merrily go ice-fishing and hunting each day. This disappointment also stems, in part, from contemporary idealizations of indigenous peoples as living close to and ‘in harmony with’ nature. Once again, we can see that images in question are created from a Western perspective, and more closely reflect the needs of Euro-North Americans than they do the social reality of the Inuit. It is no wonder that there is disappointment or disillusionment.

---

17 Although we can see how skidoos have been incorporated into the traditional ‘Eskimo’ image (see figure 1; albeit, the skidoo in this image is rather old and stylized).
Figure 1: ‘Eskimo’ puzzles enclosed in two ‘Überraschungsei’ (‘surprise egg’) chocolates (© Ferrero 1994).
when a non-Inuk visitor to the North discovers a community arguably as complex and diverse as any one would find in the South.

Stereotypical images can be misleading, particularly since the simplified terms in which they define people are often contrary to lived reality. For example, while igloos have to come to define Inuit for Euro-Canadians, some Inuit living south of Great Whale River never saw igloos until they reached that settlement and met Inuit from further north, as the following passage (from a story told by an Inuk man born in 1919) reveals:

At that time prospectors were [in Kuujjuaapik] as well as the Hudson Bay Company post.... Some people working for the prospectors lived in tents. I visited them and their tents were so cold. I used to visit anyone everyday and to visit I would climb a slope above our tent. The first time I went up the slope I noticed that there were lumps of snow all over the place and all of a sudden someone popped out of one of those lumps. I was stunned when I learned he lived in a lump of snow. I had never seen igloos before. I didn’t even know about igloos and the first person I saw going out of the igloo startled me. I was passing Ningauralluk’s place, climbing a slope when I saw that person popping out of what seemed to me like a lump of snow. That person invited me in so I went in with him. The sky was clear and it was cold. I had never been in an igloo before and I found it very cold the first time I went in but as I stayed longer I began to get warmer. The people in that igloo were talking so much and I found it hard to leave. When I finally got out I saw another person popping out of another igloo. There were also other people inside his igloo. They lived in igloos near a small hill. I guess there was more snow there and so they picked the site to build their igloos. (Inuk Elder M; PS; A)

Notwithstanding the familiar image of the igloo-inhabiting ‘Eskimo’, igloos were, for some Inuit, as foreign as the urban architecture of southern cities.

Other social and cultural practices of the Inuit who lived below the tree line along the shores of the Hudson Bay are similarly contrary to Western expectations. Among these is their relationship with the Cree, which will be discussed below.

2.3. STEREOTYPES AND INUIT-CREE RELATIONS

Rev. Peck, on one of his voyages to Fort George from Kuujjuaapik, describes in his journal in 1881 a noticeable camaraderie and peacefulness between Inuit and Cree, taking this ‘friendliness’ to be due in large part to his teachings:
Although it is not clear just what Peck meant here by 'some few years ago', what evidence he had that the Cree and Inuit in this area were 'deadly enemies' at that time, or whether they were 'enemies' or 'friends' at the time of his arrival, we do know that the stories recounted by Euro-Canadians from an incident in 1754 had been passed on, and that such views were likely perpetuated by traders at the post. There must, therefore, have been little doubt in Peck's mind that the two groups had been 'deadly enemies'.

Since we do not have Inuit or Cree life histories recorded from that time, we cannot get a sense of how much social interaction or how much animosity there was between the groups. However, with the recent recording of Inuit elders' narratives about life in the early 20th century we now have a good deal of information about Inuit-Cree interaction. The majority of these historical narratives, provided by Inuit who resided in the vicinity of Kuujjuaaraapik and Chisasibi (old Fort George) in their youth, do not mention any hostility between Cree and Inuit in early times. Rather, these narratives focus on the sharing and exchange of resources and the relationships forged between Cree and Inuit, which often ensured the survival of members of each group. If there was hostility among these people in the 18th century; there is no mention of this in Inuit narratives (except for references to the Fort Albany Cree raids of the 18th century; see §1.2 above). It is possible that the 'myth' of hostility (as with the perpetuation of other myths produced about Inuit) served a dual purpose for the colonizer: a perpetuation of the 'savage Native' image, legitimating the continued domination and colonization of these indigenous peoples; and a means to carry out this domination more effectively through a process of 'divide and conquer', whereby conflict (rather than solidarity) between indigenous groups facilitated the process of colonization.

Just as the narrative above (in which an Inuk man describes how he grew up without igloos) serves to break down stereotypes about Inuit, so too do recollections of lived experience of hunting, fishing, trapping, and trading in northern Québec, as documented in the excerpts below, break down stereotypes about Inuit-Cree relations:
When I was young Indians came to our place in search of sealskin fat in return for small fish... or an arctic hare. They gave you used or slightly used clothing or fabric for dresses or skirts in exchange for sealskin boots. They traded food for sealskin fat, and clothing for sealskin boots.... If we had a lot of sealskin fat their sleds were full of it when they left. In early fall when we didn't have enough sealskin fat they left with almost nothing. That's how we and the Indians helped each other. (Inuk Elder M; BW; A)

The Cree Indians from south saved our lives. They used to arrive in fall when the ice formed. They brought us fish and we would be so grateful to them. They saved our lives so many times and although we must be very kind to them we sort of ignore them. They came up to look for fat [in exchange] for their fish. They used to leave with a sledful of fat. Inuit collected and saved fat to sell to Indians.... The time the Indians were with us our floor was full of our guests. When the Indians were with us we didn't need to go to the trading posts. They sold [traded] flour, tea, and tobacco to the Inuit while they were visiting. They also sold fish. If it weren't for them we would have died of starvation. When the time came when they usually arrived, we would go out and listen for them. One time we went on top of a hill to see if they were approaching. We couldn't see anything so we finally began to play. We were so busy playing that we didn't hear anything until one of the sleds of the Indians almost hit us. It was night and there was a pretty moonlight. (Inuk Elder F; LM; A)

Indians went to live among the Inuit in Tikirarjuaq in the middle of summer. They never stayed very long. They stayed there only for a short time sharing the hunting place where animals were abundant. They hunted birds and ducks and then went someplace else. They hunted duck mostly in Tikirarjuaq, so did the Inuit. All the Indians who lived south of Tikirarjuaq went to Tikirarjuaq in July. They hunted ducks first, then went to the trading post in Fort George. They spent only a short time in Fort George and went back to their places. And the Inuit spent all summer in Tikirarjuaq. (Inuk Elder M; MM; A)

We lived south of Kuujjuaraapik most of the time before a trading post was erected here. We lived between here and Mailasikkut (Fort George) for a long time before moving here.... We moved to the bushes in autumn in order to have firewood in winter.... Some Indians stayed in Qikirtajuq in autumn and then came to our place in winter. We lived in the bushes with them for a long time. While living with Inuit, Indians learned Inuit skills like making sealskin boots. They chewed the skins and the made boots out of them like Inuit. I wasn't aware that they were learning from us. They could even make sealskin waders.
Indians from Mialasikkut learned from Inuit but Indians from Kuujjuaarapik didn’t. Indians from Mialasikkut were used to living with Inuit and adopted their skills. They were also very helpful to us and liked to get seal fat if there was any....

As I was saying, Indians from Mialasikkut were learning from the Inuit. The men learned how to hunt seals from Inuit until they could hunt seals through breathing holes on ice.... They hunted seals with Inuit until the sea ice was too thin to hunt. Some became good seal hunters and could easily kill seals basking in the sun on ice. Whenever they caught seals, they gave some to Inuit who didn’t get any. They never kept a whole seal for themselves if they knew anyone who needed some. The Indians from Mialasikkut liked Inuit people and went along with them. I was used to being with them when we were living there. We often stayed in Mialasikkut in summer. Even today, when I see someone I know from here, that person tells me that my old hunting or fishing trail is still visible. I was told that this summer by a man who went hunting in Nasissituravik, just as I am told the same thing every year. (Inuk Elder M; PS; A)

Even Indians would go out seal hunting sometimes. Indians very rarely went seal hunting to the sea ice. They didn’t dare hunt seals in spring. It was only recently that they started hunting seal bathing in the sun in spring. It’s the young Indian people who started hunting seals bathing in the sun in spring. They started to hunt seals just like the Inuit. They also began to hunt seals by waiting at seal holes with ropes, like Inuit, which their ancestors never had. ... The Inuit also used to make seal skin ropes for the Indians. ... I think I remember Indians starting to get dogs from the Inuit. I don’t think they had dogs in the past. They lived their own way of life. They adopted some Inuit things. They even started going from place to place like the Inuit did by dog team. (Inuk Elder M; MM; A)

We had to work like Cree in order to survive. I don’t know much about Inuit culture. I grew up in a Cree environment and lived like a Cree. I am starting to get an idea of what Inuit culture really is....

I was raised in a Cree environment and I hunted like a Cree. Hunting skills are different between Inuit and Cree. It was very hard to hunt with the Cree. Hunting and walking was hard when I first went hunting with the Cree. We had to walk day and night to try to reach our destination. It was also hard to haul sleds while hunting. We had to have snow shoes... We had to walk many miles to go to the store. (Inuk Elder M; BW from Chisasibi; A)

These excerpts reveal a number of things about Inuit-Cree relations. One is that they traded with other, and that each group mutually depended on this trade. Another is that
some Cree from around the Fort George trading post area learned Inuit skills (such as hunting seal, using its skin to make boots, and adopting dogs for their sleds); and that some Inuit from this same area, like the man cited above, learned Cree hunting skills.

Thus, early in this century, amicable relations with Cree, which included trading and sharing skills with them, were typical of the lives of certain Inuit families who lived along the Hudson Bay coast south of the tree line. To avoid the harshness of the Arctic winter and to be closer to desirable fishing lakes, some families moved inland, where they came into contact with Cree. Similarly, some Cree families were known to spend time duck-, goose-, and even seal-hunting on the open coastal areas where Inuit lived.

In some cases, a relationship of cooperation and even dependency of Inuit on Cree developed in times of hardship. On one such occasion, Inuit hunters lost their dogs to illness. For a hunter, life without dogs was difficult, since dogs were needed to reach hunting grounds and bring back heavy game, and for travelling to the trading post. In the passage below, an Inuk man describes how, in such cases, his family travelled to the post with Cree:

Sometimes we almost ran out of dogs. Dogs occasionally suffered from diseases. We lived far from the trading post and when we didn't have enough dogs, my father would go with the Indians going to Kuujjuaq to trade.... In the middle of winter our neighbours moved to the coast (to a place called Tupialuviniq) so that they could hunt seals.... We followed behind them. When we reached Tupialuviniq in winter, Indians arrived so that they could get some seal oil. So Indians were our neighbours while we were in Tupialuviniq.

(Inuk Elder M; PS; A)

As the above passages indicate, stereotypical definitions of ethnicity and cultural practices can be misleading, especially when they concern intergroup relations. The stories and images of early hostilities (see §1.2 above) seem to have persisted well into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when hostile relations were not perceived by either Rev. Peck, in the late nineteenth century, or by Inuit living among Cree early in this century. Thus, the Euro-Canadian perspective appears to be at odds with that of many Inuit elders who grew up in the vicinity of Kuujjuaq and towards the south of James Bay. The persistence of these stereotypes of hostility and unfriendly relations, despite evidence to the contrary, has not only justified the moral intervention of missionaries, but perpetuated the view of a divided and hence weaker aboriginal population, which was soon to be under the control of the federal state. The political and economic interests of Southern governments (Canadian, American, and Québécois) in the Northern regions of Canada would be facilitated by a
view of ethno-linguistic groups as unified and distinct from one another, and hence as easier to ‘know’, administer, and control.

2.4. THE EARLY POST-WAR PERIOD

After the Second World War, public awareness of the Inuit and their living conditions in northern Canada increased as the Canadian Government became committed to health, welfare, and education programmes for aboriginal peoples (Dyck 1991: 100). The increased interest in Canada’s policy toward aboriginal peoples was in part a response to the news received from church ministers, priests, and traders working in communities; and in part motivated by national and international concerns. After the war, the latter concerns were related to a ‘new international order committed to decolonization and the recognition of human rights’ (Dyck 1991: 104); and in the 1950s to Canadian sovereignty, control over the northern regions, and resource development.

Government policy in Great Whale River benefited the Inuit in the form of family allowance and relief payments, implemented in 1946. Initially, benefits were paid to the Inuit by the Hudson’s Bay Company manager in the form of food, as recalled by an Inuk elder who was a young woman at the time:

And my mom used to get a little tiny bag of flour in a cloth bag once a month, and one little bit of tea from the government when they started helping Inuit. The government was saying what are those Inuit doing here? They maybe didn’t even acknowledge that Inuit people were starving for a long time. Even when there was a government going on in white peoples land the Inuit were left alone when they needed help. They didn’t even know Inuit existed when our grandparents needed help.... Everybody had a little piece of something when my mother bought flour or tea. There were lots of people at our tent and everybody got a little something when she received that flour. Even if someone didn’t receive anything from the government at this time, people gave them a little cup of flour or some soap. (Inuk Elder F; AA)

As these comments show, sharing was crucial to survival, whether it was the sharing of game (as noted above) or of food obtained from the trading post. Food obtained through government help was especially welcome when food supplies were limited, although the relationship between Inuit and the Canadian Government was not without tension.

Honigmann, the American anthropologist mentioned in ch. 1, §5.6, spent a few summers in Kuujjuaaraapik during the late 1940s and 1950s, and notes that this tension
grew as government aid became necessary for survival. Honigmann (1951) describes the implementation of a government administrative policy in Great Whale River, during the fall and winter of 1949-1950. It involved the distribution of family allowance payments, the amount of which depended on the number of children in a family under the age of eighteen. Normally, these funds, like relief, were paid to Inuit in the form of goods—clothing, ammunition and foodstuffs like flour and sugar, which had become staples of the Inuit diet. Flour, for example, had become essential for making bannock, a type of frying-pan bread.

In August 1949, a government official and an interpreter visited Great Whale River, announcing a new policy of cutting flour and sugar from the supplies normally given to Inuit as family allowance payments. In place of the European foodstuffs, they would provide more ammunition to Inuit hunters, thereby increasing hunting and decreasing Inuit dependence on flour. The plan’s rationale was that family allowances were for children, but that when Inuit prepared food made from the flour and sugar bought with this income, the food was eaten by a whole family, and not just by children. As such, the payments were going to support entire families, and thus reducing the need for Inuit to hunt. This process, it was argued, fostered Inuit dependence on basic foodstuffs provided through government aid. As a government official wrote at the time: ‘Family Allowance is aimed at improving conditions for the Eskimo children—not at supplying basic needs’ (Honigmann 1951: 8).

According to this logic, supplying bullets instead of food was meant to improve the social conditions of children. It presumed that the sharing of foodstuffs among the collectivity for survival was a negative practice, and that money aimed at a certain target group should be used exclusively by and for those people (although it is not clear that this same concern was addressed in a similar way to other social groups in Canada at that time). The new policy was also meant to eliminate a dependence on the trading post, and on the European goods found there, which had been developing among the Inuit of Great Whale for over two hundred years. With the collapse of the fur trade—due in part to the reduction in fur resources, and a changing European fur market — Inuit received poorer returns for furs and became dependent on government assistance to prevent starvation. There was strong motivation on the part of the government to have the Inuit return to their subsistence way of life, to curb the increasing financial burden placed on the state. However, fulfilling this desire—to have Inuit rely more fully on hunting for survival—involved policies such as that described above, that crucially relied on the availability of game and of good weather in which to hunt it, since the bullets could only be put to good use under these
conditions. As one Inuk hunter remarked at the time: ‘the ammunition is no good if there is nothing to shoot. You can always eat flour’ (Honigmann 1951: 10).

Unfortunately, the winter of 1949-50 provided neither favourable weather nor abundant game for a large number of Great Whale Inuit. In addition, a government agent was able to visit only a few Inuit homes outside of Kuujjuaarapik to issue welfare benefits; severe weather conditions prevented him from visiting other camps where families had little or no food. The starvation that resulted in some families led to a growing bitterness among Inuit with respect to the federal government.

Honigmann (1951) goes into some detail about the lack of communication, or the miscommunication, between the Inuit he talked to (especially his ‘primary informant’) and the trading post manager and his wife. He speculates that the source of this communication breakdown was a lack of understanding between the two groups, and the reluctance of some Inuit to talk to the manager about their experiences of hunger and—something very rarely done—their resorting to eating skins and dog. Other ways of surviving which were neither communicated to Honigmann or the post manager at the time nor entertained by them may have also included the ones already discussed in §§2.1.2 and 2.3—namely, through the gathering of sea plants and mollusks, and possible help from Cree trappers, who may have had more food resources (on this see the following excerpt below).

Although the above excerpts from the life histories of elders do not directly concern the ‘flour-sugar order’ (as Honigmann calls it), they do describe some of the hardships associated with food shortages and with the precarious hunting economy. The winter of 1949-1950 was arguably similar to other years in which hunting conditions were poor; in this case, however, Inuit knew that their suffering could have been alleviated through government assistance.

The growing animosity and distrust between Inuit and the government are highlighted in stories like the following, which tell of government officials even discouraging the sharing of food between groups:

Whenever Indian people passed our camp they gave us some food. The Indian man told us not to tell trading post manager or a government agent that we had received food from the Indians. They told the Indians not to give any food to Inuit, Inuit were also told not to give any food to Indians. The Indians came to see how we were doing when they passed our camp, hauling food they had bought. (Inuk Elder F; JM; A)

Such policies were perhaps intended to encourage self-sufficiency among Inuit, and to discourage alliances between the two groups. The federal government of this era, faced
with increasing political, moral, and financial obligations to ensure both the sovereignty of the Canadian state and the well-being of all Canadians, was attempting to fulfil its responsibilities by making what it considered to be economically, politically, and morally responsible bureaucratic decisions. In the case of the Inuit, the government was faced with the collapse of the fur trade on the one hand, and the responsibilities and the interests of the state on the other. The government’s responsibilities included the historical moral obligation toward ensuring the rights and protection of aboriginal peoples declared in the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and in the Indian Act of 1850 and its subsequent amendments (for further discussion, see Miller 1991). The political interests of the government included the implementation of policy regarding the Arctic and its peoples, which had its origins in the paternalistic Indian Act, and which continued into the era of ‘modernization’ (to be discussed below). In general, the policies were aimed at forms of ‘economic development’ and were often assimilative in intent. If aboriginal peoples ‘assimilated’, then the ‘problem’ of dealing with land claims, and the protection of their ‘Hunting Grounds’ (as declared in the Royal Proclamation (Miller 1991: 71) would cease to be an issue. The Canadian government had further interests in economic development, especially as concerned the exploitation of natural resources in Canada’s frontiers. These interests, combined with a history of assimilative policy-making and the moral obligations to socially serve all Canadian citizens (in the form of health, education of government programmes) led to the forced sedentarization of the Inuit in the vicinity of Kuujjuaapik.

The paternalism of government policy was once more reinforced through Eurocentric images and attitudes, which in this case included those of Inuit hunters as needing ‘parental’ guidance in order to do what was best for themselves. The government accordingly did not consider the nature of the interdependent relationships that Inuit had developed with Europeans, and the social and cultural practices that had evolved over centuries of contact with Europeans around Kuujjuaapik, in the administrative approaches that it adopted. The result was a policy of denying food assistance to Inuit for reasons at odds with their traditional food-sharing practices—a policy which made them acutely aware of the government’s paternalism toward them.

In the period leading up to the Second World War, the only representations of Inuit that government bureaucrats and policy-makers received came from non-Natives. Not only were ‘Inuit’ (or ‘Eskimos’) conceived in a certain way for government officials, but decisions were made on the basis of these conceptions. In general, concern for the health and welfare of Inuit coincided with concern for Canadian sovereignty and the welfare of the Canadian population as a whole. Thus programmes conceived and implemented in southern Canada, on the basis of southern Canadian cultural and economic norms and
more broadly Western assumptions about modernity and development (as will be described below), would eventually be implemented among the Inuit of northern Québec just as they were in the South, and justified on the basis of information about and representations of Inuit received from non-Native sources.

2.5. SETTLEMENT, WAGE LABOUR, AND MODERNITY: 1955-1975

The years following the Second World War heralded a number of political, economic, and administrative changes. The first was the beginning of Canada’s Cold War alliance with the United States. Because of its historic economic relationship with and geographical proximity to its neighbour to the south, Canada had vested interests in maintaining good relations, which included collaborating with the United States on issues of military defence. In the early 1950s, as the USSR increased its military arsenal, the United States and Canada signed the NORAD agreement, which paved the way for the construction of strategic military defense sites in the Canadian Arctic (see introduction to §2). By 1957, over twenty such sites—referred to as the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line—had been built.

The economic interests of the Canadian state and of private enterprise furthered development of the North. In the election of 1958, John Diefenbaker, soon to become Prime Minister, ran on a platform that emphasized northern development as a means of ensuring economic riches for Canadians. The North became the new frontier for exploration and exploitation; its huge resource potential would now be open for development, creating a new economic discourse on the developing and resource-rich North (West 1991). Development was progress, and progress was good, regardless of the problems associated with the Inuit and other ‘Northern’ inhabitants who were caught up in these changes.

The political and economic influences on northern development coincided with issues of moral regulation, rights of citizenship, and the need for government control over and accountability to the people living within its borders. An increase in the presence of Euro-Americans associated with the military bases in the 1950s increased concerns about Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic, and brought the living conditions of Inuit into sharper focus. This period was accordingly characterized by new administrative arrangements and bureaucracy, which arose, in part, from increased public awareness of Arctic living conditions and the state’s need to meet its national responsibilities. As the Canadian government increased its presence in the North—in part to affirm and protect Canada’s Northern borders—it sought to fulfil its obligation to deal with the high rates of disease,
starvation, and material poverty experienced by some Inuit in the 20th century, and to implement government services such as health care and schooling on a permanent basis.

2.5.1. SETTLEMENT IN KUUJUARAAPIK

There is nothing uncomfortable about houses.... Today, I'm lucky being in a warm shelter. I [do not have to] gather firewood and fetch water. We aren't hungry as we used to be. Sometimes, there was absolutely nothing to eat. This is what changed our way of life, not being hungry. We didn't have nothing for breakfast and wouldn't eat all day. If it was foggy, we used to be hungry. We used to be hungry when game animals were very scarce. Flour, tea, tobacco and candies were available only when people went to trade. We were living in islands near Patirtuuk. The food we received was gone in a short while. I remember when people started to get things from white people when I was young. It isn't [the] same anymore.  

(Imuk Elder F; AN; A)

The transition to settled life in Kuujjuaraapik, which included the large-scale introduction of wage labour and the influx of large numbers of English- and French-speaking workers, constituted another significant economic and social shift for Inuit. While some of these changes brought increased material comforts (as noted in the excerpt above), there was also a price to pay as regards hunting opportunities and the shift from self-employed status to that of being an employee of a non-Native 'boss'. As noted in the previous section, the creation of many settlements in the Canadian Arctic was prompted by the arrival of the American army and the construction of military bases to be used as radar defence stations as part of a North American Cold War defence programme.

Kuujjuaraapik was one such military defense site, surveyed and slated for construction in 1955. The demand for a labour force to haul construction materials to shore and to work on the construction site was filled by Inuit in the vicinity who needed the income. Some of these material, geographical, and economic changes, from the development of mineral resources to the arrival of the military, have been well documented in the narratives of elders, as excerpted below:

Some [non-Natives] came long before we moved to Kuujjuaraapik. [...] Their purpose of coming here was to look at the minerals their people found but they didn't work on it. I heard there wasn't enough of it. They drilled the mineral and found that it wasn't worth taking. I think those were the first white people to come here. And then planes started going there in summer as well. That's when little square boats started coming as well.
The crew of those boats were part of those people who arrived by planes. [...] A few of the prospectors were still working there when the army started coming. They arrived by plane that landed on water.... We were about to leave the village when Naalattialuk [Hudson’s Bay Company trader?] informed us that the ship was about to come in that day and asked us to stay. We were going to be unloading the ship for less than a week. The ship arrived carrying barrels, cranes, bulldozers and other things. The first time I saw bulldozers clearing the land I thought how capable the white people were. The bulldozers had no problem clearing and flattening the land. Those machines stripped the land flat without sweat and I was really fascinated. [...] The army was planning to build an airstrip before the land froze. They started by shovelling the areas where the strip was to be, in early autumn. A few Inuit from here were working with them part-time. [...] When winter came when the land froze it was possible for the cargo planes to land on the airstrip. We heard they were landing before the airstrip was covered with sand or hardened. We were living near Kuukallak in the fall at the time. My wife, I and other people wanted to see those kinds of planes for the first time. We have heard that it could carry a lot of stuff and even housing material.... White people, not too many, began putting up those houses up there. [...] I don’t think we would have much meat to eat if the Hunter’s Support Program didn’t exist. Animals have become rare since white people came. There used to be plenty of animals around Kuujjuaraapik, beluga whales were so numerous around here. I think they have decreased so much because of airplanes. We used to spend all day in Pilavvik waiting for whales to pass. I started going with whale hunters as soon as I was old enough. We could see whales all day....

(Inuk Elder M; PS; A)

We moved here around 1954. The army people were still living in tents when we moved here. I don’t think it was the year when they started building their buildings. [...] The first job I had was drilling, at first we didn’t know why, but later we knew it was for pipes. They were digging to see if there was permafrost or rock underneath. Charlie was the translator. [...] I worked in plumbing for so many years, I knew all the parts in English. We learned mostly by being shown, and most of the time they were there to see what we were doing. I was always shown what to do, until I could do it on my own. Then I was checked once in a while by the boss to make sure things were all right. [...] In those days we weren’t camping, it was our home. We would leave to go hunting when it was dark and come back when it was dark. Our life changed when we moved here, because my life before was hunting, and now there was a job to go to. I worked for
myself before I moved here, and I worked for Qallunaat when I moved here. When we moved here we had to switch to weekend hunting. (Imuk Elder M; SM)

That same summer we went to Kuujjuaarapik, but I don’t remember how many days it took us to get there. We had reached the tree-line and the weather was warmer. It was an experience to see our first tree too.

We had been in Kuujjuaarapik for a while and there were a lot of soldiers working. There were four of us who decided to work and that was my first time working for a qallunaq. But I left that job in 1955 to attend school—that’s where I learned how to play the guitar. (Imuk Elder M; AN; A)

The army came around 1954, but we had been living here permanently here for a while before they came. There were maybe only 4 or 5 families at that time living here. Most were still just trading like before and staying out in camps.

[...]

When they talked about white people coming, I used to think that life would be the same, the quietness of life. I used to think that I would have everything, like lots of food and clothes and the social life would be the same, but it didn’t happen. I never used to think it would cause trouble or problems. Harold used to talk a lot about the white people who would be coming, he used to warn us that it was going to be like this or that.1 I was younger and I didn’t think it would effect me too much. Harold tried to protect us. But I have lost a lot of my life and traditions that we had when white people came.

(Inuk Elder F; LF)

We moved here in ’55 when the army was already settling in, a few houses were built. I remember feeling sorry for the land. It used to be beautiful grass and there berries. And it turned to sand when they started digging. There weren’t even those tall grasses. It was mostly ground with berries. And in the summer there used be just a few Inuit tents and Cree teepees and we would wait in the summer for the boat to arrive. The people who would be working bringing supplies ashore would be waiting here. And when the ship would come, it would go right into the river, the front would come down, and the women would pick berries for the cook, and traded with the cook for tea and sugar and flour. We

1 Harold Udgarten is often referred to by his first name in elder narratives. He is considered to be ‘White’ in most accounts, but in reality had a Métis mother and a Norwegian father (see chapter 3 for discussion). In the words of the translator, Harold ‘really protected Inuit from White people too, he even knew where women were when they were picking berries to keep an eye on them, he didn’t want them to go too far’.
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picked anything. It didn’t have to be the right size or colour. I can’t forget when the land was ploughed on. Why are this doing this to this land, I was wondering. Just making it sand.

[...] 

We moved here, where white people lived in the spring after my husband died. It was a very scary time. But things change and years pass, and even though it didn’t seem like it was going to be over, it passed. (Imuk Elder F; AA)

Despite the seeming willingness of Inuit to settle and find work or greater comforts than were available on the land, the above excerpts reveal serious drawbacks to settled life (including the increased scarcity of animals, the transition from working for oneself to working for the ‘Qallunaat’, and rapid social change resulting in the loss of tradition and damage to the environment). Some families, such as the Weetaltuk family, described below in an interview, resisted settlement in Kuujjuaaraapik from their Southern Inuit settlement on Cape Hope Island until the last possible moment.

Did Billy get a job as soon as you moved here?

Nearly all his family was still alive like Alaku Weetaltuk, Rupert, still a whole family. The government told them to come here that they are not going to be poor anymore or be hungry. We came on a small peterhead (boat) in 1960. We left behind all the dog teams. There was no room for them. The whole family was told over and over again to move here, but we refused a few times before. We didn’t want to leave a place with country food.

Did you come to a place with less country food?

Yes.

Did they get a job right away?

Yes, but it didn’t last too long with my husband or Rupert. Because the government said they would get a job we moved, when they started building houses. But this wasn’t a job that lasted. So Billy started a canoe factory... everything is still there. Sometimes he passes the time there, he goes there more or less regularly. And there is one on Weetaltuk Island where there is still equipment from his father’s canoe-making and that’s where Billy learned to make canoes. And I know how to make them too, I used to help him, I know all the tools, I was told by the government to learn this in case he’s gone I can pass it on to my children. And there are still little canoes of different sizes on the island, I saw them this summer and last summer when I went down to the island.
.... The army buildings were already up when we moved here. We really started learning about money and earning it when the army was here, even though we weren’t directly involved.  

(Imuk Elder F; MW)

I first heard about the government people, but I didn’t know what ‘government’ meant, so I didn’t know who they were. There were people who came and visited with pencil and paper, they said they were looking for a leader for the Inuit or a council. They used to even pick someone, these people with pad and paper, but it looks like they didn’t do much, the ones that they picked. Because Harold used to talk about what we should do when there were more white people, maybe that kept me going through all the changes was what Harry would say and I remember what my grandmother used to say. I would have been confused, and lost and if I hadn’t heard what was going to happen when white people came.  

(Imuk Elder F; LF)

As suggested in the above passages, there was some resistance to and some reluctance and ambivalence associated with the process of settlement. In addition, relations between the Canadian government and the Inuit were at times tense, and at times full of misunderstanding. The paternalism of the state, along with the political, economic, and cultural tension between Inuit and Qallunaat, planted the seeds of Inuit political mobilization.

2.6. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have provided an analysis of Kuujjuaq beginning from the point of contact and of the writings and recollections of those involved in this process. My analysis has drawn on two types of historical inquiry: (i) a political economic analysis of contact based on world system theory, as developed in Wolf 1983; (ii) an analysis of the production, distribution, and consequences of the legitimating ideologies that accompanied the process of colonization and European Canadian expansion into northern Quebec.

I have attempted to show how the process of colonization—from the establishment of trade relations between Europeans and Inuit, to the conversion of Inuit to Christianity, to the fostering of a paternalistic relationship between the Canadian government and the Inuit, and to the more or less forced settlement of the Inuit in the late 1950s—was difficult and at times even unruly. I have also attempted to shed light on Inuit political resistance to these processes, as reflected in their reluctance to enter into the fur trade and to immediately adopt Christian practices—and, in the case of some families, to move to the Kuujjuaqapik
settlement even after being instructed to do so by the government. In analysing these historical processes, I have shown how colonization and its concomitant changes have been constructed in oral narratives, film, and writings. This historical perspective has attempted to explain the importance of language and ethnicity within the process of colonization and Inuit resistance to it, and in turn the process of aboriginal mobilization in the late twentieth century.

The next chapter will examine the most recent historical period, beginning with the construction of the army base in 1955 and the growth of the settlement of Kuujjuaraapik, and continuing to the Inuit mobilization of the 1970s. This period includes the rise of Québec nationalism in the 1960s, the growth of hydroelectric development and the negotiation of the JBNQA, and the resulting Inuit control of certain key institutions, including control over language policy and education in Nunavik. Inuit mobilization and the development of the Nunavik state, as we shall see, have been justified in terms of historical claims to power and continued resistance to Euro-Canadian domination—justification which has, to a certain extent, involved Inuit appropriation of the European discourses of 'otherness' described in this chapter. This mobilization and its consequences for Inuit at the community level will be examined in terms of the politics of language use and linguistic markets, where certain language varieties compete and are valued in different ways.
CHAPTER 3

LANGUAGE, POWER, AND INUIT MOBILIZATION

In this chapter, I will be presenting a political economic analysis of the relation between language use and the production and distribution of material and symbolic resources in the community. My general aim will be to understand, at a theoretical level, how languages operate between and within social groups in relation to the availability and access to other valued resources—whether material goods, friendship, or a sense of ‘belonging’ to a particular social group—and the power and solidarity associated with these. In order to do this, I will examine how linguistic markets have developed historically in Nunavik and in Kuujjuaaraapik, in particular. I will also be relying on ethnographic data to investigate people’s attitudes toward the languages used in these markets. Particular focus will be given to the individual and community strategies employed in order to access resources within the trilingual, economically dominant linguistic market, with particular emphasis on the role of French as an emergent language of power in Arctic Québec.

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part deals with theoretical assumptions about linguistic markets. §1 will examine the metaphor of the linguistic market (Bourdieu 1977, 1982) and how it can be applied to the political economic, social linguistic, and historical specificities of Great Whale River. In particular, I will discuss Bourdieu’s concept of a ‘dominant market’ and his view of education as key to the processes of social reproduction. I will then address the issue of alternative markets, and critiques of Bourdieu’s notion of a unified dominant market as too restrictive (Woolard 1985; Heller 1992, 1995a, 1995b).

§2 analyzes how linguistic markets operate in Great Whale River. This includes the dominant and the ‘traditional’ alternative linguistic markets. This section outlines the distribution of material and symbolic resources, and including linguistic resources; ethnolinguistic competition for valued resources in the dominant linguistic market in Great Whale River; and the different strategies and ideological justifications used by different groups to gain and maintain power in the region. It also examines the ‘traditional’ alternative market (or co-opted subsistence) market, the persistence of ‘traditional’ values and practices, and the recent values placed on these in the face of more Southern approaches to corporate development.

Part 2 turns toward ethnographic data, and involves an analysis of the development of the dominant linguistic market in Nunavik, and in Kuujjuaaraapik in particular. §3 pays particular attention to the historical development of Anglo-Canadian and Franco-Québécois
power in the region. It incorporates a number of excerpts from elders’ narratives about the past and their relations with English and French speakers.

§4 considers the use of Inuititut as it operates in competition with French and English, and its role in Inuit political structures, set up to compete for control over political and economic resources in northern Québec. §5 investigates some of the reasons why residents of Kuujjuaapik consider certain languages necessary to learn; and the ways in which French, in particular, has recently gained importance in the community. The focus of this section is the access to valued symbolic resources in the workplace, home, and school. This section also examines more closely the relation between employers’ stated language requirements and those actually involved in obtaining employment in Great Whale River. The focus again is French, since this was a topic that interested many people during my interviews with them—one which gained prominence only recently, but which has been very much on the minds of Inuit parents, who must choose to enrol their children in the English or French stream at school.

This chapter will suggest that an explanation of why certain languages are valued in the community and taught in the school and an understanding of the responses to this symbolic domination require an examination of the complex political economic reality of Nunavik, of the contradictions between language use and language values, and of the relation between dominant and ‘alternative’ linguistic markets. This requires both an examination of the material and subjective values or attitudes attached to language varieties and an analysis of the mechanisms and processes involved in the access to and the distribution of material and linguistic resources in the community.

The focus of this chapter is the dominant linguistic market—and in particular, the transitional nature and status of French within the political economy of Arctic Québec—presented through a historical analysis of people’s attitudes toward the use and learning of French, of the use of French in a number of government offices and private enterprises, and of the strategies that residents of Kuujjuaapik are exploiting to deal with this new linguistic reality. I argue that the residents of Kuujjuaapik perceive French as important because of its political and economic dominance in the province and the community since the 1960s. At the same time, however, efforts have been made to accommodate English; and strategies have been adopted by residents, employers, and employees to deal with the sociolinguistic dominance of English and the use of the two aboriginal languages, Inuititut and Cree. Thus, while a few people in the community operate as brokers between English, Inuititut, and French, and a large number of work-related documents are translated from French into English, Inuit parents are enrolling their children in the French-language stream at school on the assumption that possessing French linguistic capital will offer distinct
advantages in the future. Although French is the dominant language in the new socio-political reality of Québec, the majority of residents in Kuujjuaraapik do not currently need the language in order to get by in their everyday lives. In general, then, there appears to be a gap between the perception and the reality of the necessity of having competence in French in Arctic Québec. Inuit who are enrolling their children in the French stream might be seen as allowing for the possibility that French will become a greater necessity in the future. A growing role for French in the verbal repertoires of Inuit residents is thus highly dependent upon the access it provides them to French-language employment and services, the effectiveness of French-language education, and the concomitant acceptance and use of French by Native and non-Native interlocutors.

The sociolinguistic analysis to be given below will incorporate a political and economic analysis of the interests involved in the distribution of linguistic resources and the values that these resources hold for French, English, and Inuititut speakers. Such an analysis offers one explanation of how a minority language is maintained in a complex multilingual community, where language is a key element in the production and reproduction of social identities, in practices of control and domination, and in the allocation of valued resources in the community. This study will shed light on the mechanisms involved in the unequal distribution of wealth and power in Northern frontier communities, and the means by which more equitable and reasonable approaches to development can be fought for and achieved.

PART 1:
LINGUISTIC MARKETS

1. LANGUAGE MARKETS, LINGUISTIC CAPITAL AND SYMBOLIC DOMINATION

Discourse is a symbolic asset which can receive different values depending on the market on which it is offered. Linguistic competence (like any other cultural competence) functions as linguistic capital in relationship with a certain market.... Those who seek to defend a threatened capital, be it Latin or any other component of traditional humanistic culture, are forced to conduct a total struggle (like religious traditionalists, in another field), because they cannot save the competence without saving the market, i.e. all the social conditions of the production and reproduction of producers and consumers.... Analogous phenomena can be observed in formerly colonized countries: the future of the language is governed by what happens to the instruments of the reproduction of linguistic capital (e.g. French or Arabic), that is to say, inter alia, the school system. The
educational system is a crucial object of struggle because it has a monopoly over the production of the mass of producers and consumers, and hence over the reproduction of the market on which the value of linguistic competence depends, in other words its capacity to function as linguistic capital. (Bourdieu 1977: 651-652)

In the above passage, Bourdieu makes two important points. One is that symbolic resources (i.e. discourse or language varieties) have different values depending on the market; so that in order to save a valued resource (such as a threatened language), one has to save the market (i.e. the social conditions) which assigns its value. The other is that education is crucial in assigning values to language varieties and in reproducing the social hierarchy.

While the concepts of symbolic markets and symbolic capital are useful for understanding situations where languages are in competition, and where social groups struggle and mobilize to defend certain markets (to preserve certain forms of discourse), the notion that there is a unified dominant market, and that the school is the most important site in social reproduction, has been contested within sociolinguistics. What follows is an examination of Bourdieu’s theory of the linguistic market (Bourdieu 1977, 1982) and how it has been applied by sociolinguists working in politicized contexts of language and ethnic mobilization (Woolard 1985, 1989; Heller 1995a).

According to Bourdieu, linguistic capital is a form of cultural capital, and both of these are unequally distributed in society. Linguistic capital comes in different forms, and these have different values depending on the market and who controls it. Those people who have access to a valued linguistic resource, such as the legitimate forms allocated in schools, gain a certain amount of social prestige or distinction because they can access other valued material and symbolic resources. Bourdieu and Passeron (1970) discuss the concept of social selection in schools and argue that it is the dominant social classes who control the valued linguistic and cultural capital, so that their children have a better chance of succeeding at school than others do. These processes of social selection result in the reproduction of social hierarchies and of social disadvantage for those who do not control the dominant linguistic forms.

Similar to the concept of the ‘symbolic marketplace’ is that of the ‘speech economy’ (Gumperz 1982; Heller 1995a), where, as in the linguistic market, forms of language are unequally distributed. Those in positions of power regulate what counts as appropriate language use and, in turn, who can participate in the social spheres that they control. In studying how a speech economy operates, Gumperz and other sociolinguists have examined gatekeeping situations in which people are evaluated on their linguistic
performances, and where those possessing the appropriate linguistic behaviour have access to valued resources (Heath 1983; Erickson and Shultz 1982; Michaels 1981). Crucial decisions are made in gatekeeping situations, such as applying for a job, taking an examination, or being in other formal institutional contexts like medical examinations or court trials.

In Bourdieu's terms, appropriate language use involves legitimized language forms, such as those produced and distributed in state-supported institutions like schools and health care services. Legitimate forms have a high 'market value', and are necessary for 'legitimate speakers' to command listeners—'not only to be understood, but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished' (Bourdieu 1977: 648). Legitimate language forms are also required by the labour market for certain desirable positions; accordingly, symbolic capital is directly exchanged for material capital (money and prestige within the capitalist economy). Furthermore, everyone participating in this market accepts these legitimate forms as 'correct', proper, and desirable (prestigious) varieties. This constitutes symbolic domination; and, like the concept of 'hegemony', symbolic domination implies a general acceptance of one language variety being 'better' than another, and involves a 'misrecognition' of domination which makes it appear natural (see Gal 1989: 353-354; Heller 1995a: 160).

Bourdieu's concepts of 'symbolic capital', 'markets', 'domination', and 'legitimation' have gained wide currency in social theory and among researchers working in sociolinguistics and in the sociology of education. However, there have also been critiques of his work, particularly as regards his theory of social reproduction in a dominant, unified symbolic market. Woolard (1985) addresses some of the limitations of Bourdieu's work and introduces the notion of the 'alternative market'. In her work on Catalonia, she argues that despite the dominance of Castilian Spanish in education and in the political-legal sphere, there is an alternative linguistic market, where the minority language Catalan is used and valued. Results from a matched guise test, where respondents evaluated Catalan and Castilian language passages (Woolard 1989: 95 ff.), showed that Catalan was more highly valued with respect to 'status' (i.e. its speakers were viewed as more intelligent, leaderlike, hardworking, self-confident, etc.) than Castilian, the official state language.

Woolard argues that too much emphasis has been placed on formal institutions in social reproduction, and that more attention should be focused on economic relations 'and on the informal structures of experience in daily life' (1985: 742). Her study of Catalonia revealed that Catalan dominates the economic sphere, specifically in the ownership and management of the private sector. The everyday functioning of Catalan in this arena, and in
day-to-day interaction in the community, provides important insights into the social (re)production of power and prestige, more than would any analysis restricted to state institutions and schools. As Woolard notes, ‘competing sets of values exist, creating strong pressures in favor of the “illegitimate” languages in the vernacular markets, and not just an absence of pressure against them’ (1985: 744). Vernacular or ‘alternative’ markets thus need to be considered if we are to understand why, how, and under what conditions vernacular languages continue to exist.

‘Alternative markets’, or markets which operate with different sets of resources and rules (Heller 1992, 1995a), have been studied in the context of Western capitalist states, where material gains—in the form of money, property, and goods—constitute valued resources and define prosperity. Accumulation of these goods has been driven by the private sector and market forces. What remains to be examined are linguistic markets in colonized areas, where non-capitalist economies had flourished prior to contact but in the meantime have, to a greater or lesser extent, been co-opted by an imposed capitalist sector. This is precisely the situation of Great Whale River, which (as described in previous chapters) has witnessed a series of economic shifts: from subsistence living on the land, to dependence on the trading post, to increased integration into (and for the most part, subordination to) a wage-labour market economy. In this particular context, a ‘traditional’ land-based, hunting economy has persisted (that is, high social values are still attached to these activities); but has, at the same time, been transformed, as current hunting, fishing, and other traditional practices have come to require input from the capitalist sector, not only for ammunition, but for fuel, transportation, food, and other required gear.

The way in which language use and the economic sphere are related in Kuujjuaraapik is noticeably different from the way they are related in other minority language situations, such as that of Catalan in Spain, as investigated by Woolard, or that of French in Canada, as investigated by Heller. While in all three situations the minority language is linked to ethnic mobilization—in the face of English or Spanish domination—there are differences in the forms that this mobilization has taken and its link to economic and political pursuits. In Catalonia, where the Catalan-speaking bourgeoisie has historically held power, mobilization has been based on resistance to political domination, persecution, and the loss of language rights. In Canada, by contrast, francophone mobilization in Québec has been directly related to historic economic domination. As Heller (1992) points out, there is a paradox in this situation in that francophone mobilization has been articulated through ‘difference’ from the mainstream, Anglo-dominant culture, even though the rising francophone middle class is ultimately after the same resources previously controlled by anglophone elites (namely, government, administrative, and bureaucratic jobs, entry into
and control over the private sector, etc.). In Kuujjuaraapik, Inuit do not control the capitalist sector; and while an aboriginal entrepreneurial class has come into existence, it is not a large one. This difference highlights an economic fact about many northern aboriginal communities: namely, that they are marked by a scarcity of private sector employment, those positions that exist being controlled largely by French- or English-speaking ‘outsiders’, whose values, attitudes, and practices are often antithetical to those of the indigenous community, and often prevent the hiring of local staff. These values and attitudes are often reinforced by the formers’ perceptions and images of aboriginal ‘others’, as reproduced in the media and other sources (as discussed in chapter 2), which can lead to continued misunderstanding, miscommunication, and tension between the ‘outsiders’ and indigenous groups. The struggle over access to this southern-controlled economic sector is characterized by the interests of the dominant group in maintaining their competitive edge over the indigenous community, and in retaining control of the market (cf. Bourdieu 1977).

2. DOMINANT AND ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE MARKETS

In order to understand the operation of language markets in Kuujjuaraapik—as I have already suggested in this study—one needs to examine the historical and colonial relationships developed in the region and the ideological construction of ethnicity and social ‘difference’ in relation to these historical processes (see chapter 2). These processes include the growth of Inuit dependence on trade and later on the wage economy, Inuit resistance to this domination and to other forms of colonial penetration, and their more recent political mobilization in northern Québec. The mandates of this political activism have been (i) to resist the further assimilation of traditional linguistic and cultural practices into dominant Canadian society; and (ii) to insure that any development on lands claimed by Inuit will give local communities both a say in how such development proceeds and a fair share of the returns from this development.

In the following sections I will examine the nature of the dominant (Southern-controlled) and alternative (‘traditional’) language markets in Kuujjuaraapik. The analysis of the dominant market will include an examination of the competition between English, French, and Inuktitut in the areas of economic control, education, and state administration. In this market, English and French have historically dominated trade and administration. More recently, the Inuit political infrastructure has grown, and Inuktitut has entered into competition with French and English as a viable language of power in the region. On the other hand, the ‘traditional’ alternative market is fundamentally at odds with the capitalist
attitudes and practices valued in the dominant market economy. In this alternative market, Inuit is valued as a means to access 'traditional' knowledge related to subsistence living and to justify Inuit 'difference' vis-à-vis dominant Western-oriented Anglo-Canadian and Québécois society. It is an Inuit-controlled market which values and identifies uniquely Inuit cultural and social practices.

2.1. THE DOMINANT MARKET

In the dominant Southern-controlled market, three language groups vie for power over the territory situated above the 55th parallel in Québec. These claims to power (justified in terms of sovereignty for Canada and Québec, and self-determination for Inuit) also include a stake in controlling resource development, especially in the areas of mining and hydroelectric power. The interested groups have each developed different strategies for gaining and maintaining their power, particularly through the introduction and maintenance of institutions, where certain language practices are valued. Political control and control over development go hand in hand, each dependent on the other. Financial benefits gained from the extraction and sale of natural resources fuel the political process, while the rights to extract these resources are gained through political means. Historically this has been the case for Canada, and more recently for the province of Québec and for Nunavik.

Control over resource development in northern Québec has been an extremely contentious issue ever since the early 1970s and the battle over control of the development of hydroelectric power (see ch. 1, §3.3). Having never signed a treaty or land claims settlement, the Cree and Inuit whose lands were to be affected had a legal right to have the La Grande hydroelectric project halted. However, the political and economic costs to the province of halting the project were simply too high, since the corporation in charge, Hydro-Québec, was strongly associated with the nationalist provincial government, and the project promised to generate both revenue and thousands of jobs for Québec. Political necessity thus hastened the negotiation of an agreement—the JBNQA—between the four parties involved: Canada, Québec, the Cree, and the Inuit. The project went ahead, and the JBNQA resulted in a new era of Inuit politics, which included the development of strategies for control over institutions such as the school, social services, etc., and a drive for a regional form of political independence.

Each language group vying for power in the dominant market of Arctic Québec legitimates in different ways its right to dominate the territory. English-language speakers tend to justify the role of English in the region in terms of its historical significance and its national and international role in communication—including communication with other
aboriginal peoples. English is the language of globalization and of international markets, and holds a hegemonic cultural, political, and economic position, as well as being one of the official languages of the federal state. Inuit are Canadian citizens, and federal institutions continue to exist in Nunavik, where Inuit educated in English fill in their income tax and Canadian pension forms in English. The historical role of English, and its current role nationally and internationally insure its dominance in the territory.

French is the dominant language of the Québec state, and has become the dominant language of the provincial bureaucracy. Technically, Québec has had the right to govern the territory since 1912, when the province’s borders were extended to include the area known as Nouveau-Québec. But the real dominance of French in Kuujjuaraapik began in the 1960s, with the rise of Québec nationalism and of an emergent francophone middle class. It was a period of a rich cultural awakening in the province, known as the révolution tranquille (‘quiet revolution’), and of nationalist political aspirations, including a Liberal government which ran on a slogan of ‘maîtres chez nous’ (masters in our own house). The nationalization of electricity in Québec, under the impetus of René Lévesque (the Natural Resources Minister of the 1962 Liberal government) became an important symbol of Québec independence from American and anglo-Canadian economic domination in the 1960s and 70s. The formation of ‘original’ Québec institutions like Hydro-Québec and the system of credit unions (caisses populaires) contributed significantly to the political mobilization and nationalist consciousness of Québécois during the 1960s and 70s (Handler 1988: 185).

The early 1960s saw an increase in the economic and political interests in Nouveau-Québec. Up until this point, the federal government had held control of the region, partially because of its historic obligations to the aboriginal peoples who inhabited the region (see ch. 2, §2.4), and partially because of the political and economic interests concerning national defense, arctic sovereignty, and the exploitation of natural resources. Thus, when the Québec government took an interest in its northern frontier, there was a struggle with the federal government, and eventually jurisdiction in many areas (such as education, health care, policing, etc.) was transferred from the federal government to appease Québec. This, coupled with the concomitant increase in the local numbers of Québécois workers and managerial class, made the competition between French and English for the role of dominant European language in Kuujjuaraapik more visible. This competition was particularly visible in the school system, where, for a short period of time during the transfer of services, the participation of both federal and provincial governments gave rise to a duplication of services. Control of the school became a key issue; and while French language instruction was not initially popular, the implementation of Inuititut language
programmes for beginning levels was. The provincial takeover of the school system would eventually exert a great impact on the structure of education in Arctic Québec.

Inuit claims to power, and the justification of Inuittitut within the dominant Southern market, have been based on legitimate claims to Arctic territory. These claims stem from the fact that the Inuit have inhabited this region for centuries, and had not ceded it before signing the JBNQA. As soon as development threatened the region and its wildlife resources, which were used by both Inuit and Cree, the issue of asserting and protecting their rights to it came to the fore, and resulted in the signing of the JBNQA. In accordance with the Agreement, a number of institutions and governing bodies accountable to the Inuit population of Nunavik have been established; and Inuittitut plays a key symbolic and practical role in them. Thus, Inuittitut has become not only the language operating in schools and governing bodies, but also a necessary symbol in defining an institution as Inuit and in claiming political power for the population.

The three language groups and their claims to legitimacy and power in Nunavik have consequences for institutional language use in Inuit communities. A major obstacle for Québec Inuit is the complexity created by two levels of government, operating in two different languages. English-language schooling, introduced in the late 1950s, has been crucial to the persistence of English as the dominant second language, and has permitted the majority of those under the age of 50 to achieve conversational fluency in English (and at least a basic level of formal education). The relation between the Québécois and Inuittitut language groups, on the other hand, is more complex. Historically, both have been positioned subordinate to the politically and economically dominant Anglo-Canadian group. This has resulted in additional tension and competition between these two language groups in Northern communities, particularly since English has become the lingua franca of Inuit, Cree, French, and English speakers in Kuujjuaq, while French—though growing as a language of power in the community—has not been as widely adopted as a second or third language. Thus, Inuittitut speakers, finding themselves in a position subordinate to both French- and English-speakers, have had to develop strategies to accommodate this less established language of power, which has political and economic dominance in Québec. The primary strategy of Inuit leaders has been to ‘francize’ Inuit institutions and organizations in Arctic Québec—granting quasi-official status to French, along with Inuittitut and English. This has involved translating official documents into French, teaching French in schools, etc.

The language use of speakers is affected by the strategies adopted by institutions to deal with the linguistic reality of Nunavik communities. Schools teach solely in Inuittitut until grade 3, after which point children enter either the French stream or the English
stream and are taught Inuttitut as a subject. The school administration attempts to maintain a balance between the three languages at both local and regional administrative levels. Other key institutions like the nursing station and the courthouse operate through translators to provide services in three languages. Most services in Kuujjuaapik—including postal and telephone (including telephone directory) services, local government offices, and airline ticket sales services—are offered in all three languages, plus Cree. The only institution that does not really need a strategy to cope with French is the Anglican Church, which for over a century has locally incorporated Inuttitut and Cree into its English structure.

The strategies adopted by Inuit in Arctic Québec to cope with three languages in the dominant market have their basis in Inuit political mobilization. This mobilization has been shaped by their experiences of domination by provincial and federal governments, and by their more recent confrontation with Hydro-Québec in the early 1970s.

2.2. THE ALTERNATIVE LINGUISTIC MARKET: INUTITUT LANGUAGE PRACTICES AS RESISTANCE

Where there are unifying, globalizing tendencies and imposed systems of domination, there is often some form of resistance. When resistance becomes organized, it presents its own unifying practices, which serve to mount opposition and to form a legitimate political body with which larger (federal and provincial) government bodies can interact and negotiate. In the case of Arctic Québec, community-level resistance has been a fact of political life, because local interests have frequently been left out of larger regional struggles. In the process, conflicts have arisen and divisions have, to a certain extent, been created in the territory. Some of these divisions—which range from those reflected in the refusal of three communities (Povungnituk, Ivujivik, and Salluit) to sign the JBNQA to those reflected in the more recent resistance of Great Whale River, Umiujak, Inukjuak, and Povungnituk residents to hydroelectric development in Great Whale River and up the Hudson Bay coast—have been based on alternative practices and oppositional ideologies regarding the sale of land for capitalist exploitation. This resistance to capitalist exploitation reflects the existence of what I will call a ‘traditional’ ideology, a ‘traditional’ economy, and a ‘traditional’ Inuttitut marketplace which is in fact distinct from, though it overlaps significantly with, the English, French, and Inuit capitalist markets.

Just what is the nature of this ‘traditional’ market, and how can we apply the notion of such a market to the study of current politics and language practices in Nunavik? First, the ‘traditional’ market has come to be associated with a strategy in order to justify local control—a strategy that values Inuit linguistic and cultural heritage not only in a general
sense, but also at a local level, where particular language forms and social practices imbue a region with historical, ancestral significance. In a local, familial, and ancestral marketplace, regional knowledge and heritage are not only valued, but become crucial to the creation of a sense of place and identity which helps people make sense of everyday life. In a unifying Nunavik Inuit marketplace, however, local practices that are not standardized will always be devalued. Yet the formation of a unified Nunavik Inuit language market, which draws on ‘traditional’ and localized forms of knowledge and language practices, is crucial to the political struggles of Nunavik as a whole. Inuit political mobilization has been based on the premise that the land supplies a wealth of resources, necessary for the identity and survival of Northern aboriginal peoples. Crucial to the mobilization process, then, has been the articulation of ‘difference’ based on ‘traditional’ practices—many of which have emerged only since the time of the fur trade, as we shall see in the next section—and the maintenance of that ‘difference’ for years to come. Thus the preservation of a harvesting economy has been a key element in the negotiation of land claims settlements and in the political basis for control over the northern territory. The contradictory nature of this market—one which is committed to ‘traditional’ practices in order to pursue ‘modern’ goals such as political and economic self-determination—and the historical and ideological basis of this market will be explored further in the next section.

2.2.1. THE ALTERNATIVE ‘TRADITIONAL’ INUITTUT LANGUAGE MARKET

In addition to the language varieties valued and legitimized in school and other formal institutions, there is an alternative language market operating among Inuititut speakers in Kuujjuaraapik. It is governed by an exchange system of symbolic and material resources that involves localized Inuit language and harvesting practices and is driven by local values and ‘traditional’ skills associated with these. Although it overlaps to a large extent with the capitalist sector, and thus with the dominant market, this ‘local’ market is closely related to centuries-old Inuit experience with the land, and incorporates beliefs and practices which are, at least to some extent, at odds with most school and Southern institutional and business practices.

Symbolic resources needed to access this ‘traditional’ market are acquired locally through family and friends. The local variety of Inuittitut has phonological and lexical characteristics which are not legitimated by school practices (i.e., standardized in reading and writing exercises), although they may be used alongside standardized forms in Inuittitut classes on both the Hudson Bay and Ungava coasts, as well as informally by students, Inuit teachers, and other Inuit staff. In this particular language market, symbolic resources
(cultural and linguistic) are exchanged for other symbolic resources such as local respect, solidarity, friendship, leadership, and material resources such as country food. Prestige is thus based on resources other than Southern consumer goods.

The overlap of this ‘traditional’ or local market with the capitalist sector (and thus with the dominant linguistic market operating in Great Whale River and Arctic Québec) is best understood historically, in terms of the relations between Inuit hunters, harvesting activities, and the material goods obtained from the post (see chapter 2). Since the beginning of trade, the Inuit hunting economy has been (at least partially) co-opted and integrated into the world capitalist system. Accommodation on both sides led to the maintenance of Inuit ways, while at the same time fuelling the European trade economy. Integration into Western economic practices has continued, given that money is needed to sustain hunting. (Dorais (1997), for example, notes that to buy and maintain a snowmobile, an Inuk now needs about $15,000).

While the ‘traditional’ market overlaps to a large extent with the Inuttitut language practices produced and reproduced in schools and in the dominant market, it is distinct both linguistically and culturally from what the school and other bureaucratic domains have to offer. The linguistic and cultural attitudes and practices of the former are linked more closely to a non-capitalist economy, although not completely isolated from the larger Canadian and Québec states. In the following section I will examine this in more detail.

2.2.2. OVERLAP BETWEEN THE DOMINANT AND ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE MARKETS

In a study of language attitudes in an Arctic Québec village along the Hudson Strait, Dorais (1990b) interviewed eighteen people in Inuttitut and examined two underlying (opposing) ideological conceptions embodied in the Inuttitut terms maqarinng and kiinajaliurutit. The former, which Dorais translates as ‘going on the land’ (for hunting, fishing, or trapping), is ‘the activity most essential to the preservation of native identity’; while the latter, which he translates as ‘means for making money’ (i.e. abilities related to wage work), ‘do not stem from Inuit culture’, but are ‘introduced, taught and controlled by White people.... This is why the best place to learn them is at school, whose prime function seems to be the transmission of some useful kiinajaliurutit’ (Dorais 1990b: 12).

The majority of our respondents assert that without maqarinng, the Inuit would not be Inuit anymore. Maqarinng is taught to children and young people within the extended family and is conducted in Inuktutit. Most informants consider it as the occasion par excellence for learning and practicing the native language.... Since kiinajaliurutit are
basically White people affairs, the White people's languages, English and French, are two of the most useful 'means for making money'. It is thus considered normal if the main school languages are those of the non-Inuit. (Dorais 1990b: 12-13)

In other words, moquinniq is associated with 'traditional culture' and Inuititut; and kiinaujaliuruit with 'contemporary life' and with French and English, the languages needed to cope in the modern world.

These two ideological systems, which are embedded in the knowledge and practices associated with 'going on the land' and 'making money', may represent oppositional constructs for Inuit, but they do not form a simple dichotomy. The actual overlaps and divisions between the 'Inuit way of life' and the 'White people's way of life' are much more complex, as are the linguistic markets in which forms of Inuititut, English, and French are valued.

We might see these two ideological systems as stemming from two different economic systems—a hunting economy and a capitalist economy—which have been linked in complex ways since the days of the fur trade, the domination of European traders, and increased dependence of Inuit on European goods. Inuit have historically been provided with opportunities to participate in the newly imposed modern structures, but on terms set by the colonizers. This resulted in major transformations in the Inuit way of life, as Inuit accommodated the trader by hunting for fur-bearing animals, and learned to read in syllabics as part of Christian practice (thus further accommodating to European power). Although Inuit resisted this domination to varying degrees, their dependence on ammunition, foodstuffs, and other products from the post necessarily linked their subsistence culture to the world capitalist system. Conversion to Christianity created further dependence, as Inuit sought contact with missionaries, who made regular visits to the post or were stationed there (see ch. 2, §1.4.1 for more detailed discussion on this issue).

Despite the effects of contact, however, the Inuit hunting economy was not completely co-opted and unified into the market economy. An Inuit-dominant 'traditional' way of life has persisted, which includes valued linguistic and other cultural practices that are exchanged for material and symbolic resources necessary for the survival of the group and of the hunting economy. Among the most important cultural practices is the use of the syllabary developed by nineteenth-century missionaries, which for some has been synonymous with being Inuk (on this, see the discussion in §4.3 below). Thus, while certain cultural practices have been introduced or modified through contact with non-
Natives, they have been sufficiently integrated into Inuit cultural practices that they are still identified as 'Inuit'.

Cultural, economic, and linguistic practices associated with being Inuk constitute a partially co-opted economic market, since the primary producers (Inuit engaging in a 'traditional' hunting economy) have been dependent upon the English-dominant capitalist trade economy for goods and for spiritual, medical, and educational resources, yet operate according to a non-capitalist, 'Inuit' world-view (on this, see e.g. Brody 1975, 1987). Inuit 'difference' (as defined by Inuit themselves and others) is constructed to maintain distinct Inuit identities and an Inuit way of life.

Activities such as mining and hydroelectric power development, given their serious environmental effects, are clearly at odds with the actual 'traditional' hunting economy. The former sphere values practices associated with international business and financial markets, and negotiations with government leaders; while the latter values local Inuit and cultural practices, linked to values associated with a centuries-old hunting and harvesting way of life. The social processes and practices of the 'traditional' hunting economy are quite distinct from 'modern' Inuit political organization, although the two are interdependent—each necessary to insure the 'Inuit way of life'. The traditional hunting economy, and the costs involved in buying and maintaining snowmobiles, boats, and other equipment, could not be sustained to the extent that it is today without the financial resources made available to Inuit through political mobilization, negotiated settlements, and financial investment. A by-product of mobilization has been the creation of municipal jobs servicing the community and maintaining a cash flow into the local economy.

One way in which the hunting economy has been linked to the Inuit regional government, and thus to capitalist enterprise, is through a programme set up to support Inuit hunters. This programme, described in the JBNQA, 'is established for Inuit hunting, fishing and trapping... to guarantee a supply of hunting, fishing and trapping produce to Inuit who are disadvantaged and who cannot hunt, fish and trap for themselves or otherwise obtain such produce' (Government of Québec 1991: §29.0.5, 427). This programme makes it possible for hunters to sell their fish and game to the Municipal Council, which is allotted money for this purpose, based on the conditions outlined in the JBNQA (ibid., 427-430). The meat or fish is then placed in a community freezer for all of the Inuit in the community to use. The hunter receives a cash settlement, paid according the weight of his catch. There is thus a direct exchange of money for meat obtained through traditional hunting practices (which make use of knowledge about where game may be found, hunting skills to catch the game, and the camping skills needed to spend a number of nights away from the village). The Hunter's Support programme (as it is commonly
known) thus promotes continued hunting in Nunavik. It is an institutionalized means by which the traditional hunting economy overlaps with the capitalist market (where harvested produce is exchanged for money).

Inuititut language use in the dominant, Southern-controlled market, like hunting in the ‘traditional’ market, is controlled by Inuit and financially supported with monies obtained from the negotiated JBNQA settlement and from subsequent private investment. Inuititut-speaking participants in the dominant sphere claim ‘authenticity’ from the traditional Inuit market; yet its operation remains both linguistically and economically distinct from localized Inuit practices. In the dominant market, processes of Inuititut standardization create new forms of language to be valued and exchanged in emerging institutional and political arenas. These processes are technically run by Inuit for Inuit, although they are complicated by the conflicting symbolic practices of those who accept the ‘traditional’ hunting and community practices on a full-time basis and those who have become key players in the political and institutional arenas of the South. Both Makivik Corporation (the key Inuit political and economic governing body) and the Kativik School Board (considered a key institution in the emerging territory of Nunavik) are based in the Montréal area. Inuit working in these southern organizations have the difficult role of balancing being ‘Inuit’, or holding what might be considered ‘traditional’ Inuit values, and being legitimate players in a Western capitalist society. There is thus a tension between the claim to ‘authenticity’—participating in ‘authentic’ Inuit symbolic practices—and the claim to Western legitimacy, which involves understanding the rules and possessing the necessary symbolic resources to operate effectively in the English- and French-dominant political economic arenas.

2.2.3. THE ALTERNATIVE ‘TRADITIONAL’ MARKET: A LINGUISTIC PARADOX

The linguistic reality of Arctic Québec results in a fundamental paradox for the Inuit. This is that they must be able to compete economically and politically according to Euro-Canadian rules (which includes communicating in English or French), yet must somehow remain distinctively ‘Inuit’ while doing so, in order to justify their claims to territory and power. The paradox surfaces most obviously in Inuit-run institutions in which Inuit adopt Southern strategies in order to compete with Québec and Canadian interests, even while Inuit mobilization is being legitimized through ‘distinctive’ practices which are at odds with Southern interests. Thus, Inuit must rely ideologically, culturally, and linguistically on the alternative Inuit symbolic market, where ‘traditional’ activities are accessed exclusively through Inuititut. In this alternative market, value is placed on ‘alternative’ forms of
cultural knowledge, as opposed to the type of knowledge that one can learn in schools and use in business. But these ‘alternative’ practices and values appear to create more conflict for those Inuit trying to reconcile both systems of knowledge.

To summarize: in the dominant social and political arena, French-, English-, and Inuititut-speaking players each want to have a say in the future of Northern economic, social, and political development, in order to secure an economic base and fulfill economic interests for Québec, Canada and Nunavik respectively. In northern Québec, aboriginal peoples who have inhabited the region for centuries often view development (and the way in which it should proceed) differently from Southern Canadian business interests. In particular, the destruction of large tracts of land is not in the interests of those who continue to rely heavily on harvested game from the region. However, Inuit want and need economic resources gained in the Southern dominant market in order to preserve their ‘traditional’ way of life, which has been the basis of constructing notions of ‘difference’ and legitimizing claims to political and economic power in the region. Thus, those Inuit vying for control over development need the support of the hunters and trappers to have political legitimacy and a status as ‘authentic’ Inuit. That is, to maintain legitimacy among the Inuit population, political leaders and those working for Makivik must remain ‘Inuit’. Ideally they must still have a stake in the hunting economy in order to pass as Inuit in the eyes of those they are serving. This fundamental paradox of simultaneously working for and away from the cultural survival of Inuit economic, cultural, and linguistic practices is crucial to understanding the operation of all Inuit institutions, including the school.

The persistence of the values, meanings, and practices associated with the hunting economy is due, in large part, to historical localized resistance in the fifteen Nunavik communities. This includes resistance to centuries of colonial practices and to current processes of institutionalizing Inuit language and culture. This is not to say that the hunting economy cannot benefit from the emerging institutionalized practices controlled and developed by Inuit (such as environmental protection measures or financial assistance to continue harvesting), but it does mean that there will be contradictions—in approaches to land use and in the way Inuit subjects construct their identities and develop ways to define ‘Inuitness’.

---

1 The Québec state also legitimizes its claims by appealing to its ‘distinctiveness’ vis-à-vis the dominant English sphere, although it is, in fact, competing with the Canadian state and the Inuit for the same resources.

2 There are fifteen Inuit communities if we include Chisasibi, which has a small Inuit population. Some members from this community moved to Kuujjuaq when the island community of Fort George was relocated to the mainland in the early 1980s, due to the environmental effects of hydroelectric development on La Grande River.
PART 2: 
THE DOMINANT SOUTHERN MARKET

This part of chapter 3 examines ethnographic data on the historical development of and current participation of Inuit in the dominant linguistic market. It is divided into four sections. The first will look at how French and English came to be in competition with each other, and local perspectives on these developments. The three sections that follow it will respectively examine three key arenas where certain symbolic resources are valued, access to which is a concern of local residents. These are Inuittut standardization, strategies involved in gaining access to French, and the languages needed in the job market.

3. COMPETITION BETWEEN ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Learning how to speak and write in English is very useful, but elderly people have not been taught in English. They must have interpreters and white people who arrive in our village also should have interpreters because they do not know how to speak in Inuittut. In the past, people did not have any knowledge of how to speak in English. That is why learning how to speak and write in English is very useful today. I think education is important because our children cannot go back to our lifestyle in the past and they have jobs also. (Inuk Elder M; SM: A)

English is the most ‘threatening’ of the dominant languages in Arctic Québec for those concerned with the maintenance of Inuittut as a minority language. This is because of its historic role in colonization, as the language of traders, missionaries, and federal agents; and because of the power associated with it and the introduction of the market economy to the region. The power associated with English is reflected in the role of the Hudson’s Bay Company traders, who had immense discretionary power to administer credit and to fix the prices of furs. These prices fluctuated from year to year for the Inuit hunter, who was thus dependent both on an unstable resource and on the unpredictable non-Native traders at the post. This situation created ‘a kind of fear, a blend of awe and intimidation’, of the trader, and later of missionaries and police (Brody 1977: 10-11). It was a kind of fear or ilira—‘the feeling you have about a person whose behaviour you can neither control nor predict’ (ibid., 10) —associated with those who spoke English.

The dominance of English has been further maintained by globalization and the role of English in the North American economy, culture, and media. As noted above, English is
also the lingua franca of Great Whale River (due largely to the historical dominance of English in schooling), and is thus a prerequisite for any employment that involves contact with people from different groups, such as in the public and service sectors. As the elder quoted above notes, English is associated with education, wage labour, and the present day. It is 'useful' for young people who must now operate in the wage economy and cannot return to the past. The utility of English, however, does not outweigh the importance of Inuititut; it is merely a prerequisite for success in the job markets and bureaucracies of the modern world.

While English has been a language of power in Arctic Québec since contact, French has had such a status only in this century. In the vicinity of Kuujjuaraapik, the Révillon Frères trading company set up a post in 1920-1921. This was followed by a Roman Catholic mission in 1924 and then by Church-run schools for Cree and Inuit in Chisasibi. However, it was not until the 1950s, when the army base was being constructed, that larger groups of French-speaking employees made their presence known. The trend toward a greater French-speaking presence continued throughout the 1960s and 1970s, especially as areas under the jurisdiction of the federal Department of Northern Affairs were transferred to the province.

French speakers were, for all intents and purposes, a distinct group of 'Whiteman'—they were 'White' Europeans, but initially held a noticeably less powerful position than the English. This is described in the following excerpts of interviews with Inuit elders. The first passage reveals the competitive nature of the trading companies—how the Hudson’s Bay Company threatened Inuit who traded regularly with Révillon Frères by warning them that they would now have no one to trade with:

When my family came to Kuujjuaraapik to trade, there were two groups of traders: the French and the Hudson Bay. As long as I can remember, there were always those white people.... My eldest brother told us that the French traders were going to leave, so he was able to prepare us. He was in the hospital when he was young and broke his arm and learned some English. My brother left before I could remember and came back when there were two other young ones after me.3 He used to communicate with the traders and could even read newspapers. That’s how we learned that the fur traders were going to be leaving, we were told that by my brother. We were warned that there wasn’t going to be anyone to trade with us. We were warned by the Hudson Bay people that we were not going to eat anymore bannock, we won’t get any more flour. (Inuk Elder F; LF)

3 Her brother apparently went away a few years, and may have had tuberculosis, although she does not specifically say this.
In the following passages, elders mention the Roman Catholic school in Chisasibi, which tried to recruit students from the area of Kuujjuaapik:

The only French people I heard of were at the school in Chisasibi. Harold and our parents didn’t want myself or the other children who were my age to go. Harold said we would turn into Frenchmen. Three Inuit that I know and some Cree people went to the Chisasibi school. It was a Roman Catholic school, but I think they taught in English. Harold used to say that he didn’t want the children of Great Whale to go away.

(Inuk Elder M; SM)

... I know there was a school in Chisasibi before Great Whale. Students were sought here in Great Whale to get education in Chisasibi, but [those looking for students] were not successful in getting people to go to Chisasibi. The teachers found two persons from Richmond Gulf who would go to school in Chisasibi. I don’t know how much they both learned.

(Inuk Elder M; SM; A)

From these early recollections of trade and education, it is apparent that the social category of ‘French people’ had been constructed, although actual contact with French speakers, as either instructors or traders, was minimal. The ‘French trading company’ lost out in competition with the Hudson’s Bay Company, and the Inuit children of Kuujjuaapik were discouraged from going to the school in Chisasibi, perhaps in part because of the distance from home, and perhaps because of the seeming distrust among Inuit of French speakers and Catholicism, perpetuated by people like Harold and the Anglican church, which had already firmly established itself in the region. This feeling of distrust and distance seems to have continued into the 1960s and 1970s, when francophones settled in the area of Kuujjuaapik. At this time, there were Inuit who seemed to have had very little to do with them, separated by physical distance, language, and religion. There was also pressure on some, as noted in the excerpt below, to recognize ‘sameness’ as well as ‘difference’:

I hardly remember the ordinary French people because maybe they weren’t really with the Inuit people, maybe they were not traders but did something else. There was a Roman Catholic priest until the early seventies. I was told that Roman Catholicism is a separate religion, but they think the same way. They pray to the same God, but they have more
pictures of the Virgin Mary and Jesus. And Harold had a lot to say about this too, that they were the same.  

(Imuk Elder F; LF)

The shift from a few French traders to large numbers of francophone workers in the area of Kuujjuaapik took place during the construction of the army base and the introduction of wage labour to the area. This period of transition is discussed in the passage below, which has been excerpted from a longer narrative about an Inuk man moving and settling in Kuujjuaapik to work at the base. When he speaks of ‘White people’ settling in the area, he does not refer to traders or missionaries, with whom the Inuit way of life was already intimately connected, but to other ‘White people’ arriving to exploit mineral resources or to engage in other economic activities outside of the Inuit trade economy. This was the beginning of wage labour for Inuit in the area, many of whom were encouraged at that time to move to the settlement in order to obtain work.

The next year white people increased and kept on increasing in the years after.... We stayed here over a month. Some men already had jobs. We also wanted jobs so we would hang around the work site, hoping someone would hire us. We envied those who were working but we returned home jobless more than once. Nobody was hiring us although several Inuit were working by then.... When we had given up hanging around the work places someone came over to our tent when we were still sleeping in the morning. When I woke up I could hear someone speaking English outside our tent. I rose and looked outside. When he saw me he asked me to go to him. I understood what he said although he said it in English. He kept on talking in English and I didn’t understand any other word he was saying but I did understand that he was asking me to find many men.... The white man pointed at the ships and I thought we were going to be going to them. There weren’t too many of us and we were taken to the ships. We were hired to unload them.... The little tugboat was going back and forth between the shore and the ship. There was nothing left at last and we were happy to go back ashore. The ship was about to leave. The man who was in charge of us spoke just English although there were many French people by that time. While we were on our way to the shore our boss was in the front of the boat and a French person was talking to him in French. He was apparently trying to tell him something but he didn’t speak French at all and didn’t seem to understand a word. Sometimes he didn’t even answer the French man. The first time we saw French people we were quite overwhelmed. We didn’t expect them to stay all winter but they have been here since.... When we finished our job we were looking forward to rest and I planned to work on our tent before doing anything else. I was planning to repair the bottom of our
tent where rocks and wooden sticks were placed to keep it in place before winter came. We were all back home when we were called to go to the base in the evening, so we went. We were hired again and someone asked us if we would like to start the next morning. They had a lot to do and they needed help since they were just beginning to settle there. I wasn't looking forward to so much work yet and my mind disagreed to the idea of working again. Not right away anyway, but Saala agreed to work again and I hated him for it! I was looking forward to relaxing and working around our place. I was so tired but we started to work again the next morning. There were many French people who needed men to work with them up there. Some were mixing and shaping cement. They dried up a big pond behind the army base that same fall. There were so many men working and making cement that the pond was actually drained dry.... The army fired anybody who made a slightest mistake. I think they had the strictest regulations and hardest to work for in all the Qallunaat I have ever worked for. Many men were fired for one thing or the other. It seemed like they fired several men every day. Some men held their jobs for a while. The army was doing much work when they have just arrived so they expected everyone to do their jobs properly so we were afraid to make mistakes while working for them. They worked hard in winter and especially in summer when there were many of them. They had many French employees who could speak only their language.

(Inuk Elder M; PS; A)

In the above passage, we are given a perspective on the workers who made up newly settled labour pool for the army base. In it, we see the beginnings of dependency on wage labour, and the pressure to work while work was available, despite the obvious resentment on the part of the speaker to continue working when he was so tired. In addition, there are two other important observations to make about this man's work experience in the 1950s, as described in the above passage. The first concerns language use and his observations about English, French, and Inuititut use. The second concerns the impact of francophone migration to Kuujjuaapik, and his observations about their relation to both the English-speaking employers and Inuit co-workers.

In his recollection of this period, the narrator makes it clear that English is the language of the army and of wage labour. (It is also the language of the prospectors and new technology in the area, such as airplanes, bulldozers, and land-movers, as is recorded in ch. 2, §2.5.) In short, it is the language of power, spoken by those who hire, fire, and pay the wages; and the language of those to whom French and Inuititut-speaking employees are subordinate. The expectations that arose from the social linguistic conditions
in Kuujjuaapik at that time were that the Inuit would have to adapt to the language of their English employers, who spoke neither Inuititut nor French.

In another narrative, a woman who was a permanent resident of Kuujjuaapik before the army came talks about the changes that occurred during the period in the 1950s:

[T]he army came in around 1954. It seemed that there was no need for a translator. Inuit who could understand English would take it upon themselves to communicate to other people about what was going on. Sometimes the trader and the minister would translate for the army because they knew Inuititut.... [W]e had been living here permanently here for a while before they came. There were maybe only 4 or 5 families at that time living here. Most were still just trading like before and staying out in camps. It seems that they needed more translators when the army came, so the minister and the trader used to translate. Even older people used to translate even though they didn’t really speak English, but they understood enough to translate. Even Johnny’s father used to understand English. Because of his grandfather, whose father was a white man. Johnny’s father’s grandfather was English....

(Inuk Elder F; LF)

As her narrative indicates, Inuit adopted a makeshift strategy of using interpreters (Inuit who could understand English, or a trader or the minister who could speak some Inuititut) in order to facilitate communication between employers, employees, and officials.

The first French people who arrived in large numbers came to work for the same English-speaking employers as the Inuit were working for, and were in effect in competition with the Inuit labour force. At the same time, however, this new group of francophone labourers represented another form of non-Native domination and a second European language with which the Inuit had to contend. Although the French-speaking workers were subordinate to their English-speaking employers (who did not appear to speak French), their European descent and familiarity with the market economy and the technologies employed within it differentiated them from the Inuit as regards culture and status. Not only did the Inuit have to make an effort to understand their employers, the work environment, and the wage economy, but they also were faced with the arrival of a large influx of ‘White people’ on their land. French-speakers made up a large part of this influx, and constituted a whole new social group—one which would eventually move into a higher economic position, and hold a greater position of power in the community. Part of this process was directly linked to francophone mobilization of the 1960s (as previously discussed), the emergence of a French-speaking middle class and the rise in managerial
positions held by francophones who would now be in charge of the hiring and firing of employees.

The following excerpt is from the narrative of a woman who had been employed at the base in Kuujjuaraapik in the 1950s. As with many Inuit residents of the time, she could manage with a bit of English until the early 1960s, when the federal Department of Northern Affairs transferred its authority to the Québec provincial government, the Direction générale du Nouveau Québec (DGNQ). Despite the difference in language, which becomes salient in differentiating social groups, she claims that she could not distinguish in any other way between English- and French-speaking employers. In addition, her comments about speaking some English and then losing it are quite revealing about attitudes toward French, which appears to be a language that one did not attempt to learn.

I started working for someone up on the base. I was okay with my English then. But then they switched to a French employer and I couldn't understand French and I lost my English. French and English people always seemed the same to me, if you didn't steal or if you were dependable, you were treated okay. (Inuk Elder F; LF)

This shift from English-speaking to French-speaking managers and administrators in Kuujjuaraapik formed a second important transition period after the army arrived. As Québec nationalism gained momentum in the 1960s and the francophone middle class mobilized to take control of the private sector, the provincial government took an interest in its northern territory in order to strengthen its administrative authority there, and to claim political and economic control within its borders. These processes resulted in an even greater influx of francophones into northern Québec, not just as employees, but as managers, entrepreneurs, and administrators of Quebec government offices.

The story of Inuit mobilization is rooted in the story of francophone mobilization and Québec's efforts to assert political and economic control over natural resource development. The question for many Inuit is whether they would be better off under the authority of an Anglo-dominant Canada or a Franco-dominant Québec, or whether they would be better off eventually governing themselves.

4. INUIT MOBILIZATION AND THE RISE OF INUUITTUT

Although the economic circumstances of minority settings may differ, mobilization across settings is always based on agreement to improve or maintain the material conditions of the community. A logical response of Inuit to increasing pressure from the dominant groups in
Canada to exploit the natural resources of northern Québec has been resistance and political mobilization. This response is logical inasmuch as it has paralleled both historical resistance to domination and threats to Inuit ways of life and other patterns of state formation that Inuit and their legal advisors have been exposed to—in particular, Québec political developments of the 1960s, which led to increased provincial control over valued resources and territory. It has also followed the logic of social movements of the era—in particular, the American Civil Rights Movement, and Native rights movements mounted in the 1960s in the United States, Canada, and elsewhere. Given Inuit access to a range of material resources, in particular those procured through the JBNQA, and given the centuries of exploitation of the natural resources of Arctic Québec by whalers, traders, and mining and hydroelectric companies—exploitation which benefited those who controlled the market—the desire of Inuit for their own territory, whose existence would benefit local Inuit populations, is a reasonable one.

In aboriginal communities in northern Québec, political mobilization serves to gain access to political and economic power (control over resources) within Québec and Canada. Those working in Inuit political organizations saw the need to work with their Cree counterparts to initiate legal action and to negotiate with the federal and provincial governments to gain a voice in the planning and execution of development projects and to be compensated for lost or damaged land resources.

One catalyst for this mobilization is the differences that these communities have articulated between their cultural values and practices—including those associated with land-harvesting and centuries-old relationships that have developed from these—and those of the dominant Euro-Canadian culture, which has emphasized the accumulation of wealth and various other values and practices associated with success in a capitalist state. The central argument of these communities has been structured around the notion that the maintenance of aboriginal identity, culture and well-being derives from the resources harvested from the land and the maintenance of cultural ‘difference’ associated with land harvesting practices. For the Cree and Inuit, preservation of land resources and harvesting practices was a key goal in a negotiated settlement; compensation money would be put into harvesting maintenance programmes, in addition to economic development projects (in areas such as tourism, commercial fishing, and local manufacturing of items such as clothing and crafts) and programmes to create employment and to insure proper housing, infrastructure, education, and health care for Northern communities.
4.1. **INUTTITUT IN THE DOMINANT LINGUISTIC MARKET**

In Arctic Québec, Makivik Corporation became the key organization in Inuit economic development and planning after the implementation of the JBNQA. The organization has seen a need for renewed negotiations with governments and corporations over resource development, potential profit-sharing ventures, and some measure of 'sovereignty' or autonomy over their territory. Makivik has also been concerned with language policy and along with the Kativik School Board, has taken an interest in schooling and the development of sound language programmes, as key elements in the struggle for self-government. 

As an institution, schools are at the centre of Nunavik’s paradoxical goals (cf. Heller 1994 for a parallel situation with Franco-Ontarian schools). On the one hand, schools have been given the mandate of preserving Inuit culture, values, and language, while on the other, they have aimed to prepare students for employment opportunities or for post-secondary education in Montréal. To a large extent, the dilemma has been resolved linguistically: schools operate in three languages in order to deal with three competing sets of symbolic resources in the dominant linguistic market. As in Nunavik generally, language and school policy attempts to deal with (i) the dominant role of English language resources; (ii) the dominant role of French language resources in the province, and the competition between French and English in the current labour market; and (iii) the important role of Inuit language resources, which are supported and maintained through the current political mobilization of Inuit. The last set of resources has a paradoxical position in the school: linked to an alternative market and a subsistence economy, and to historical continuity and Inuit cultural ‘difference’; and yet also seen to play a key role in Inuit efforts to achieve political power in the region (and as undergoing standardization in order to fulfil this role). Inuititut language resources, although widely used in everyday interaction, are dependent on institutionalized practices and political support—crucial for the language to maintain an economic value, given the dominance of French and English within the Canadian state.

---

4 They voiced their concern in the publication of a controversial task force report on education, commissioned in the early 1990s, which outlined problems with education. (see Nunavik Educational Task Force. 1992)
4.2. INUITITUT LANGUAGE USE: EDUCATION AND STANDARDIZATION

It is embarrassing to talk to other Inuit from other communities because each community
has a different dialect. I am afraid that they might [miserunderstand].

(Inuk Elder M; SM; A)

In 1964, the Québec government introduced an education policy for Arctic Québec which
allowed for Inuititut language instruction in schools. Although instruction, curriculum
development, and Inuit teacher training were not implemented immediately, the policy was
in place for institutionalizing Inuititut in Québec’s North. Two implications of this policy
are current concerns of the Kativik School Board, which assumed control over Inuit
education in Arctic Québec in 1978. One is the implication for Inuititut language
maintenance and the role that education can play in insuring its survival. Another is the
implication for language policy—more specifically, for the implementation of
institutionalized Inuititut language forms in schools. Standardization is crucial to the
production of curriculum materials, a standardized orthography, and legitimate language
forms which may become valued in the dominant language market. Only through this
process, it is argued, can Inuititut become a legitimate contender with English and French,
and achieve political and economic dominance in Arctic Québec. Thus Inuititut
standardization and legitimization are products of a political process set in motion in the
1960s.

Processes of standardization represent unifying tendencies in political organization:
uniting people under a common banner, common assumptions about their social position,
and common goals in an increasingly globalized marketplace. At the same time, the
processes of ‘unification’ are met with localized resistance—particularly among hunters
and other practitioners of ‘traditional’ activities, who might value more local ways of
speaking and the historical association of place and culture that these localized forms
signify. Thus, local interests in maintaining certain forms of spoken Inuititut might be
voiced among community members or encouraged through their continued use.

Despite forms of localized resistance, the political mobilization of Inuit has fuelled
the processes involved in creating Nunavik, and has created an Inuit platform from which
an Inuit voice can be heard on issues of economic, social, and political development in
northern Québec. Linguistic standardization has been an important part of this process.

---

5 An example of community concerns about local ways of speaking occurred during my initial
meeting with the Kuujjuaraapik municipal council and school committee. One of the council
members, who was an active hunter, voiced concern over the loss of the local Kuujjuaraapik way of speaking, due to
the use of standardized forms in schools. He felt that something should be done to preserve localized forms.
since it is a key to legitimizing Inuit in schools and other institutional spheres, where these symbolic resources can be valued and exchanged for other material and symbolic resources within the same linguistic market as English and French. Despite these pressures toward standardization, local varieties of Inuit nevertheless persist, and continue to be valued in Kuujjuaraapik and other Inuit communities.

4.3. INSTITUTIONALIZED PRACTICES AND THE SYMBOLIC IMPORTANCE OF INUITITUT

W: If someone gave me 2 books, one in Inuit and one in English, I would take the English one. The Inuit is really slow... for reading... because of the way it’s written, instead of one word, you have many phrases. Unless you are VERY very good reading in Inuit, you would be so busy trying to figure out what the word says that you won’t enjoy the book.

[...]

D: But do you think it’s still important that things are written in Inuit?

W: (laughter) Well, yes. Because it makes up a large portion of who we are. It’s something of our own.

(Intuk Educator F; WN)

Interviewer: Do you write syllabics?

Inuk Hunter: Yes, because I’m Inuk.

(Hydro-Québec 1978: 12.5)

In chapter 2, we saw how the Inuit syllabary was developed by missionaries, and how it became an important element in the spread of Christianity among Inuit. Literacy was introduced through informal education, and (as noted above) readily adopted as an important symbolic resource in the construction of Inuit identity. Thus, participants in the ‘traditional’ hunting economy valued Inuit syllabics as a resource that fulfilled spiritual needs and was uniquely ‘Inuit’.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, Inuititut became a valuable resource for Inuit involved in the formation of Inuit political, educational, and bureaucratic structures. Because written Inuititut was already established in religious and later bureaucratic texts, there was good justification for its inclusion in the school curriculum. Inuititut literacy is also consistent with Western concepts of education and with the view of literacy as an intellectual, social, and economic good (on this issue, see ch. 2, §1.4.1).

Given the value of literacy generally in Western societies, and the value of Inuititut literacy in the construction of Inuit identity, the importance of Inuititut literacy for Inuit mobilization becomes clear. As a symbolic resource, it is recognized and valued by all
Inuit, including those interested in the preservation of the Inuit language for cultural and political reasons. What is more, syllabics are relatively easy to learn: before formal schooling, most Inuit learned syllabics relatively quickly, either on their own or with the help of a family member. The syllabary is therefore quite easy for young children to acquire before they acquire literacy skills in a second language. This gives further justification to the teaching of Inuktut literacy in schools, and to a prominent role for Inuktut in other Inuit institutional arenas. It has become a key symbolic resource in the construction of ‘Inuitness’ and for Inuit operating in the dominant market, where it can be exchanged for employment in cultural and educational sectors.

The introduction of Inuktut literacy in schools, however, brings with it a whole new set of problems. Missionaries, and to a certain extent the church of today, have transposed local linguistic forms into written forms used in church services and hymns. That is, an English text may be translated into a variety of Inuktut used in one community, and the Inuktut translation subsequently altered to conform to the features of another variety used elsewhere. However, when a language that covers a wide area of dialectal diversity has not been standardized is developed for use in schools, at least two things happen: first, dialectal differences between communities, which have previously had little importance, suddenly become an issue, since one language variety must be chosen as the standard (with the power and prestige that that entails); and second, there is the dilemma of choosing the dialect (or dialects) that will become the standard, and used (among other things) to produce books for a common curriculum in Nunavik schools.

4.4. Processes of Inuktut Standardization

One of the preoccupations of the ‘Inuit-controlled’ Kativik School Board since its inception in 1978 has been the question of Inuktut curriculum development, and in turn the question of which dialects should be selected for the production of such materials, and thus which symbolic resources should be valued in Nunavik. I raised these questions in two interviews with Kativik School Board personnel, which are excerpted below:

D: How do you deal with the two dialects? Do you develop material slightly different for each region?

C: Most of our books are in two dialects, one of them would be bracketed. The two dialects are so close, just some words... so the whole book, for instance, might be in

---

6 In Kuujjuaarapik, the local priest maintained that this was still the practice; that is, to replace words or phrases in a religious text which were not used locally with the local variety.
Ungava Bay and the bracketed terminology would be Hudson Bay. Like Maggie K. is from Ungava Bay and Ida I. is from Inukjuak and they are both mature, but a lot of times we work with the elders such as Miqjiutq and Johnny George (both from Ungava Bay).

(Inuk Kativik School Board Educator F; CP)

D: Have you noticed that the kids in school are speaking a more standard Inuktitut than their parents, have you noticed that in Umiujaq at all?
W: Oh yes... yes because they keep bringing up Kuujjuaaqik [way of speaking]. We have a very strong Inuktitut secondary teacher, who is originally from Inukjuak. He played a large part in getting children to adopt little bits of Inukjuak dialect. Because we didn’t know very much about the glottal, it is impossible to write what they were saying.
D: They had to learn to write a more standard Nunavik style...
W: Yes.

(Inuk Educator F; WN)

Standardized Inuktitut forms tend to be from Inukjuak and Kuujjuaq (Ungava Bay). A discussion of the reasons for these choices is beyond the scope of this study; for present purposes, however, we might note that such choices are clearly political ones, since any form could conceivably be chosen as the legitimate ‘standard’. The variety chosen is instantly accorded the prestige and power associated with institutional legitimation. In the case of Nunavik, two ‘standards’ have been chosen and developed to reflect the political reality of two coasts, each with its own dialect. The choice of language variety along these coasts could also be political, representing the power and influence associated with decision makers from particular communities. Another influence on dialect preferences is the field of linguistics, which provides a basis for taking certain forms to be more conservative (and, for some, more legitimately ‘Inuit’) than others. (Gemination, for instance, is considered to be less conservative than the maintainence of a phonological distinction between two consonants.) These arguments are, of course, meaningless to inhabitants of areas whose language is not considered ‘standard’, since they have engaged in local language practices for generations.

Since the founding of the Kativik School Board, language policy, standardized language practices in schools, and Inuit political mobilization have been inextricably linked. Each has been dependent on the other: the Kativik School Board owes its existence to Inuit mobilization, while Inuit political organizations have been dependent upon schooling for the production and legitimation of standardized symbolic resources. That is, the school needs the material resources to continue curriculum development in standardized Inuktitut; and any move toward a self-governing Inuit territory is dependent on a functional, unified
 indigenous language of state, in order to create a ‘national’ or regional consciousness and to justify and reaffirm its status as a potential self-governing state.

In the following passage, an Inuk educator notes the importance of Inuititut with respect to its relation to Inuit self-government, and the crucial role that schooling plays in bolstering Inuititut and helping to construct a strong Inuit identity:

I think it's the main force behind the Inuititut language, for it to continue to be on the face of the earth, for Nunavik. There's so much, I just don't know how to put it in words.... I suppose one of the important principles of Kativik School Board is that I think it's going to be the main instrument for preparing children to [govern] themselves in the future.... I'm not a politician, but if what they have in mind is an all-Inuit government, and everything was in Inuititut, then um, then the Kativik School Board, and the teacher training in particular, are important because the teachers will have to make some changes for self-government.... I think it's something to do with values. I can't think of any other way that there will be changes except through the school and children. Maybe there is another way... I like to think that the school is important.

(Inuk Educator F; WN)

The institutionalization of Inuititut language practices presents a whole new range of challenges for Inuit educators, which are political as well as linguistic. It is important to understand the link between the education system and Inuit political mobilization in order to understand the importance placed on education in Nunavik. Language choices in school policy are based on political decisions regarding the symbolic resources to be taught and legitimized in the schools. Potential solutions have to be examined within the social and political context, and with a view to the paradoxes that arise in using alternative or ‘oppositional’ cultural knowledge within the Southern structure of the school. It is by understanding this historical, political, economic, and cultural complexity that we can begin to understand what it means to teach certain languages in schools, and the importance of putting resources into language development programmes.

5. PARTICIPATING IN THE SOUTHERN MARKET

Children started school only when the army buildings were abandoned.... Before there was no such thing as education.... The school started in 1957 here in Great Whale. It was just like yesterday I remember the first day of the school. Today, kids drop out of school and some still go to school.... We are a long way behind others because education came here
Up to now, we have examined the language markets operating in Kuujjuaraapik, and their complex historical and political economic development. We have seen some of the ways in which language practices—patterns of use and acquisition—are valued by particular speakers in the community of Kuujjuaraapik. In this section, we will be examining the linguistic and other prerequisites needed for employment; and more generally the relation between the symbolic practices valued in the school and the value of these practices in the symbolic and economic markets of the wider community.

Linguistic resources produced, reproduced, and valued in classrooms constitute forms of symbolic domination to which social actors (students, teachers, and administrators) respond in various ways. Social interaction in the classroom involves specific forms of communication, language learning, and evaluation which can produce new forms of language and knowledge and reproduce hegemonic forms valued institutionally and socially. These same classroom processes can lead to resistance by some speakers, who may engage in cultural practices that are alternatives to or are opposed to those valued in school. Classroom practices can also be transformative in nature, and lead to new strategies to transform inequitable conditions in a given social reality.

In Nunavik schools, students are introduced to various symbolic practices, and can take different paths, depending on how they engage with and acquire the valued cultural and linguistic capital that leads to school success. These paths are not entirely independent of each other, and often overlap in complex and contradictory ways, since students share similarities based on ethnicity, origin, and place. The routes that Inuit students follow are particularly complex, since they are often negotiating emerging social identities in a complex post-colonial era. There are constant tensions and complex overlappings between community and family values and norms, Southern (or more generally Western) values and norms, and the construction of ‘Inuitness’ based on a relatively reified ‘traditional past’ and a relatively abstract ‘self-governing’ future. The fact still remains that some paths lead to greater access to material resources than others.

A relatively small proportion of students do very well in school, and some of these choose to continue their education in Montréal. Of the ones who do, some stay in the South and engage in wage employment—within an Inuit organization, where their Inuititut skills
as well as their Southern education hold a high value, or in the mainstream anglophone- or francophone-dominated workforce—while others return to the community, where there are employment opportunities in the Inuit sector (such as at the municipal council) and, to a lesser extent, in the French-dominant public and private sector of Great Whale River. Some of the options available, and constraints on employment in the latter sector, will be discussed in §5.1.4.

Other students do not fare so well in school, for various reasons. These include various forms of resistance to school practices, arising either from difficulties that a student may have in acquiring the resources offered by the school (for personal, family, or other reasons) or from a student's outright rejection of what the school has to offer and favouring of alternative opportunities available within the Inuit community. Whatever these circumstances, the cultural and linguistic capital that Inuit children bring into the school is not valued in the Southern educational market; and those who do not complete their secondary schooling do not have the same opportunities—the same access to dominant symbolic resources—as those who do.

Inuit students who do not receive further education in the South and opt to stay in the community are not completely excluded from further educational opportunities. If they possess strong Inuit language skills, they might become Inuit language teachers, and receive teacher training available to them in their own language. Adult education services have also set up job-training programmes, such as secretarial, maintenance, and construction courses and academic upgrading for those who wish to continue their schooling in their community. In most cases, however, students who have not succeeded in school reject all school practices. They are not willing to invest the time necessary to gain access to the opportunities promised by the school—whether because they do not believe these opportunities are truly available, or because they do not desire them, since the social reality presented by the school does not, for them, correspond to that of the community.

In order to understand what shapes and constrains the choices that students make with regards to their willingness to participate in school and higher education, it is important to address the broader social, linguistic, and economic practices of the community.

5.1. LEARNING LANGUAGES AT WORK, HOME, AND SCHOOL
Since the introduction of wage labour, it is the Inuit workers, rather than the 'outsiders', who have been expected to accommodate themselves to the presence of those in their work environment who did not speak their language. Responses to language learning varied; some acquired English, the language of those in power—although they of course did so with varying degrees of success—while others merely expressed a desire to learn the language, and still others resisted learning the language altogether. Acquisition of English, in part was dependent on one's access and exposure to the language (through contact, schooling, hospitalization etc.), and in part a question of one's integration into the English dominated workforce, as well as of one's attitudes towards this economic dominance, and towards English speakers themselves.

During this same period, French workers were positioned similarly to Inuit ones vis-à-vis the anglophone employers. Although I have no ethnographic evidence to support claims about anglophone-francophone relations at the time, it would be safe to assume that there was some accommodation of French speakers to their English bosses, rather than the other way around. English was the sole language of power in the dominant linguistic market at that time. Historical evidence tends to support the notion that aside from a few long-term Hudson's Bay Company traders and missionaries, very few English-speaking non-Native workers stationed in the North have invested the time and energy necessary for learning the economically less dominant languages.

With the rise of French in the dominant linguistic market, these patterns of language learning have changed. Many anglophones and Inuit have seen the necessity of learning French to advance in the workplace, but also to adjust to living in a predominantly francophone province. At the same time, French non-Native residents of Arctic Québec face the necessity of having to accommodate themselves to English. The result is a highly bilingual (and trilingual) population in communities like Great Whale River; and in general, a strong value placed on second language learning. (Inuit speak English and/or French in addition to Inuititut; and the majority of francophones and anglophones are bilingual in French and English). Significantly, however, very few non-Native residents manage to learn Inuititut. One non-Native man I interviewed gave the following explanation for his own poor knowledge of Inuititut:

M: (laughter) The language is sooo hard—I try, I really try. And my wife is Inuk, obviously, and our children are Inuit too, but I would rather say, it is easier for me now, my son is three years old, and I am at his level, so every word he picks up, I pick [it] up too. I learn a lot from children, but the language itself is really hard, you cannot use any English or French background.... I would say also that I don't see very much effort by the
Inuit institutions to teach the language... Adult education gave a course for a while, but it
died very soon, and we haven't anything more about that.

D: And there is a demand among white people to take it?

M: Yeah sure, the interest is still there. But I think the Inuit people put too much effort
[in having] the population... learn either English or French than they do [in creating] their
own policy and [putting] their money [into forcing] everybody to speak Inuitut on their
territory.

While the issue of Inuitut language-learning resources is an important one, it is one that I
must leave for future research. The following discussion will, instead, be concentrating on
the issue of French as second language (and to a lesser extent English).

While many anglophones and almost all francophones working in Nunavik are
bilingual in the two dominant European languages, Inuit have been faced with the prospect
of having to become trilingual. As we shall see in this section, both French and English
are seen as necessary to gain access to the dominant job market, and to get by in Québec
and Canada.

As French assumed a position of power, and gained dominance in the
administrative and entrepreneurial spheres, the desire of Inuit to learn this new language
and the perceived necessity of doing so increased. Nevertheless, there was some
reluctance: English was the language of education when the federal day school began
teaching in the late 1950s and had thus already gained a hold as the second language of the
region; and those who already knew some English were reluctant to put energy into
learning another European language, especially when most of the francophones they would
have contact with would be able to manage in English or the French used in the workplace
could be translated.

In the 1990s, more Inuit have seen a need to learn the language, although very few
who have been educated in English are actively learning French. In most of these cases,
even though they have clearly stated a need to learn French, this is not a priority, since they
are able to work and function in the community using only Inuitut and English. There are
many reasons why learning French is seen as a necessity though not a priority, and many
strategies that have arisen in response to this situation. These will be addressed in the next
section.

5.1.2. THE IMPORTANCE OF FRENCH AS A SECOND OR THIRD LANGUAGE
This section addresses the question of how the people of Great Whale River who have been educated in English, and now hold key administrative and employment positions in the community, view the role of French. It also includes how they have been involved in learning and speaking it, and their views on and hopes for the younger generations who have access to French in school. It draws on excerpts from interviews conducted in English with Inuit who attended the federal day school in the 1960s in Great Whale River and are now between thirty and forty-five years of age. It also contains a few excerpts from interviews with non-Native residents who talked about language use in the workplace and other social spheres, and a discussion of some of the strategies that they have adopted for coping with this relatively new competition from French in the dominant language market.

5.1.2.1. GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

The interview data suggest that Inuit often understand the need for French abstractly, in terms of territorial, political and geographical position. That is, Nunavik is a region situated, governed, and controlled within the larger French-speaking Québec state, so there is general agreement on the dominance of French within state-supported agencies and a recognition of its symbolic domination in institutional practices.

D: Would you like to learn French? Is French important for you?
P: Yes I think so. We live in Québec and the second language here is French on top of English. So, I think it has a lot of importance. (Inuk Municipal Council Employee M; PP)

D: What about the importance of French and English in the community now? Do you think English is used too much?
A: Yeah, in my opinion I think English is used rather too much because we are in a situation where we are in Québec, and French is the language of the majority of the province, and being Inuk, trying to maintain our culture and our language, and we’re having to deal with three languages, everybody tends to turn to English. But there is a reason for that though, because when we first started in the federal day school it was the only language taught, up until 1975 or 76, so it is the most common language you find here.

(Inuk Municipal Council Employee M; AI)

The interview data also suggest that French is important for Inuit because it is the dominant language needed to obtain services in the wider province. This can include any type of health or social service obtained in francophone communities, and provincial
government information and forms that deal with pensions, welfare, driver’s licenses, and the like. These services can be obtained in English, but it can take more time if the offices are in smaller francophone communities with limited bilingual staff. Both Inuit and anglophone residents have commented on the prevalence of French in these domains:

Even if you don’t need it in your community, you may need French when you are down south. I was really stuck once, it turned out that the doctor didn’t speak English and I didn’t know how to communicate. Not only with the doctors, I was lost too in the city. You going around with nobody being able to understand you, I wouldn’t want that feeling for my children, not a bit. (Iqaluit Municipal Council Employee F; JS)

... we have problems with government documents, provincial documents. For example, old age pension, welfare, these things they send the forms in French. And sometimes we receive people coming to Pierre [a francophone employee in the office] for translation. In my case I get some documents in French as well... so I rely on Pierre. Same thing with the driver’s license, it’s all in French; there’s some rules and regulations on the back. My understanding of the rules and regulations are based on English.

D: Does Pierre do a lot of that kind of work?
A: It’s not really part of his mandate of job, but he does it out of the kindness of his heart. He is sympathetic to people who do not understand French, he likes to help people, so we are fortunate that he’s here. But I don’t know exactly how they do it with welfare, I think they have people to translate for them on the spot.

(Iqaluit Municipal Council Employee M; AI)

D: On the subject of French, what about other government services, have you noticed in your experience living here where French would have helped?
G: Yeah, it would have, just dealing with government documents and letters, um, in my job it wouldn’t have really made much difference, because you can get English services over the phone, but it’s hard, you have to wait a long time. Like some days, I’ve gone through days before I’ve been able to get through for English services.

D: For income tax? or—
G: For income tax, and for any general information.

D: How does it work usually, you give the number and they call you back, or do you have to keep trying?
G: Well, you go through those electronic phone systems where for English you punch such and such a number, and they you’re put on hold.... Like I do people’s income tax
returns, because the Inuit have to pay income tax, and they don't understand a lot of the rules, and why they have to keep all their receipts, and their family allowance slips and their pension slips and everything. So when it comes to income tax time, they're usually missing a lot of information. And to try and get that information is really hard.... I've often had to take it to a French person who works at the municipal office to get that information for me. And he gets it much quicker in French.

(Non-Native Resident F; GH)

A third reason for valuing French is that it is often used in the workplace, especially in positions that involve dealing with provincial agencies, departments, or employees from southern Québec. Although not all employees speak French, almost everyone can cite occasions when they have had to deal with a unilingual French speaker, or where some aspect of their job involved written French.

D: Did you ever learn French, or want to learn French?
M: I never learned French. It was important in my working areas, because I have to speak to people who only know French sometimes for the telephone.... Even now they ask me 'parlez-vous français' and I have to say no. Even though I understand that, but... I don't know French. (Inuk Municipal Council Employee F; MM)

Sometimes I get phone calls, and when it's a French man, and he don't have much of an English in him, it's pretty hard to have a conversation with that person, so... sometimes you wish that only if you'd learned French. (Inuk Municipal Council Employee M; PP)

In the following excerpt, a non-Native Protestant missionary who had lived in Kuujjuaapik for a number of years notes the importance of French, in addition to Inuititut and Cree, in the service sector:

D: What about during some of your other jobs, like work in the restaurant. Were there ever times of miscommunication?
G: Yeah, there were. In the restaurant it wasn't too bad, 'cause there were other people who spoke French and they could fill in, like if I couldn't understand something, they would take over. But there would have been a problem if they hadn't been there, because people would come in they'd ask about the menu, which I didn't understand. I could point to them to where the menu was, but if they had any questions about it, I wouldn't be able to communicate with them. Mind you, I had people come in there speaking Inuititut who
I had to work with, and the French people couldn't, the other employees couldn't. And, there was only one incident where I had a Cree person, a Cree elder there, where they couldn't speak English or French and I had to try and communicate in Cree. So it's helpful, it's very helpful to know even a little bit of Inuktitut or Cree just pertaining to your job, like just being able to say how much something is or what things are, just a few sentences even, that would help. (Non-Native Resident F; GH)

In addition to this role of French in the workplace, the more pressing concern for many Inuit is that French language skills might become a prerequisite for employment, and that without these skills, the ability to obtain employment might be jeopardized. As the following excerpt from an Inuk leader makes clear, living in a French province means increased exposure to French, and possible demands for French in the workplace:

... the requirement for French has been more evident, in our community and in the whole region. In most job applications, French is sometimes a necessity, but in most cases it's an asset.... And a lot of the television we get here, the news, they're in French and they seem interesting, and it gives us a desire to understand it. And being a minority in a province where French is mostly spoken you'd like to catch up with everybody and speak French as well. (Inuk Municipal Council Employee M; AI)

Thus, if French is not yet a requirement, it is already definitely an asset. And as many other people interviewed in the community told me, the demand for French in the workplace will increase, and those who can speak French will have a better chance at employment. This is one of the key incentives for placing children in the French stream at school, starting in grade 3. (The actual requirements of certain employers in Great Whale will be discussed in §5.1.5.1 below.)

To summarize the above observations, knowledge of French is seen as necessary because of the circumstances just described: Nunavik is situated in the province of Québec; services and the vast majority of the province operate in French; and many workplaces require knowledge of French or use French at least some of the time.

Despite the social linguistic dominance of French, however, the majority of those who have been educated in English do not actively engage in French language learning. There are various reasons for this. One is that those who have mastered English as a second language are already bilingual, and thus already have access to two of the languages operating in the dominant language market. Moreover, despite all the explanations given for the importance of French, English remains the dominant language in North America.
and in international, globalized markets. It is also the community’s lingua franca: if you can speak English, you can speak with members of all language groups:

Being fortunate enough to speak two languages, I can communicate in either one....
When I communicate with the Cree for example, or the French, the communication is in English, and that’s no problem, everybody seems to speak English.

(Inuk Municipal Council Employee M; AI)

It seems, then, that many Inuit of this group find that Inuittut and English serve them well; and most Inuit and unilingual anglophones do not see a need to learn French to function in the community, because of the prevalence of English.

There are other reasons why learning French might not be a priority. One mentioned was the limited amount of time that people—particularly single mothers and others with families—felt able to invest in learning French:

D: Did you ever think of taking French courses?
M: I thought of it, but it takes too much of my time. I’d rather be pursuing traditional sewing than to take the time to learn French, and be at home afterward, especially if I’m [a single parent] it’s very hard. (Inuk Municipal Council Employee F; MM)

For some, there is also the question of identity associated with speaking English, which is linked to colonial history—in particular, the dominant relationship between English language practices (of traders, church, and school) and the Inuit cultural and economic practices that characterized this period of contact. One Inuk woman I interviewed identified speaking English as a second language with being Inuk. When I asked her why it was important for her to learn English, she replied:

... since I’m Inuk, English is my second language.... The English came here and they wanted us to learn how to speak English. It is my second language and I really don’t know how to answer that. I really want to understand very much in English.... I’d rather learn English than French. (Inuk Resident F; MS)

She then added: ‘I have nothing against French; if I ever need a translator my son will translate for me.’ (Enrolling one’s children in the French stream at school, as we shall see in §5.1.4, is a common response to French dominance.)
In sum, it appears that knowledge of one second language (English) is often seen as sufficient by Inuit who have been educated in English, despite their abstract acknowledgement of the importance of French in the community. The value of French is evidenced in the large number of Inuit who opt to place their children in the French stream at school (see §5.1.3). Nevertheless, some individuals take part in active French language learning, primarily motivated for work related reasons, as will be discussed below.

5.1.3. ACCESS TO FRENCH AT HOME

Despite the reluctance of some bilinguals to acquire a third language, there are cases in which adult Inuit who have been educated in English are motivated to learn French. One of these is the case of mixed couples, where an Inuk woman is living with a francophone man. In this case, French is sometimes used in the home, but more commonly when the man is speaking to the younger children of the household than when husband and wife are speaking to each other. Nevertheless, of the six French-Inuktitut mixed marriages in Kuujjuaq of this sort, only two families actively used French (in addition to Inuktitut and English) in the home. From what I could observe, a third family used French some of the time; while the other three used English and Inuktitut but very little French. The Inuit women in households where French was used were motivated to learn French in order to understand the communication between their husband and their children. However, only one woman actively spoke the language—probably in large part because of the requirements of her job as a ticket agent with an airline company. Such job-related requirements (which will be discussed in more detail in §5.1.5.2) are the more common motivation for adult Inuit to learn French.

In general, the children in Kuujjuaq with a francophone father are exposed to some French at home, if the father uses French in the home. However, even this access can be minimal since, as just noted, communication between husband and wife is usually in English:

D: Do you feel your kids' Inuktitut, French and English are all very strong?
P: I think they're very strong in Inuktitut and then English and then French. I'm the only one who's been talking to them in French. I think school will help a lot, 'cause they'll

7 There is one case of a mixed couple where a francophone woman is married to an Inuk man. However, they have no children, and use English in the home, in order to communicate with each other.
have more exposure and... the more they go to school in French, the more they will use it. For me it was important for them to speak Inuttitut, for them to learn to read and write Inuttitut. And then they have a chance to learn that. When they you small you learn faster. And then my second priority was for them to learn French. I knew they are so much exposed to English, I knew they would learn it no matter what. So I've not been encouraging them at all to speak English and they are very very fluent, but it's the exposure. It shows the importance of trying to protect your language because the exposure is so great in English. I don't think it's bad, to the contrary, I think it is very good to speak English, but uh, we have to lessen the exposure of English also.

D: Where is that exposure coming from?

P: Television, kids together and me and my wife speaking English together. Sometimes it's faster to say something in English, so they go for a shortcut, so I always have to remind them when they speak to me, they don't speak in English they speak in French to me. (Laughter.)

(Non-Native Municipal Council Employee M; PR)

This reason, that it is sometimes easier for the francophone parent to use English with children in an English-Inuttitut dominant household, was given to me by another francophone man. Most families, including these, rely on the school to provide access to valued French and Inuttitut language resources.

5.1.4. FRENCH AND SCHOOLING

One of the key responses to French dominance, as suggested above, has been to enrol one's son or daughter in the French stream at school, in order to allow the children access to a symbolic resource and to prepare for the new sociolinguistic reality of northern Québec. It is generally accepted that the generations to come will have access to French language resources by studying French at school. They will be able to participate more fully in the francophone milieu, and be legitimized as French speakers by the credentials offered by the school. But sometimes making the decision to place a child in the English or the French stream is not an easy one. As one woman notes, French secures one's chances for the future; yet parents who cannot speak French are unable to help their children with their homework:

I think I made a mistake putting my son in English. Because we are in the province of Québec, it's going to be required that you speak French more than it will be required to speak English in the future if you want to get into the job market. But I can help him
more in English, because I know English, but I can’t help my daughter who is in French. You know what I mean. 
(Inuk Municipal Council Employee F; MM)

In addition to help with schoolwork that they may receive from parents educated in English, children studying in English also receive crucial practice outside of school, which they need to really master a second language.

The problems that certain students face with French in school are described in the following excerpt from an interview with an Inuk court worker:

There’s students who went to French classes, and we’ve lost them. They’re not speaking in English and they’re not speaking in French. Their Inuititut is okay. My cousin, he went to French school here, and he does not speak in French, ‘cause he doesn’t use it, they don’t use when they’re at home, either they speak in English or Inuititut, so they don’t speak in French in the house. So they lose that after they leave the school, they lose French, and they don’t speak English very well either. And they can’t read. I also have a nephew who can’t sign his own name, he’s seventeen years old. As I said, there is no discipline in school today, so he didn’t learn. He was always doing something else in the classroom and he dropped out and he doesn’t even know how to sign his name. He has to look at his name and write it and look at it like that. It’s very sad. And there’s a lot of people like that now. 
(Inuk Court Employee F; Li)

This has led some parents to enrol their children in English if they are potentially slow learners. The English stream is assumed to be the easier one, since children can receive more second language support outside the school than they would if they studied in French.

Although there is a recognition of the current importance of French, there is also a widely held belief that its value will increase even further in the future. As proficiency in French as a second language increases, so will one’s access to French linguistic resources and employment. Children enrolled in French now are thus an investment in that future; if they are too shy to speak French in face-to-face interaction in the community, this is not a real worry, since self-confidence and language ability will come with time. This has parallels with the situation of English among Inuit in the 1950s, where language learning appeared to be minimal, but the language was eventually mastered in many cases (see Macpherson 1991). The strategy of deferring the need to use French now but valuing the

---

8 A. F. Applewhite, who taught in Inukjuak from 1954 to 1957, has this to say about his former students’ knowledge and use of English:
learning of the language for the future appears to have a dual purpose: namely, to affirm the value of French while at the same time legitimizing the lack of enthusiasm among adults for learning the language and the minimal use of the language by young people being educated in it (as will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter):

D: Do you think those kids learning French have more chance at getting jobs?
P: Yes, I believe so. Some students I know take French as a second language, at secondary level, but they have to really get used to it. So, sometime, once they feel older and more self-confident, I guess they’ll use it more. We don’t see that too much here.... It would increase our level of confidence, if only we could speak Inuitut, English and French. (Inuk Municipal Council Employee M; PP)

5.1.5. FRENCH AND THE WORKPLACE

Other important strategies for coping with French have been developed in the workplace and elsewhere in the community. Those educated in English find ways either to obtain services in English, or to obtain translations of documents presented to them in French—again pinning their hopes on the younger generation’s greater ability to cope in a francophone environment.

One strategy adopted by the municipal council has been to hire a francophone man (who is married to a local Inuk woman and lives in Kuujjuaraapik) to fill the position of secretary-treasurer. This has proved invaluable in helping Inuit at the council and in the community to deal with French-language government and other official communications. In the following excerpt, this man comments on the past, present, and future of French in the community:

D: When you started working here, did you find you were a real benefit to the community because you could speak French?
P: It’s truly a need. But the school is doing great in that sense. Maybe for the future, it will be very good, the kids will be speaking three languages regularly. I think we are on the right way, yeah, right now it’s a need.

The pupils were quite accustomed to being in school. They didn’t speak much English—aactually refused—although most of them understood English. They could read quite well. They could read words, but I never really knew if they could understand what they read. There seemed to be an underlying feeling that they didn’t really want to learn English. However, they really did quite well in mathematical skills and language skills. Speaking English wasn’t one of the things that they could do, or wanted to do. (Macpherson & Macpherson 1991: 76)
D: When do you need French?
P: Like I said previously, the French government works in French so I have to act many times as intermediary many times between the people here and the government. Many times, I have translated official letters from the government, I've been making quite an effort to translate their things, 'cause I don't enjoy that. It takes a lot of my time to translate, and I wasn't hired in the first place to be a translator...
D: But a lot of people are in your position now! (Laughter.)
P: (Laughter.) Yeah! ... It's part of the game now, you have to be a good generalist. You have to touch a little bit of everything.... Sometimes without being involved with my job, the people receive things from the government all in French, and they come and see me to see if it's important or not, and if it is they'd like to know what's the contents. Sometimes I help them to prepare an answer.
D: Have you had to help with applications in French, like for pensions?
P: Yeah, and we try to make sure when we fill out these applications that next time they will correspond in English, so they can get help from other members of the family who speak English. But it's still gonna happen, even though they are more aware now that the speaking language here is more English than French.... Before, it was not that they were badly intended, it's just that they were ignorant of the fact that the federal government was here before the provincial government, and when they installed school, they didn't put French (in the) school, they brought English ..., so the people kinda got used to the English language in this way. Now the provincial government took responsibility starting with the James Bay Agreement and we see more and more French in schools.9 That's why I say it's on the right track now.

(Non-Native Municipal Council Employee M; PR)

Inuit employees see more of a need to learn French in some workplaces than in others. For example, Inuit who hold positions in Québec government offices are able to have documents translated from French into English—although, as Pierre mentions above, it is taxing on those who have to do the translating. In the following excerpt, a francophone woman describes how she has fared in a Québec government office, where new procedures from the ministry would always be sent in French, but where the majority of Native employees could not work in French:

---

9 Note that this statement is not quite accurate: the provincial government had responsibility for schooling before the JBNQA, but the establishment of a French stream in schools came after the Agreement.
5.1.5.1. LANGUAGE MARKETS AND JOB MARKETS

Inuititut, French, and English are taught in Nunavik schools, and used and valued in social groups and in various workplaces in Great Whale River. Although the school is responsible for producing and reproducing legitimate, standardized forms of language, it is not the only site where linguistic norms are developed and maintained. There is a constant tension between what is expected, accepted, and valued in the community and what is valued in the school. In general, school language practices have a higher value in exchange for material resources than other linguistic forms. Thus, for Inuit deciding whether to stay or settle in Kuujuuaraapik, it is important to ask how French, English or standardized Inuititut will benefit them, and what opportunities are available to them if they choose to live in the community. The following section will attempt to answer these questions by examining which languages are required in certain workplaces.

5.1.5.2. LANGUAGE LEARNING AND OBTAINING WORK

While there are strategies for dealing with the new francophone reality which do not involve learning French, some adult Inuit have learned French or have made efforts to do so, generally for work-related reasons. During the course of my fieldwork I investigated three workplaces where employees were encouraged to learn French, not only for promotion, but also for dealing with customers or in order to get the work done. These workplaces included the (federally-run) post office, a provincial government office, and a commercial airline. These sites are representative of government and service related jobs in
Great Whale River, that serve the wider community. However, it should be noted that the majority jobs available for local people—such as those affiliated with the council, the school board, stores in Kuujjuaarpik and health and social services—do not require French to the same degree. In all three places, Inuit and Cree employees had sought out language training, either because it was required or because it would facilitate their duties at work.

The post office in Great Whale River was perhaps the most obvious example of how an office, service, or business can run effectively in four languages. The three full-time employees—an Inuk, a Cree and a francophone—were always ready to serve customers in their mother tongue or in English. Thus, if an Inuk came in to office, they were served by Mina in Inuitut. Cree customers were served by Robert in Cree, while English and French speaking customers were served in the language of their choice by whoever was available. Mina, the Inuk employee, had had some French language training in Montreal over a period of two years, before accepting the job at the post office; and Robert, the Cree employee, was taking French lessons one night a week at the adult education centre. Although I never witnessed Robert serving customers in French, I observed Mina on one occasion help a visitor from France with limited English sort out the prices of stamps for various destinations.

The success of this office led me to interview both the Post Master of Great Whale River and the District Manager of the post offices in James Bay and Northern Québec, who was visiting one day from Val D’Or, a francophone community to the south. My interview with the Post Master was conducted in both French and English, while the interview with the District Manager was conducted in English, which was his preference.

My interest in this office stemmed both from their practice of hiring staff locally and from the efficiency of their service, given the difficult conditions of providing such service in Arctic regions. What became clear from the interviews was that the local hiring practices were a direct result of policy changes regarding the running of the post office system. Political pressure from the Northwest Territories led to a creation in 1989 of a Northern services division, which linked all post office services in Northern Canadian regions. The physical reality of Northern communities and their social—and in particular, linguistic—needs made their situation and budget requirements unique. The district manager, who had worked for Canada Post in northern regions since 1984, described this shift in policy as follows:

Post Offices are run locally; it is a contract. It can be with municipal council, band council, Northern Store, Co-ops, and in some places we have our own employees. But on
James Bay, all positions in the post office, it doesn’t matter if it’s our own employee or a contractor, they are all Native employees. In the past we had some White people, but after our division took over, it was the mandate to whenever possible to staff offices with local employees who speak the language of the community.

D: Since when?
R: It started in 1989.
D: What is the reason behind this change?
R: The reason behind, well it wasn’t really logical you know to see a place, like I saw in Kuujjuaq. There were three employees in the post office, all White people. One spoke English pretty good, the two others were barely speaking English, and they have to serve, let’s say 90% of the population are Native. Okay. So plus, they were serving them in really poor English.
D: This was in the ‘80s?
R: In ’87, ’88, that’s before our division was created. But we changed it. As soon as one White employee who spoke French or English left, we tried to replace them with a Native person. And here, there are no White people working here, only the post master, who speaks French and English.... it didn’t happen in one day. In 1989 I think there were three White employees here... then you start replacing them with reliable employees. You could go through six casuals before you find one who’s gonna suit the position. But that began four years ago, and even in Iqaluit, which has one of the largest post offices, the post mistress is Native, she’s been there close to a year now, and she’s doing good. And Chisasibi is a pretty large office, and the post master is Cree. On James Bay it’s all Native. And there’s only here and Kuujjuaq where we have a White post master, the rest is all Native. Well, except if we talk about Radisson, is not Native. There are no Natives living in Radisson or on James Bay Hydro Project Post Office, it’s all non-Native, there’s no need for Native there. Everywhere people can be served in their own language.

(District Post Office Manager M)

The Post Master in Great Whale River summarized the functioning of the local post office in a separate interview. Like the district manager, he also highlighted its language practices, and the extent to which local hiring practices have changed:

Well, there might be one thing that might be special here, for the post office in Kuujjuaapik. One thing special, that no other office in Canada has, is that we offer service in four languages... Most frequently used is English, but there’s also lots of Inuitit involved and Cree a little less. But the reason, the reason why there is a little
Thus, in the post office, at least two languages are necessary. Despite the relatively large francophone population, and the contact that employees have with French speakers who need to be served in French, bilingualism in their mother tongue and English fulfils policy requirements. The Post Master did note, though, that some post offices in northern communities are run by Inuit who speak French as a second language:

G: At the moment there's Akulivik, and like they're in the transitional stage at the moment because for about ten years the Kativik School Board (has been) promoting French as a Second Language, so now ... the students that are getting out of school have French as a Second Language instead of English.

D: So the people running that post office are Inuit, but they're speaking French?

G: Yes, in Akulivik and there's POV,\textsuperscript{10} at the moment it's English, but I notice when people call that there's more... French than before.

However, in certain other workplaces in Great Whale River, French is either required by policy, even though it may not actually be required on the job; or is not officially required but is so prevalent in the workplace that employees feel compelled to learn it.

In the following interview, the manager of Hydro-Québec describes the corporation's language policy and its requirements for both Québécois and Inuit employees working in the north:

\textsuperscript{10} The community of Povungnituk, along the northern Hudson Bay coast, is often colloquially referred to as 'P-O-V' (with the letter-names 'P' 'O' and 'V' pronounced individually).
D: What are the requirements to become permanent?
H-Q: I have one [Imik] guy here. One guy and he was temporary for a while, at least five years. And we asked him to get some French, my boss in Quebec City asked him to get some French. He was doing his job very well, and uh, we just switched him from temporary to permanent about let's say, two months ago. It's only an evaluation period right now because we have to, you know because the procedure and everything, but he'll be permanent in a short while. And, we asked him to have more French, and he took some course, and we even gave him some course, like the company. They supplied a course. We did that to a couple of the guys up the coast, that asked for it.
D: Do they go away for the course?
H-Q: No it's like, how do they call that, the cassettes and books.
D: They can do it at home?
H-Q: Yeah that's the best we can do. Even if there was a course in the village, a French course at night or something and they ask for it, we say okay, go ahead, and we pay for it and everything. Normally we try to get French and we try to get it where it is.
D: ... Why is it that it's so important that they have French for working?
H-Q: I don't know, it's a policy of the company. Personally, I don't speak French anywhere else but here with my secretary and my linemen, and that's it. Up coast it's English, even here with the guy we just switched to permanent, I speak English to him, he's more comfortable and it's better understanding.
D: It's a rule of the company and that's it?
H-Q: Yeah, yeah, Hydro-Québec, it's like, I have to ask, even sometime all the paper from down south, all the memos or whatever it is. They ask me to send it to the powerhouse and it's in French. And before I was here, they just sent it like this. And I said no way, you won't do that, I asked the guy to translate it. Everything that comes here has to be in English. You know, it's no good if they send something in French and they don't understand. You want the people to understand what you want and you send it in French. They don't know and they throw it away. So now it's better, they've got a translation department and they translate all the paper and send it here.

As in provincial government offices, Hydro-Québec functions in French in Montréal or Québec City, but serves an aboriginal population that functions mostly in aboriginal languages or in English as a second language. Thus directives, information, and memos written in French need to be translated if those employed locally are to make any use of them. In the case of Hydro-Québec meter readers, and those who man the powerhouse, French is not required, except to read information sent from offices in the French-speaking
South. The reluctance of Southern offices to translate into English is understandable given the political circumstances surrounding the use of French in Québec, and a genuine lack of awareness that English is the most common second language of Native communities. Employees in Northern offices have found ways of coping with the situation, by demanding translation and by acting as language brokers; and for those who do not speak French, the need for the language, the desirability of learning it, and the access to learning resources really depend on the situation.

The following excerpts are from two employees of the provincial government office, each of whom has sought out French language training. However, one of them voices an opinion shared by many that mastering two languages is sufficient, and that learning a third should not be necessary, particularly if employees find it difficult to learn and can cope without it.

... this job that I have is nothing but French, with some translation and stuff, I'm able to do this. My co-workers here don't speak French they all... they can do the job. You get a little training, you get the hang of it and you can do the job.... I've been trying hard to learn French. I even took a six-week immersion course this year, but it's not enough. Like I already have two languages, putting in a third one, you know it's kind of hard.

(Inuk Québec Government Employee M; DN)

The other interviewee would like to learn more French, but ironically her francophone manager does not see the need for her to devote an hour per day of work time for language training:

D: Do you have to use French here at your job?
SI: Everything that we work with, most of the forms, they're all in French. The computer's all in French.
D: So what happens, how do you deal with that?
SI: Having taken the French course it's makes it more understandable as to what we're working with. Because, like previously when we never had the French course, I didn't even know what I was reading. But having taken the French course, I get a general idea what is happening.
D: So it helps quite a bit?
SI: Yes.
D: Would you continue learning French?
SI: We were supposed to continue our French course, but our boss is very reluctant to give us the French course. He said we have too much work load.... We had the same work load before and we were taking French course. One hour at the end, that was very helpful. .... From what he says, why should we learn French? That’s his question. We explain to him why, but nothing's happening.... All the pamphlets, everything, even letters from the union are in French. Even all the directives, communications, the new changes that we receive through the computer, it’s all in French, it has to be translated for us before we could read it. Because some of these changes are very drastic for the files.

(Inuk Québec Government Employee F; SI)

The last workplace I will discuss is a private one—a major commercial airline serving the Native and Non-Native population travelling south to Québec City or Montréal. Like the post office and government welfare office, the airline hires local Inuit and Cree to work in cargo and to serve customers at the desk. However, French is required in order to obtain the latter position, which at the time of my fieldwork was held by Rebecca, an Inuk woman who was married to a francophone.

Rebecca began learning French when it was taught as a subject in the federal day school in the early 1970s. She married a francophone; and when they had a child, her husband spoke French to both her and the child. This is when her knowledge of the language really improved. Soon after she obtained her present position at the airline company, which required a good knowledge of French, since it involved serving many customers in French. It is important to note that she needed only speaking and listening, but not reading or writing, ability in French; her informally acquired knowledge was thus sufficient, and she was not required to attend an academically-oriented course in French.

Another Native employee, a Cree woman married to an Inuk man, was also inspired to learn French, primarily to obtain work as a clerk, which she preferred to her present position as a cargo handler. When asked about French, and why she wanted to learn it, she offered the following remarks:

D: Why are you learning French, why is it important for you?
L: 'Cause, the reason why I decided to learn French is because I wanna get a better job, more higher, like let's say where I'm working right now as a cargo loader, I need French in order to be working at the counter with the customers, the public.... I guess in some areas we need French, especially where I'm working, to deal with the public, you need English and French, and we do need the Cree and the Inuktitut, they're all important.

...
D: Do you sometimes have to use Cree on the job?
L: Yeah, and Inuktitut, with customers, and they ask questions about, you know, the plane and the cargo, all kinds of questions. They mostly ask for us because I guess they're so used to speaking their own languages, you know what I mean.

Thus, French is considered necessary, but so are Inuktitut, Cree and English. Because an airline clerk's work, pay, and benefits are attractive, the motivation to learn French in order to qualify for such a position is high. Of course, language skills are not the only ones needed to perform the job well, and they are not the only prerequisites. However, language requirements—in particular, relatively high levels of proficiency in second or third languages—serve as gate-keeping mechanisms for employment and promotion in certain workplaces. For this reason, it is important to see what exactly employers in Great Whale River are looking for in their employees. These findings will be discussed in this last section.

5.1.5.3. AN OVERVIEW OF LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS IN THE WORKPLACE

DP: A propos des postes pour les stagiaires, quel pourcentage demande le français?
MB: Beaucoup, beaucoup... moi, je dirais que c'est rendu, moitié, peut-être plus. C'est peut-être juste Kuujuaraapik, mais il y a beaucoup d'employeurs francophones. Donc, il demande aussi l'anglais, faut que tu parles l'anglais, sinon tu ne peux pas communiquer avec les autres personnes, ou bien Cri ou Inuktitut. Mais, c'est au moins 75% des employeurs d'ici qui demandent le français.

DP: Est-ce que c'est réaliste?
MB: Quand je dis 'demandent', si tu n'as pas, ils vont quand-même vous prendre, parce qu'ils n'ont pas le choix. Si tu veux bien fonctionner, je dirais que 75% des organismes fonctionnent beaucoup en français. Regarde juste les bureaux principaux que tu as ici comme... le welfare, Transport Québec, Transport Canada... Toutes les petites compagnies locales aussi, tu vois comme le 'nursing', il y a beaucoup d'infirmières qui fonctionnent en français. Tu vas du coté de Jean-Pierre Pilon... c'est des entreprises privées qui [sont] plus du côté français. Peut-être que je ne suis pas réaliste de dire 75%, mais disons un gros 60%. Parce que je commence à faire le tour, puis beaucoup beaucoup demandent le français. (Non-Native Adult Education Employee F; MB)

Earlier in the chapter we saw how French has become a valuable symbolic resource in Great Whale River for improving employment opportunities. We also saw some reasons
why most Inuit have nevertheless avoided learning French, and the strategies that they exploit in dealing with a perceived need to have access to this language. That this need is not yet a part of the social reality of the community—that a gap exists between the perceived necessity of French and real employment requirements in Kuujjuaq—is made clear by the adult education counsellor quoted above, who notes that employers who ask for French-language skills ‘vont quand-même ... prendre’ a potential employee (‘they will take [an employee] anyway’), even if the prospective employee does not speak French. We have also seen how many work-related documents (new information, instructions, laws, etc.) are being translated into English to accommodate the non-French-speaking employees of the North. Nevertheless, the conception that the job market is an arena in which French is valued and often required has been one of the factors (which also include the need to access Québec government and private-sector services, as discussed above) that have prompted many parents to enrol their children in the French stream at school. Currently, school appears to be the only arena in the community where French language resources can be accessed; and the practice of enrolling children in this stream might best be understood as a symbolic accommodation by the Inuit of Québec and the French language, and a recognition of the possibility that French might assume a greater role in the community in the future. In what follows, I will be examining the demands that certain key players in the job market are making regarding language and other symbolic and cultural resources.

This examination involves an analysis of interview data from a selection of employers who represent the range of possible employment in Great Whale River. The following excerpt is from an interview with the manager of the Northern Store:

D: And what about language requirements?
G: English is fine... for this particular store. There are some stores where they would definitely need French, but for the most part, they don’t have to be bilingual.

... 
D: If someone came to you locally, and they spoke French and English, say an Inuk, would that make a difference to you, over someone who just spoke English?
G: No, well if that was the only difference in their skills, I suppose, but I mean I wouldn’t look specifically at that skill, no. But if it came down to they all had the same experience and what-not, but that wouldn’t be my main focus.
D: The language used most in this store is English?
G: That’s right.
The next excerpt is from an interview with a non-Native Québec government employee:

D: Do you need French to do your job?
J: Yeah, we are in Québec, all the papers are in French... everything is in French. For northern Québec we translate everything in English.

D: Do you do that translation?
J: No, no no. I do my own paper in English, and the court proceeds in English. But there is no obligation for us to do that in English. We do that because there is a principle, an agreement saying that for northern Québec, it is recognized in the James Bay Agreement that everything has to be translated in English. But the working language in Québec, which includes northern Québec, is French. So everything is in French. So you have to understand French, and you have to pass the exam at 'la Commission des affaires'...

The third excerpt is from an interview with the head of the regional division of the Sûreté du Québec:

D: C’est quoi la politique exactement de la SQ pour embaucher les constables?
MC: Concernant la langue, c’est qu’il doit, soit parler le français ou l’anglais. Parce que les rapports, la majorité des rapports, vont se faire soit en anglais ou en français. C’est normal, parce que lorsque les lecteurs, nous autres, ou des autorités à Montréal ou à Rouyn, si on doit lire un rapport, mais il comprend pas l’Inuitut, puis il comprend pas non plus le Cri, donc, ça soit en anglais ou français. Donc, on a besoin de personnel qui peut... parler soit le français ou l’anglais.

D: Est-ce qu’il y a des problèmes si les constables ne parlent pas français?
MC: Non, aucun problème sur le côté français, parce que tous les rapports sont faits ici en anglais.... Aucun problème parce que tout le personnel qui est attitré à la division autochtone doit parler l’anglais, il y a avant d’être attitré ou d’être assigné à la division autochtone, il y a un test d’anglais qui est donné au personnel, et si ce test-là, il n’est pas passé, ben, la personne n’ira pas dans cette division-là. Donc tout le personnel qu’on rencontre dans la division autochtone est un personnel qui parle l’anglais, puis qui écrit l’anglais.

As we have seen elsewhere in the chapter, French is the language of the majority of government offices in Great Whale River; and the people working in these offices, Native and non-Native, have had to cope with the necessity of having documents translated into English. French is needed for some positions in these offices: namely, the secretarial and
managerial positions that involve direct dealings with French-speaking employees in Southern francophone communities. But French is not required even for much of the day-to-day work associated with the positions, or for a large portion of the other government jobs:

HQ: Oh say we have an Inuit girl coming in one afternoon a week, on a training (programme) with the Kativik School Board.
D: Oh really, for training for the secretary?
HQ: Yeah they call that administration clerk. And when I was looking to replace..., because the placement was open, I met a few Inuit girls (for) the post, but they didn't have enough French. That's the main problem. They have English, and Inuititut ... I'd rather have Inuit people there because of the coast it's all Inuit, everybody... so that's why. But they don't have enough French because they have to speak French with the people down south. Our main office is down south. Everybody speaks French there.

(Non-Native Hydro-Québec Employee M: YH)

Thus, for some positions (such as the 'administration clerk' at Hydro-Québec), bilingual English-Inuititut speakers, who lack the French-language fluency to speak to people in francophone offices in the South, appear to be missing opportunities for employment. This gate-keeping function of French language proficiency, however, appears to be rare, since it appears to apply only in positions where employees have to communicate with Southern francophone offices or to deal with a French-speaking clientele, such as at the airport or in the post office. As we have seen, most Québec government offices have hired local people who have limited knowledge of French, but who can function well in English and Inuititut or Cree. This is due largely to the current practice—the result of much effort on the part of Québécois employees—of insisting on the translation of most French work-related material into English. This accommodation of Inuit second-language-English speakers by francophone individuals and institutions may reflect a simple acceptance of English as having been long entrenched as a second language in Arctic Québec communities—although it may also reflect the desire of many in the province’s public and private sectors to include aboriginal minorities within the Québécois nation. Of course, French-speaking employees, usually arriving from the South, are still required in these offices, and French is also required for most promotions. Thus, the perception in Kuujjuaapik that French linguistic resources are now required for access to the job market seems to be based only in part on a recognition of current employment practices. However, since the positions of power in government offices and in the small
enterprises in the Qallunaat sector are held by francophones, the perception that French linguistic resources are highly valued in the larger political economy of Québec appears to be an accurate one. What remains unclear is the degree to which Inuit will have access to French language resources, in order to penetrate these positions of power within the franco-dominant administrative sector; and to what extent the accommodation of an English-speaking workforce will continue to be accepted in French-dominant workplaces.

6. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have examined the concept of language markets, in which certain language varieties—symbolic resources—are valued and exchanged for other symbolic and material resources. More specifically, I have examined the notion of the dominant Southern linguistic market, and how it operates in relation to an alternative ‘traditional’ linguistic market in Arctic Québec. I have argued that in order to understand the values currently placed on certain symbolic resources, we need to understand the historical importance of English, French, and Inuitut, and the mechanisms by which language is linked to political mobilization of minority groups—Québécois and Inuit—within the Canadian state. The historical analysis that I have presented has included an examination of the dominance of English during the fur trade and the intervention of the Canadian state (chapter 2) and the role of the English-dominated wage labour market and education system introduced to the area in the 1950s. It has also included an examination of the rise of Québécois nationalism in the 1960s, and the increased importance of French in the region. Coupled with the historical importance of these two dominant European languages is the rising importance of Inuitut in Arctic Québec—particularly in its role in Inuit mobilization—and of the strategies that Inuit have adopted to enable them as an English-educated workforce to adapt to a new franco-dominant political and economic reality. One of these strategies has included enrolling children in the French stream at school to provide them with access to newly-valued French language resources.

For now, a large part of the wage labour market in the community still functions in English, and some parts of it—such as those associated with the municipal government and services—in Inuitut and Cree. Although French is linked to positions of power within Québec, and recognized as necessary for communicating with people in southern Québec communities, there still seems to be a gap between the perception and the reality of the role of French-language competence in Arctic Québec. French appears to play a crucial workplace role in only a few positions, such as at the airport and in some secretarial and managerial positions that require direct dealings with the South. In most Québec
government offices, for example, translation of material into English has become the norm; and as for other Southern French-language institutions, residents of Kuujjuaapik can generally rely on English-French (and will eventually be able to rely on Inuititut-French) bilingual brokers to assist them in dealing with these institutions.

Inuit (and others) have also adopted a number of other strategies in order to deal with the new sociopolitical reality of French. Among these is the practice of enrolling children in the French stream, which might be understood both as a symbolic gesture by the Inuit to acknowledge the importance of French in the community and as an admission of the possibility that French will become a greater necessity in the future. As matters stand, the future place of French in the verbal repertoires of local residents remains very much dependent on the effectiveness of French-language education, on Inuit access to French-language employment and on the acceptance and use of French by Native and non-Native interlocutors alike. To what extent the Inuit use the four languages in Kuujjuaapik will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

ETHNOGRAPHY OF LANGUAGE USE

In the last chapter, I examined the historical development of the linguistic markets operating in Nunavik in general and Kuujjuaraapik in particular; and showed how English, French, and Inuittitut have become associated with certain forms of power and prestige in this northern political economy, and which strategies institutions and speaking subjects have adopted in order to produce, distribute, and gain access to these valued resources. I also showed how institutional processes and individual strategies have become linked to the political and economic realities of the last forty-five years, as Kuujjuaamit have been faced with a rapid shift to modernity, as reflected in settlement, wage labour, formal schooling, and political organization.

In this chapter, I will examine what happens at the micro-level of day-to-day interaction between speakers from the four language groups described in chapter 1: English, French, Inuittitut and Cree speakers. The focus is Kuujjuaraapik—in particular, the use of language in this community, and its relation to the Cree and Non-Native communities. (These latter two communities will receive relatively less detailed consideration, a more complete examination of language use to be left for future research.) This chapter attempts to address why and how speakers of Kuujjuaraapik learn and use Inuittitut, French, and English in the school and community, and what consequences these language choices have for interlocutors. In particular, it examines what languages are used in particular circumstances and the role of language choice in the construction, maintenance, and transcendence of ethnolinguistic boundaries and in the formation of ethnic identities. In order to achieve these goals, we will have to examine language practices and intercultural communication in a variety of community settings.

As part of my research on the ethnolinguistic groups mentioned above, I conducted a language survey that would provide a general picture of the linguistic competences and the language practices of residents of Kuujjuaraapik; and also recorded examples of face-to-face interactions within and between language groups. The survey, which I will be describing in §2, was a collaborative effort with the Kativik School Board, based on previous surveys that it conducted in collaboration with Donald Taylor (Taylor 1990; Taylor & Wright 1989). Basing this survey on previous ones facilitated the comparison of its results with those of similar ones conducted in other Nunavik communities. When I began this research, I realized that the use of self-reports, while making possible a description of the language practices of a large number of people, had the drawback of
reflecting what people think or say they do, but not necessarily what they actually do, with language. I therefore supplemented these data with descriptions of actual language interaction and an analysis of its social consequences. These observations confirmed the frequent use of Inuktitut and English and relatively rare use of French among Inuit in the community. The last three sections of the chapter, which are based on my observations of language interaction in the community, consider how language choice operates in Kuujjuaq to construct social boundaries between Inuit and non-Native speakers—boundaries which are not ‘fixed’, but negotiated, constructed, and maintained through linguistic and cultural practices which have persisted over centuries of contact. Within these social groups, material and symbolic resources are exchanged, and social, cultural and economic values are defined through linguistic interaction. These values are distinguishable, yet clearly linked, and include the social meanings associated with family and sharing between kin relations; traditional cultural practices associated with food harvesting and preparation; and the economic value of harvested game as a staple food resource for the community. These values thus pertain to symbolic resources such as social solidarity and friendship; and material resources such as whale meat, fat, and other harvested products. As we shall see, sociolinguistic processes of boundary formation, through which these values are defined, construct particular forms of ‘Inuit’, ‘Cree’, ‘Québécois’, and ‘Anglo-Canadian’ ethnicity in Great Whale River and serve to define, include, and exclude people of different ethnic groups.

1. WHO SPEAKS WHAT: THE DISTRIBUTION OF LINGUISTIC RESOURCES

1.1. ENGLISH AND FRENCH

English is the most widely spoken language in Great Whale River, primarily because it was the language of education for both Inuit and Cree when the federal day school opened in 1958. It was also the language of higher education for those who pursued studies in Southern high schools, colleges, and universities. Thus English became the primary second language of residents and is the language of intercultural communication, despite the increasing role of French, and the introduction of French language instruction in the 1960s. English, for example, is the sole language of communication (signs, schedules, etc.) at the gymnasium, where people from all four language groups congregate. Most francophones, allophones, Cree, and Inuit would probably agree that English is the most useful second language.
French language resources have a much smaller distribution than English, despite the important role of French in the community of Poste-de-la-Baleine (the name I use to refer to the non-Native sector), in provincial government offices, and in many workplaces. Because of the importance of French as a community language in Poste-de-la-Baleine and its importance in the province of Québec, many of the anglophones living in that part of the community speak French quite fluently. In addition, many Inuit school children are enrolled in French at school, so it is becoming increasingly popular as a second and third language.

In general, most francophones speak English, some anglophones speak French, and even fewer members of each group learn or speak Inuktitut or Cree. During my period of fieldwork, I knew of only one non-Native other than myself who had made a serious attempt to learn Inuktitut in addition to some Cree. She had been an evangelical missionary in Arctic Québec for a number of years, and had begun learning the language in a smaller, more northern community. Her knowledge was sufficient to engage in short conversations with elders, and she could read and write the syllabary fluently. However, the majority of her conversations were conducted in English with Inuit or Cree who had learned the language at school.

During interviews, a few non-Native people expressed interest in an Inuktitut course if one were offered and if the material were presented in an accessible fashion. Some had taken an adult education course before and had some knowledge of Inuktitut phrases, and would regularly greet elders in Inuktitut. Beyond this, however, there was no real Inuktitut language learning among residents in Poste-de-la-Baleine. This includes the six non-Native residents living with Inuit spouses (five men and one woman).

In general, French and English are widely distributed in the non-Native community, which is a heterogeneous group composed of people with different backgrounds and interests, who are there for work and/or to be with their spouses. In everyday interaction, the majority use French among themselves and English in intercultural communication. Despite the interest expressed in learning Inuktitut, learning the language is considered to be quite difficult, and is not really considered a priority.

1.2. INUKTITUT AND CREE

Inuktitut and Cree are the first languages learned and spoken by Inuit and Cree in the communities of Kuujjuaq and Whapmagoostui, respectively. In general, they are not learned as second languages. However, there are a few exceptional cases, which include historical examples, where early traders, Hudson Bay Company employees and
missionaries learned one or both of the aboriginal languages; and where Cree and Inuit earlier this century learned each other’s language in shared camps, or where Inuit learned Cree as children. There are also the current examples of Inuit with Cree ancestry placing their children in the Cree school, where they have access to Cree in pre-kindergarten and kindergarten; of mixed Cree-Inuit households in Kuujjuaraapik, where children may grow up speaking both languages, or go to the Cree school and play in Inuittitut with Inuit children in Kuujjuaraapik. There is also the case of the missionary (mentioned above) who was actively engaged in language learning, and the case of some non-Inuit spouses attempting to learn the language.

Despite the long-term presence of English in Great Whale River, and the power associated with French and English, both Inuittitut and Cree are widely used in their respective communities. However, as previously mentioned, most everyone born after 1950 speaks English as a second language. In the Inuit communities in Arctic Québec, this rate of bilingualism has led some to worry about the state of the language and the potential influence of English on the structure and vitality of Inuittitut (Dorais 1997; Taylor et al. 1993). This concern has led school board educators and researchers to address the issues of minority language maintenance and Inuittitut survival, which I will address in the next section, before turning to a description of a language survey that I conducted in Kuujjuaraapik on the use of four languages in the home and community.

2. MINORITY LANGUAGES IN CANADA AND THE ‘SURVIVAL’ OF INUITITUT

Languages—especially small, ‘less used’, or minority languages—are often described as ‘living things’ (Dorian 1989), and characterized either as vibrant, thriving, strong, or surviving, or as threatened, dying or dead. Languages are usually said to ‘live’ or ‘die’ depending on a range of social, historical, political, and economic factors; and those most ‘threatened’ are usually indigenous languages, spoken by peoples who have entered into colonial and political economic relationships which favour the use of one or more dominant languages or language varieties.

Two different approaches have been used in the study of indigenous languages of North America. The first involves recording and categorizing grammatical and phonological aspects of a language, usually in consultation with older, more ‘authentic’ speakers; and has been called ‘with slight disparagement “salvage work”’ (Dorian 1990b: 159) or ‘salvage linguistics’—a pursuit which ‘documents for science another dying language’ (Collins 1992: 407). The second approach involves language revival and the introduction of indigenous language programmes. These linguistic maintenance efforts are
often directly linked to the political mobilization of indigenous groups, and to ideologies of linguistic and cultural ‘survival’ fostered by cultural activists at the local and institutional level. It is thus under specific political, social, economic, and historical conditions that minority languages survive.

Foster (1982) notes that in Canada, Inuititut, Cree, and Ojibway are the indigenous languages most likely to ‘survive’ given the sheer number of speakers. Inuititut (often spelled Inuktut in the Northwest Territories) is a member of the Eskimo-Aleut language family and has about 17 000 speakers. It is closely related to Inupiaq in Alaska, which has about 5 000 speakers, and to Greenlandic, which has about 45 000 speakers (Dorian 1990a: 144). In northern Québec alone, there are about 8 000 speakers of Inuititut living in fifteen communities. The varieties of Inuititut spoken in these communities are characterized both by regionalisms and by more local ways of speaking, but there are similarities running across them as well.

In Inuit villages, Inuititut plays an important role in local institutions, which include the school, the media, and the local government. Though based largely on Southern institutions, many of these have been adapted to the Inuit way of life, and function at community as well as at regional levels, where they have been instrumental in processes of social transformation and adaptation, and are important sites of Inuit resistance to assimilation.

Although Inuititut is spoken between Inuit speakers in a variety of settings, and all Inuititut speakers in the community use Inuititut more than any other language in family and work settings, Inuititut support in institutional settings has been a community priority. The specific reasons for this will be discussed in a later section; for now, we might note they are related to Inuit recognition of the ideological and material importance of Inuititut language maintenance in Arctic Québec, and of global trends toward indigenous language death.

In Nunavik, institutional support for Inuititut can be observed in various settings. In the schools, it is the sole language of instruction in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2, and then taught as a subject; in addition, it is used approximately six hours per week in physical education and culture classes. On the local FM community radio station, Inuititut is broadcasted up to eight hours per day. The radio station plays an especially important role in supporting Inuititut, since most people in the community turn in to this radio station, which keeps them informed about community events, local news, and national news.

---

1 This includes Chisasibi, which is located 150 kilometers south of the 55th parallel, and sometimes considered to be one of the fifteen Inuit villages. It has a relatively small Inuk population, however, and since it is predominantly Cree, and located so far to the south, it is usually considered to be a Cree village.
provided by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) services from Iqaluit. In addition, CBC Northern Service and the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation (IBC) regularly broadcast television programmes in Inuttitut. Inuttitut is also regularly seen in print, not only in local announcements and the like, but throughout the Eastern Arctic in ‘about three dozen bilingual Inuktut-English periodicals’ (Dorais 1989: 199). The Anglican church has also historically operated in Inuttitut. The first task of missionaries was to learn Inuktut, preach in the language, and introduce literacy in order to insure the spread of Christianity. Inuktut-speaking ministers were a presence in Great Whale River until the arrival of a unilingual, English-speaking minister in the mid-1980s. The current minister still conducts services in Inuktut, however, with the help of lay interpreters. More recently arrived evangelical missionaries also work with Inuktut material and make attempts to learn the language. Finally, the local government, administered by an elected municipal council, allocates local resources based on the needs of the Inuktut-speaking community.

Inuktut is a symbolic resource directly linked to the distribution of material resources at the community level. Work associated with the community (including road and building maintenance and the running of community events) is carried out in Inuktut. Exceptions include the maintenance of the airport, commercial enterprises (such as the Northern Store), and (to a certain extent) the running of the health clinic and the school, which are both dependent on a relatively large amount of non-local management.

Thus, from an outsider’s perspective, Inuktut appears to be thriving. It is an important resource in the community, in social life, and in institutions—that is, in everyday practices between community members, and in more formal, institutional settings such as the school, where standardized, regulatory language practices constitute legitimate forms of Inuktut usage. It is important to understand the relationship between the legitimate language practices reproduced in educational settings and everyday practices which can constitute resistance, production, and transformation of the norm, in order to understand the effects of language policy on the development and maintenance of particular language varieties. This chapter has so far focused on one piece of this larger picture in examining language choices made in community settings. The next section examines everyday language practices in Kuujjuaraapik from the standpoint of the contexts of the use of (and Inuit perceptions of their competence in) the four languages spoken in their community. It addresses the results of a language survey which show how language use and proficiency in Kuujjuaraapik are related to the particular historical political economic shifts in the region.

3. LANGUAGE SURVEY DATA: SELF-REPORTS OF LANGUAGE USE

175
During the 1980s, language surveys in the Canadian Arctic found that Inuittitut was widely used, but always together with English and always under the threat of language shift. In spite of the caveats associated with surveys—that they rely on self-reported data, and fail to capture the complexity of language use, such as the use of code-mixing in certain contexts—language surveys can be valuable tools. In particular, they can provide information about the languages associated with some of the more salient contexts of language use in communities. Even under circumstances where one’s self-reporting may not reflect what actually happens, surveys allow us gauge tendencies toward the use of one language variety over another in a particular domain. Survey data can also be a useful supplement to face-to-face data on language choice in the community, given their wide scope as regards numbers of speakers. In this section, I will briefly consider the results of these surveys, and then provide the results of the survey that I conducted in Kuujjuaapik during 1993-1994.

Although ‘the Inuittitut language remains strong and vibrant’ in Arctic Québec (Taylor and Wright 1989: 95), the consensus of language surveys is that there is always a possibility of language shift to English in the Canadian Arctic (Dorais 1990a). Indications of this shift include bilingualism, especially among Inuit educated in English; the power English holds in communities, especially in institutional domains such as the media, education, and employment; the role of English as the lingua franca of English-, French-, and Inuittitut-speakers; the increased influence of Euro-Canadian culture, particularly on children and teenagers; the varying degrees of language loss or ‘deterioration’ among young Inuittitut speakers, at least as perceived by older members of the community (Dorais 1990a, 1997).

Bilingualism throughout the Eastern Arctic appears to be on the rise. Dorais (1989) notes that the majority of Inuit born around 1950 and later are bilingual. In a study that Dorais conducted, the amount of English used in everyday life was found to be greater in three settlements in the Northwest Territories (Igloolik, Lake Harbour, and Iqaluit) than in two villages along the Hudson Bay coast (Povungnituk and Iqaluit). The results are supported by other surveys in the Québec region. This, together with the finding that the number of Inupiaq speakers of Alaska is dwindling (Dorian 1990a: 143), has prompted researchers and residents alike to fear that Inuittitut use in Nunavik could take a similar route. Increased bilingualism is not seen as a cause, but as one of the indicators that English is playing a greater role in social life.

Quoting a survey conducted by the Kativik Regional Government (KRG) in 1987, Taylor (1990) notes that 94% of Inuit adults in Arctic Québec indicated that they were
functional in Inuititut. In their own survey of the largest Arctic Québec settlement (which is 75% Inuit, 15% francophone, and 10% anglophone), Taylor and Wright (1989) found similarly high levels of Inuititut proficiency among native speakers, and noted that the ‘Inuit respondents are as fluent and literate in Inuititut as Anglophones and Francophones are in English and French respectively’ (1989: 93). However, just as Dorais’s study found, the number of bilingual adults appears to be increasing as the number of unilingual speakers in Arctic Québec decreases. The 1981 census reported that 73% of the Arctic Québec population were unilingual in Inuititut, whereas the 1987 KRG survey reported that 27% were. Although these figures have to be read with extreme caution (a 46% increase in bilingual speakers over six years is probably exaggerated), bilingualism is definitely increasing—something to be expected, as young people educated in English or French enter adulthood and the number of older unilingual speakers decreases.

Education in French as a second language in Arctic Québec really took hold only in the late 1970s. For this reason, in a 1987 survey, only 1.1% of the population were reported to speak French as a second language in a Nunavik community. Taylor (1990: 14) concludes from this ‘that the Inuit community does not make any use of the French language.’ Based on these data and my own observations, it appears that French is rarely used as a language of intercultural communication, although there have been reports that more French is being used among younger educated Inuit in more isolated communities. As already noted, English is the lingua franca of the region; and according to Taylor and Wright, ‘significantly greater use of English was reported in the job context than in the home or while engaging in traditional activities of hunting and fishing’; and ‘the trend toward English is especially noticeable among young people’ (1989: 99). ‘Perception’ needs to be emphasized here, since actual language use on the job was not observed in this study. In smaller communities it appears that Inuititut is often used among Inuit speakers in job settings. As Dorais (1990b: 11) notes: ‘The native language is also commonly heard in the work place, except for linguistic interchanges with non-Inuit co-workers. In this case, English is used (except at the nursing station, where the interpreter is a French speaking Inuk).’

This reported use of English among young people goes hand in hand with people’s general perception of young people as using more English. There was, for instance, some concern in the community that children were losing interest in Inuit language and culture

---

While Inuit in Kuujjuaraapik appear reluctant to use French, I found that in the smaller community of Quaqtaq, where English is not so widely used, many young people educated in French addressed francophone teachers in French outside of class. I also observed an Inuit woman using French throughout her court hearing with the francophone judge and lawyers of the ‘travelling court’. The postmaster in Kuujjuaraapik also commented on a rise in the use of French in the more northern communities along the Hudson Bay coast.
(Taylor and Wright 1989). These perceptions are linked, in turn, to the apparent attraction of younger people to ‘Southern’ culture, and to the belief that they are losing Inunittut vocabulary and certain aspects of the language’s grammatical system. The observations and vocabulary testing reported in Dorais 1990a: 254-55 lend support to this belief, which was echoed in conversations that I had with fluent adult Inuititut speakers, who felt that younger people were not only losing vocabulary related to Inuit cultural practices, but also certain grammatical endings and forms.

In spite of the view that bilingualism is a precondition for shift towards a dominant language and of reports of a ‘systematic use of English when addressing one’s own children’ in the Eastern Arctic (Dorais 1989: 199), there appears to be no conclusive evidence that a shift toward English is taking place. However, the tendencies discussed in the surveys do point to an increased use of English in Inuit communities, which could affect the status of Inuititut.

In the following section, I will examine the results of a language survey I conducted in Kuujjuaapik in 1993-1994, which serves to supplement both the study of language choice that I will be giving in §6 and previous language surveys conducted in Arctic Québec. The purpose of my own survey was to provide general background information on the extent of bilingualism and of the use of different languages among Inuititut speakers in the community. In general, the results of the survey show that Inuititut is widely used in verbal interaction among Inuit in the community and that English is in a relatively dominant position in the domain of reading and writing and in the workplace. In these latter domains, the dominance of English vis-à-vis Inuititut coincides with the powerful historical role of English in the political economy of the region, especially in the area of education. Although these results are similar to those of other surveys, the position of Kuujjuaapik as the most southerly Inuit village and the presence of Inuititut-Cree bilinguals leads to some interesting differences with these other survey data.

3.1. THE LANGUAGE SURVEY OF KUUJJUARAAPIK

The following language survey results and discussion are based on a written questionnaire conducted in Kuujjuaapik in 1993. The survey examined how well and in what way people (reported that they) use the four languages of the community: Inuititut, English, French and Cree. Discussion of the results focusses on the Inuit community of

---

3 Observations of young mothers in Great Whale River speaking to their babies in English were also reported to me by a high school teacher whose former students regularly came to visit with their children.
Kuujjuaraapik and its use of Inuttitut in relation to other languages. There were a number of practical reasons for this. One was that the Kativik School Board provided advisory, material, and financial assistance for the survey; and its interests lie primarily in serving the Inuit community and in providing adequate language programmes in Kativik School Board schools. At the time of the survey, all of the children in the Kativik School Board school were Inuit, and lived in Kuujjuaraapik. Another reason was the wishes of the Municipal Council and the Education Committee, both composed of locally elected Inuit members and both concerned primarily with Kuujjuaraapik and the welfare of Inuit. A third reason was the time and resources available for the collection and analysis of data, which were simply not sufficient to include the non-Native community in the language survey. Given these constraints, my investigation of language use in the Non-Native community, which makes use of observation and secondary sources only, must be seen as preliminary.

3.1.1. The Language Survey

The language survey (see appendix 1) was distributed to all residents of Kuujjuaraapik sixteen years old and over; this included all of the secondary 4 and 5 students (most of whom were 15 to 17 years old and in their final or penultimate year of public schooling) and all adult Inuit and their Cree, anglophone, or francophone spouses. The inclusion of the high school students both broadened the age range of the sample, and provided important input from adolescent speakers.

The survey was distributed to households with the help of Inuit assistants, who also answered questions and offered help to those who had difficulty completing the surveys themselves. Respondents were asked a series of questions with respect to their age, sex, and ethnic background, in order to ensure a representative number of respondents from each age group, and to use the survey responses for comparative purposes. In the survey, respondents answered a series of questions about how well they speak, understand, write, and read Inuttitut, English, French, and Cree. These questions were intended to provide general information about the level of language proficiency in both productive and receptive skills. In addition, respondents were asked questions about language use in the workplace, home, community, and school—key sites where symbolic resources are exchanged for material and other symbolic resources. The last few questions asked about the amount of time that respondents spent listening to radio, television, and music, and the kinds of music and radio and television programmes that they enjoyed. These were intended to measure the dominance of English-language media in people’s homes. The survey consisted of a questionnaire with 23 questions, to which respondents
provided short answers or answered on a scale of 1 to 10. It could be answered in English, French, or Inuititut, according to the respondent’s preference.

The results that follow are based on the questionnaires obtained from 89 Inuit who filled out the surveys. At the time of the survey the population of Great Whale River (including Inuit, Cree, and Non-Natives) was approximately 1100. In Kuujjuaapik there were approximately 250 Inuit over the age of 18 (the actual number of inhabitants in the village fluctuates slightly due to movement required for work or schooling). The fact that less than half of those surveyed actually submitted completed questionnaires is primarily a result of the limited human resources available to return to people’s homes (when they were in) to help them fill out the survey, and to collect the questionnaires once they were completed. Considering the limitations on conducting such research, the sample proved to be an adequate representation of age and gender groupings, although gender did not prove to be significant factor in the survey results. As previously mentioned, a more in-depth analysis of gender differences, particularly with respect to the use of language in various domains, will have to be explored in further research.

3.1.2. Survey Results

The results are presented on six tables presented in the following pages. The tables and results will discussed in three sections: (i) language ability; (ii) use of languages in different contexts; and (iii) language and the media.

3.1.2.1. Language Ability: Speaking, Understanding, Writing, and Reading

Table 1 describes how well people feel that they can speak, understand, write, and read in Inuititut, English, French, and Cree. These results highlight the difference between spoken and written language ability.

The results show that almost all the Inuit surveyed feel that they can speak and understand Inuititut ‘very well’. This is in sharp contrast to their ability to speak and understand English, which they described, on average, as ‘adequate’. Thus Inuititut appears to be the dominant language in the community with respect to speaking and understanding.

In writing and reading ability, however, the situation is very different. Many people feel that there is not such a sharp difference here between Inuititut and English. On average, the Inuit surveyed in Kuujjuaapik feel that they read and write ‘adequately’ in
TABLE 2  LANGUAGE ABILITIES BY AGE GROUP

SPREADING ABILITY
Inuit Sample

UNDERSTANDING
Inuit Sample

WRITING ABILITY
Inuit Sample

READING ABILITY
Inuit Sample
USE OF LANGUAGES IN VARIOUS DOMAINS
Inuit Sample

- On the job
- With friends
- Community
- Hunting
- Home

Mean Rating

Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Inuittut</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Table 3: Use of Languages in Various Domains
USE OF LANGUAGES AT WORK
Inuit Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>On the job</th>
<th>With friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inunngua (N=89)</td>
<td>6.605</td>
<td>7.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (N=89)</td>
<td>5.907</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (N=89)</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 4. USE OF LANGUAGES AT WORK
LANGUAGE IMPORTANCE TO GET A JOB

Inuittitut: 8.4
English: 7.5
French: 4.3

TABLE 5
TABLE 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours Spent Watching TV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inuktitut</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
both of these languages. Thus, while Inuttitut may be the dominant spoken language in the community, it is not the dominant written language.

Table 2 displays the same results broken down into three age groups which are relatively the same size: those younger than 28 years old; those 28-39; and those 40-78. While all age groups speak and understand Inuttitut ‘very well’, in general speakers under the age of 40 have a much greater command of English than those over 40. As for the use of Cree and French, however, those over 40 are more likely to be able to speak and understand Cree, whereas those under 28 are most likely to be able to speak, understand, read, and write French.

If we look more closely at the English and Inuttitut language ability of those under 40, we notice a significant difference between their ability to speak and understand and their ability to read and write. While this group claims to speak and understand more Inuttitut than English, the opposite is true for reading and writing: they claim to be able to read and write better in English than in Inuttitut. This is in sharp contrast to the older generation, who claim to be able to read and write better in Inuttitut than in English.

3.1.2.2. USE OF LANGUAGE IN DIFFERENT CONTEXTS

Table 3 illustrates use of languages in various domains. The results show that Inuttitut is used the most by Inuit when talking with friends, in the community, while hunting, and at home.\(^1\) However, there is a significant drop in the use of Inuttitut on the job, and an increase in the use of English. In general, English and Inuttitut are used in relatively equal proportions on the job, while French is used very little and Cree not at all. In all other domains, French is used a little, while a small amount of Cree is used while hunting and in the home.

In Table 4 we look closer at the use of languages at work. Inuttitut is spoken much more with friends during breaks and while socializing at work. However, during actual work activities, the use of Inuttitut decreases and the use of English increases. This seems to indicate that although Inuttitut is an important ‘social’ language at work, the use of English increases when one is actually ‘doing work’ in the workplace.

---

\(^1\) As Table 3 indicates, there is some English reportedly used while hunting. This English usage is a reflection of the participation of non-Natives in these activities (particularly non-Native spouses living in Kuujjuaq or visitors to the community, who might accompany Inuit hunters from time to time). As previously mentioned, some of these domains of language use may also vary along gender lines, since some of the activities in the home, or while hunting may be more male or female oriented. The nature of these divisions will have to be explored in future research.
Table 5 indicates that, despite the use of English on the job, people believe that Inuttitut is more important than English for securing employment in Kuujjuaraapik.

3.1.2.3. LANGUAGE AND THE MEDIA

Like other communities in Nunavik, Kuujjuaraapik has a community-based FM radio station, which broadcasts information about various activities and events, and relays messages in Inuttitut. However, as in other communities, television has become a popular means of entertainment in most households.

Table 6 shows us approximately how many hours people estimate they spend watching television and the language of the programmes that they watch. Because of an increase in Inuttitut programming, Inuit are able to watch an average of two hours a day of Inuttitut programming. Despite this tendency, however, about twice as many hours are spent watching English language programmes. As Table 6 reveals, people claim to spend an average of four hours per day watching television in English.

3.1.2.4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results of the survey indicate various tendencies in the use of Inuttitut, English, French, and Cree that are consistent with the conclusions arrived at in previous chapters. These results can be described as follows: Inuttitut is very important in the Inuit community as a spoken language, where it is the language used within local social networks and serves as a key element in the construction of local identity and ethnic boundaries. English is important as a vehicle of intercultural communication and as a ‘power’ language, particularly in written form and as a major language in the workplace. In general, language proficiency in French and Cree varies according to age group. This variation is linked to major political and economic shifts in this century, the consequence of which is that older Inuit use Cree with varying degrees of proficiency, but speak no French; while some younger Inuit—namely, those who have been educated in French—use French, though no one in this age group speaks Cree. French, though growing in importance as a ‘power’ language, has not gained the importance that English continues to have, since only a very small proportion of the Inuit population actually use the former language.
3.1.2.4.1. INUITITUT AND ENGLISH

The survey results show that Inuit, despite being the dominant spoken language of the community, and despite being taught in the school, is not as widely written or read. In the settlement overall, literacy skills in English were almost as good as those in the mother tongue. These results, when broken down according to age, reveal that those under the age of 40 claim to have slightly higher skills in English. This is not surprising, given the role of English in education, and its current status as the lingua franca in Great Whale River. English (as opposed to Inuit, Cree or French) is used in written communication at various sites, such as the gymnasium, arena, stores, and other places frequented by all four ethnolinguistic groups in the community. In addition, English is gaining an important role among Inuit in the workplace, since it is often needed as the lingua franca (to communicate with Cree or non-Native employees or customers). The data suggest that while Inuititut is widely used between friends at work, English is used almost as much as Inuititut when actually doing the work.

The rising importance of written English in Kuujjuaaraapik may have a number of sources. One is that students may be exposed, in numbers of hours per day, to more second-language than first-language texts over the course of their school careers. Ever since the Inuit takeover of the Kativik School Board in 1978, students have been receiving solid training in Inuititut literacy during the first three years of school; however, there is far less exposure to Inuititut texts in school after these first three years. There is also far less exposure to Inuititut reading materials outside of school than to English texts, which include newspapers, books, magazines, information about consumer products, and (as previously mentioned) announcements and schedules at the gymnasium, arena, and other places shared with Cree and non-Natives. Another source is simply the limited number of texts available in Inuititut, given the very small number of Inuititut speakers in the world, and the limited amount of resources for textual production in the language. A third source is the lesser importance of Inuititut vis-à-vis English and French for future wage employment or higher education. Since the mid-1950s and the shift to a wage economy, English and, to a lesser degree, French have figured prominently in the domain of work.

In the wage economy, it is important to look at the availability of jobs and at the credentials required for obtaining employment in the community. Job requirements usually include a certain grade level in school and certain linguistic and other skills, and these demands may affect the importance that people in the community attach to such skills. While it might be necessary to speak Inuititut for certain types of employment—and, as the survey results show, people feel that speaking Inuititut is very important for obtaining
employment—it is important to look at the requirements for reading and writing the language. If the job does require some reading or writing in Inuit, the level of skill is usually not specified, and does not carry the same currency as English literacy skills.

In Kuujjuaaraapik, spoken Inuit is vital in consolidating family and community ties; and is all that is heard on community radio, during Inuit church services, and at community gatherings (such as picnics and games). Written Inuit does not seem to play the same role in the community. A relatively small proportion of people regularly attend church, and the only other places where written Inuit can be found are the school, official Nunavik publications (which are usually co-published in English and French), and community notices designed for unilingual Inuit speakers (such as housing notices, and other written information from the municipal council or school).

The discussion so far has focused on certain language issues that concern Nunavik in general and Kuujjuaaraapik in particular. An important question about the future of Inuit in Nunavik concerns the elderly population. When the last unilingual speakers of Inuit die, what will be the future of written Inuit and of spoken Inuit at work? Since the political mobilization of Inuit in Nunavik there had been continuing support for Inuit from political organizations and institutions, and a perceived need for Inuit language requirements for employment and participation in the community. If written as well as spoken Inuit were perceived as both economically and culturally important—that is, as valued symbolic resources in the maintenance of community networks, social solidarity and economic advancement—its survival in the community would be more certain.

In Kuujjuaaraapik, Inuit, English, Cree, and French constitute symbolic resources whose respective values differ according to the social, cultural, and economic positions of speakers. Inuit and English are by far the most widely distributed symbolic resources in the community. Inuit is valued by its speakers as a language of social solidarity and sociocultural practices associated with being Inuit. English linguistic resources, on the other hand, are widely valued in employment and intercultural communication. Historically, Cree resources were valued by some Inuit for maintaining key social relationships with Cree hunters and trappers, and for active participation in certain 'traditional' cultural practices on the land around Kuujjuaaraapik. However, after settlement in the 1950s, the role of Cree diminished; today very few younger speakers learn more than a few phrases. The reverse is true for French language resources: access to these resources is provided directly by the school to younger Inuit who enrol in the French stream, although similar access is not provided to others in the community, who tend to know little more than a few stock words and phrases. French, though in
competition with Inuitut and English in the dominant linguistic marketplace, has yet to become a large part of Inuit speakers' verbal repertoires. The extent to which French will penetrate everyday verbal interaction in the community in the coming years thus remains an open question.

4. ETHNIC BOUNDARIES AND SOCIAL SPACE

In the previous section, I presented the results of a language survey of Kuujjuaaraapik, which suggested that Inuitut remains vital to the community but is feeling the pressure of English, particularly in the economic sphere. This section will supplement these results with a more theoretically oriented and historically grounded examination of language use in the Inuit community.

Among the most striking features of Great Whale River are its patterns of language use and the ways that social groups and ethnic identities have been constructed in the community. Cultural and political practices appear to define social spaces along lines of ethnic or 'racial' difference; these divisions are manifested in the informal social networks that define the community, as well as in recreational activities, housing, and language practices. As regards the language practices of Inuit, one finds Inuitut spoken frequently and fluently in the community, as if the historical political economic domination of English in the region had had little effect on the Inuitut language and its speakers. Admittedly, however, the ethnic boundary between Inuit and non-Inuit is a permeable one, and—perhaps due to the pressures of contact with English—the Inuitut language appears to be changing, most notably with respect to its vocabulary, which includes a significant number English borrowings. (On this matter, see Dorais 1997: 82-86.)

Both features mentioned above (the patterns of language use and the construction of ethnic groups) are important in understanding the historical, political, economic, and sociolinguistic context of this community. Ethnic groups and identities are constructed through linguistic, cultural, and political practices; and patterns of language use develop within and across groups. The dialectical nature of these phenomena—'ethnicities' and social groups being constructed through language practices, and language practices being produced and power, solidarity, and ethnicity being articulated through them—has important social consequences for individual speakers, language learners, and the community at large.

In what follows, I will be examining how social groups are constructed in Great Whale River, and how these are related to language practices—more specifically, the use of dominant and minority languages—and in turn to language policy and the social and
political processes that shape and constrain language acquisition and use. At first glance, social groups in Great Whale seem homogeneous, with well-defined and fixed boundaries. On close inspection, however, they turn out to be much more fluid and heterogeneous, composed of social actors speaking and operating from various subject positions.

Another subject of investigation will be the effects of contact with English on the everyday use of Inuititut. My focus will not be linguistic processes of lexical borrowing or language loss, but rather the conditions that favour the development of language policy and Inuititut language use in certain contexts. Although the impact of extended contact with English is evident in the processes of language change in Kuujjuaapik Inuititut—changes which include, as mentioned above, a limited use of English borrowings and the loss of certain older forms and expressions—the analysis will concentrate on the processes that are serving to preserve Inuititut as a living language.

I will first be exploring the nature of ethnic and social groups in Great Whale River, which are grounded in historical, economic, and political relations. The discussion will centre on those social categories constructed by Euro-Canadians and those constructed by Inuit. Next I will be examining how boundaries between ethnic groups are formed and maintained through language practices. Using examples from my fieldwork, I will be discussing how the choice of one language over another serves to negotiate identity, relations of power, and solidarity. The analysis will not centre on how or to what extent contact with English and French has led to a ‘deterioration’ or loss of Inuititut, but rather on how and why Inuititut is used and maintained in the face of domination by French and English.

4.1. ETHNICITY IN GREAT WHALE RIVER

‘Ethnicity’ has been discussed by Stuart Hall in relation to the construction of the ‘black subject’:

If the black subject and black experience are not stabilized by Nature or by some other essential guarantee, then it must be the case that they are constructed historically, culturally, politically—and the concept which refers to this is ‘ethnicity’.

(Hall 1992: 257).

Ethnicities are constructed on the basis of shared histories, traditions, and language. On one level, ‘Whiteness’ and ‘Nativeness’ operate as unifying and hegemonic categories which construct two distinct racial and social realities in this relatively small community.
As we have observed in previous chapters, the categories have been constructed historically, through colonial discourses about the ‘Other’, and through political economic processes that brought aboriginal peoples into a world economic system. More recently, the politicized term ‘First Nations’ has operated across ethnic, linguistic, and historical boundaries to unite Native people in political struggle with governments and multinational corporations over issues of land rights within Canada and internationally. Both ‘Whiteness’ and ‘Nativeness’ operate as broad social categories, unifying ethnic and cultural difference between social groups. These have become racialized categories constructed through a long history of colonial relations.

On another level, within these larger categories, ‘Inuit’, ‘Cree’, ‘Québécois’, and ‘Anglo-Canadian’ ethnic identities are constructed in relation to colonial histories, nationalist projects, marginalization, and the politics of resistance. Regardless of the category, each is politically and historically located, and serves to shape a subject’s understanding of the ‘natural’ order of things, and position speakers relative to each other.

Language plays a crucial role in the construction of ethnicity in Kuujjuaraapik; and despite the omnipresence of English, and the recent ascent of French as a language of business and state, the indigenous language, Inuktut, appears to be relatively strong. It is easy to observe conversations between Inuit speakers of all ages conducted in Inuktut; and to note that there is relatively little code-mixing among these speakers. Some speakers, particularly those educated in English in the 1960s and 1970s, might use English words like ‘post office’ in a sentence of Inuktut, but the mixing remains at the level of isolated words. Rarely does a sentence of English intrude into an otherwise Inuktut conversation.

4.2. SOCIAL GROUPS AND BOUNDARIES

In Great Whale River, historically rooted linguistic, cultural, and social practices intersect with the social categories of ethnicity (and ‘race’) to construct social groups and to position speakers discursively in terms of ‘us’ and ‘them’, forming a boundary between those who are and those who are not indigenous to the territory. The ‘indigenous’ group includes Inuit and Cree whose ancestors have lived here for generations, hunting, fishing, and trapping in the vicinity of the Hudson Bay. The ‘non-indigenous’ group includes Europeans and others who have temporarily based themselves in the Great Whale River area in order to explore, trade, exploit, convert, work, help or visit, and who have introduced Western ideologies and practices.

The boundary between ‘Native’ and ‘non-Native’ has been formed and maintained historically and institutionally. As discussed in the preceding chapters, Native ‘Otherness’
has been constructed through differential power relations, differences in social, cultural, and linguistic practices, and different ways of seeing, analysing and representing social reality. Historically, colonizers were white, European, and male; and functioned as traders, sailors, explorers, or missionaries, whose power was related to their links with England and their access to valued material resources. Inuit resistance to these forms of uninvited power was interpreted by Europeans as reflecting their ‘savage’ and ‘heathen’ nature. Represented as the ‘Other’ to the civilizing forces of Western Europe, Inuit themselves viewed the ‘Whiteman’, and before that their Cree neighbours, as fundamentally different from themselves.

The term Inuit means ‘the people’, and is used by the Inuit to define themselves. Non-Inuit whom they encountered were called allait, qallunaat, or uqguit—terms referring to Cree, English, and French, respectively. Allait is said to mean simply ‘the others’, and initially referred to those encountered before contact with Europeans. Qallunaat (sometimes anglicized as Kabloona) is said to mean ‘people who pamper their eyebrows’; and, according to at least one source, ‘can imply that these people pamper or fuss with nature, or are of a materialistic nature’ (Pauktuutit n.d.).

The term uqguit refers to ‘those who say oui-oui’, who are perhaps best seen as a sub-group of qallunaat differentiated primarily by language and religion.

The terms qallunaat and allait are only superficially equivalent to the social categories of ‘Whites’ and ‘Indians’ in English. Qallunaat has a range of meanings in Inuktut, associated with the structural, political, and economic imbalance of the imposed colonial relationship. Allait refers to other indigenous peoples with whom the Inuit had limited contact, and who were simply different from them, but did not dominate them: Allait led a subsistence life in a neighbouring ecological region. Qallunaat, in contrast, introduced processes of modernization and social selection which they controlled through new practices and institutions and new forms of knowledge.

Although the new social order imposed constraints on how Inuit would live and hunt, it also provided them with the resources to resist complete co-optation and to maintain a distinctiveness which would become the basis for assuming institutional and political control of their territory. It is in this political economic context that the study of linguistic practices and language maintenance becomes meaningful. Access to valued symbolic and material resources will accordingly be analysed in terms of the historical and political processes involved in the development of social institutions, including the

---

2 The booklet cited in the text was published by Pauktuutit (Inuit Women’s Association) as a means of educating non-Inuit working in cross-cultural settings on Inuit culture and values.
paradoxical struggle for local control of social institutions which are often at odds with Inuit practices and beliefs.

5. SOCIAL NETWORKS IN GREAT WHALE RIVER

We can gain a clearer understanding of these constraints and patterns by examining the formation and structure of social networks in Great Whale River and the constraints on language use that they impose. The ‘social network’ is a key concept in the analysis of language choice in linguistic communities, where strong social ties between speakers constrain language use in everyday, informal contexts (Gumperz 1982; Gal 1979; Milroy 1980). This concept is particularly relevant to the study of language maintenance and to the question of how and why vernacular languages are used to the exclusion of dominant varieties. As Milroy and Wei (1995:139) observe, ‘closeknit social networks consisting mainly of strong ties seem to have a particular capacity to maintain and even enforce local conventions and norms—including linguistic norms.’ In other words, social interaction within tight-knit networks constrains linguistic and social behaviour, and operates to favour the use of one language variety over another. For this reason, it is important to look at how social networks operate in Great Whale River, and to what effect.

Network analysis has often been used to examine language use of socially differentiated groups in urban contexts (Labov 1972, Milroy 1986). In such analyses, interactive networks have been contrasted with exchange networks. The former (which would include the relationship between a storeclerk and a customer) are considered to be ‘weak’ links; while the latter (which would include friendships) are considered to be ‘strong’ links between people who exchange support, advice, and information. Exchange networks are further strengthened if they are multiplex, as they are when speakers have social ties in their capacity as neighbours, kin, friends, employees, etc. Multiplex networks are said to be strongly associated with social class, and operate as systems of exchange to form tight-knit communities (Milroy and Wei 1995: 138). Milroy (1987: 52) notes about a working-class Belfast community that ‘it was quite common for relatives to live next door, have frequent voluntary association with each other, and travel together to a common place of work.’ Milroy contrasts this with an upper-middle-class professional district of Belfast, in which such multiplex relationships were rare.

In Great Whale River social class is not as salient in network formation as ethnicity. To a certain extent, class is associated with work-related networks, but most friendship and other network associations are built around shared ethnicity and kinship. This is
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particularly true of networks in Kuujjuaraapik and Poste-de-la-Baleine, which are similar to the multiplex situations outlined by Milroy, and operate to produce similar outcomes.

In Kuujjuaraapik, relatives often live very close by, even next door to each other, and have 'frequent voluntary association with each other', although they are unlikely to have a common place of work. (This is largely because jobs for Inuit in the community are scarce, and those that do exist are very diverse.) In contrast, family relations in Poste-de-la-Baleine are generally limited to one's spouse or children—although many neighbours have 'frequent voluntary association with each other', and perhaps even 'travel together to a common place of work.' The majority of non-Native workers in Poste-de-la-Baleine have middle-class occupations (as managers, teachers, or health care professionals) or perform skilled manual labour (as carpenters, electricians, and the like), often at wages higher than they would receive in the South. Thus, while informal social networks in Kuujjuaraapik develop around friendship and kinship, those in Poste-de-la-Baleine often develop among co-workers, arising from common interests and attitudes. In both cases, however, close-knit associations and loyalties between speakers are formed, along with particular patterns of social and linguistic interaction.

5.1. INFORMAL FAMILY AND FRIENDSHIP NETWORKS

The structure of a community and the ties that link people in various relationships are situated in a particular historical, political, and economic context, as I have discussed in previous chapters. Structural inequality between the Inuit community of Kuujjuaraapik and the qallunaat community of Poste-de-la-Baleine and the struggle over English and French dominance in this northern region are key elements in the construction of ethnicities in Great Whale River. Linked to these processes is the development of social networks, based on the internal needs of the group and in relation to other social groups in the settlement.

In Kuujjuaraapik, family networks are central to the informal structure of the community. Although friendships often develop between kin of the same age group, certain obligations and practices exist among kin of all ages. These obligations include practices pertaining to the sharing of meat after a hunt, childminding, visiting, and helping and providing companionship for the sick and elderly.  

---

3 It should be noted that kin groups extend to communities beyond Kuujjuaraapik. In particular many people are related to families in the more northern community of Umiujaq, which separated from Kuujjuaraapik in 1987, as agreed in the negotiations pertaining to the JBNQA. (It is often claimed that the more 'traditional' hunters and their families moved to this more isolated community). In addition, many people are related to Inuit in Sanikiluaq, on the Belcher Islands west of Kuujjuaraapik (see Map 1). Officially Sanikiluaq is in the North West Territories, although many Kuujjuaraapik Inuit have relations
Poste-de-la-Baleine, on the other hand, operates as a temporary migrant community. There are a large number of young, single people who have moved to the community for employment-related reasons. Most of those with families do not intend to stay past the time when their children reach school age. For the few families who do stay, a pattern has developed according to which they send their children to the Cree school, which offers a pre-kindergarten programme for four-year-olds. Very few of these children continue past grades 1 or 2, however, since it is usually at this point that their parents decide to move and reintegrate into a community in the South. During the time of my fieldwork, only three non-Native families had children enrolled in higher grades, and the future of these families in the community was uncertain.

While the structure and role of kinship or family networks are markedly different in Kuujjuaq and Poste-de-la-Baleine, friendship networks operate in much the same fashion. Like anywhere else, cohesive networks are formed between people who socialize together and who share similar social values and experiences. However, because Kuujjuaq is 'home' to many Inuit, and Poste-de-la-Baleine is a 'work site' for many qallunaat, relationships between friends can carry rather different meanings. For instance, there is a difference between growing up with others in close-knit surroundings and living in such a community only as an adult. The experiences one shares with those one grows up with, and the knowledge one has of their family backgrounds, character traits, and so forth, create ties in a fashion different from relationships developed later in life. In this respect, Inuit are linked with Cree in their experiences of place and local knowledge about community members. In contrast, cultural misunderstandings and conflicts often arise with outsiders, including police and health care and social service workers, and particularly when local knowledge and institutional procedures clash.4

An important social 'glue' in Poste-de-la-Baleine is shared experiences of work and of living in a 'foreign' environment—a situation which, for most, is a temporary one. Since most residents of Kuujjuaq, in contrast, live there or have settled there permanently, the relationships that they develop with one another are based on neither narrow nor temporary interests and experiences. In other words, the experience of growing up Inuk and negotiating relations with the Euro-Canadian presence connects people in ways fundamentally different from those in which qallunaat in Poste-de-la-Baleine are there, and there is a certain amount of travel and exchange between the communities. In general, the Inuit communities are relatively endogamous, ensuring the maintenance of these kin networks.

4 One example of this type of conflict arose in the summer of 1993 when the Québec police force (Sûreté du Québec) brought in a large number of armed officers to deal with an Inuk man who had armed himself with a rifle and refused to leave his apartment. Many local people considered the use of heavy reinforcements to be an overreaction. Inuit commented that the man in question had no history of violence, and suggested that his father would have been more of a help in this situation than armed police officers.
connected to one another. However, while the two communities construct rather different contexts for friendships and other relationships, friendship networks in both communities operate in a similar manner. Both construct tightly-knit groups and feelings of loyalty, which can have specific linguistic and political economic consequences for speakers and—in the case of stereotyping and the reproduction of social inequality—for the whole ethnic group in question.

Co-ethnic social networks are the norm in Great Whale River: people of similar ethnic backgrounds are most likely to associate and form tightly-knit groups with one another. Despite this clear tendency, friendships between Native and non-Native peoples are more common than might first appear. Intercultural friendships, of course, develop for a variety of reasons, including shared interests; mutually beneficial exchanges of information, support, or material goods; and work relationships. Workplaces are particularly important arenas of intercultural communication, not only because they often bring together people who, given the presence of ethnic boundaries, would not otherwise come into social contact, but also because it is here that symbolic resources are often exchanged directly for material resources.

Work-related social networks involve groups of people who interact on the job, during breaks, and socially if they meet by chance. These kinds of networks provide the greatest opportunities in Great Whale River for intercultural communication and boundary crossing, since many workplaces are in the service sector, and have to serve the settlement in four languages. Yet many work-related social networks develop between members of a single ethnic group; this is especially true if friendships overlap with work relationships (as in multiplex networks), and divisions are created in the workplace between groups with different interests.

While most workplaces are multi-ethnic and multilingual, there are a few sites in which the majority of the staff come from one ethnic group. One example is the Municipal Council office, set up specifically to permit Inuit affairs to be looked after by an Inuit staff. Private businesses, such as those involved in construction and household maintenance, may also limit their hiring to one ethnic group. The hotel and the coffee shop have also at times engaged in such hiring practices, depending on the availability of local staff and the needs of the business. Some government sectors, such as Transport Québec and Transport Canada, which together manage the airport, flight services station, and air traffic control, have operated without Cree or Inuit; while the police station (Sûreté du Québec), which has an established policy of hiring local Cree and Inuit constables, has sometimes had difficulty filling the Inuit post. (The role of language in the workplace in Great Whale River was discussed earlier; see ch.3, §5.1.)
In summary, social networks operate to negotiate and maintain boundaries within and across groups. In Great Whale River, groups are unified by shared languages, history, and cultural practices; and maintain their boundaries by means of specific Inuittitut, Cree, French, and English language practices, respectively. These practices can serve to define or to include or exclude interlocutors. Intercultural networks, on the other hand, cross ethnic boundaries through communication conducted primarily in English. Work networks often cut across linguistic boundaries, and operate in English or French, depending on the linguistic abilities of the speakers involved. Details of these social and linguistic processes will be examined in the next section.

6. LANGUAGE PRACTICES

6.1. SOCIAL NETWORKS AND BOUNDARY MAINTENANCE

To a large extent, the language used between members of relatively stable social networks is more predictable than in interactive environments where speakers are brought together for the first time. However, even in less predictable environments, certain patterns emerge in intercultural communication which have specific consequences for speakers and their respective communities.

In this section, I will be examining patterns of language interaction in the community that have developed within the exchange social networks described above and in interactive networks such as those formed through the administration of services. I will be showing how language choice is used strategically to negotiate relations of power and solidarity; and how linguistic interaction constructs social boundaries, and can serve to define and include or exclude social players of different ethnic groups. What this means is that social groups, including Cree, French, Anglo-Canadian, and Inuit, are not fixed, but constructed, at least in part, by language practices, either between members of the same group or between members of different social or ethnic groups. In these situations, the language chosen becomes crucial.

I will be concentrating on established patterns of language loyalty that have developed when speakers of similar linguistic backgrounds interact; and situations in which language choice is used, intentionally or unintentionally, to exclude others present in the interaction, and in turn to define social identity and to reassert ethnic and cultural affiliation. Examples will be drawn from observations of various institutional and recreational settings, including the Inuit school, the health clinic, law courts, gymnasium, workplace, and
community events; and from my own experiences as a bilingual French and English speaker, with limited knowledge of Inuttitut.

6.1.1. BOUNDARY-DEFINING LANGUAGE PRACTICES

In close-knit social networks whose members have similar ethnolinguistic backgrounds, language (at least to a certain extent) defines the group, and is an important element in constructing social identities. In the relatively large Inuit and francophone communities, Inuttitut and French operate as important boundary-creating devices, their use serving to construct ethnic boundaries. At the same time, language use is a product of group cohesion and solidarity. In Great Whale River, when two people with the same first language meet, they will almost invariably speak in that language, even if they share a second (or third) language. That is, two Inuttitut speakers will speak Inuttitut, and two francophones French, even if each also speaks English. (In the latter case, French is used once it has been established, usually through introductions, that both participants speak French; see §6.2.1.1 for further discussion.) This pattern has been established across different types of networks—work-related, friendship, and family—and despite the historical dominance of English and its role as a lingua franca in the community.

Despite the relatively high level of Inuttitut usage in Kuujjuaraapik, concerns have been expressed about the increased use of English, particularly among young people. While I was living in the community, adult Inuit speakers often told me that young people now use a lot more English among themselves than in the past. What is not clear is what their comments really meant: are people referring to English words that have become ‘Inuttitutized’, or to English words and phrases mixed in with Inuttitut that would be discernible to a non-Inuttitut speakers, or to entire sentences, interactions or conversations conducted in English?

My own observations of a large number of children and adolescents—in or near the house where I was living, in the community, and in the school—indicate that they use a minimal amount of English and virtually no French among themselves. This observation is particularly striking given the pressures of English and French inside and outside the community. Although I sometimes heard English phrases such as ‘let’s go!’ and ‘not fair!’ and words such as ‘post office’ inserted into a sentence, the use of English sentences such as ‘I had an accident’ and ‘how could they?’ was less frequent, and complete English conversations were extremely rare.5

5 These observations suggest that Inuit children and adolescents are, in fact, far more at home in Inuttitut than in English. This conclusion is supported by one observation I made about the eight-year-old
During my period of fieldwork, I heard only one conversation conducted in English where Inuittitut would normally have been used. The conversation took place in the household where I had been living for six months. I had assumed a role of caregiver to eight-year old William, his sixteen-year old brother, Richard, and their grandfather; and there was a constant stream of younger and older people coming to visit (see ch. 1, §5 for a discussion of living arrangements). The one interaction in English that I observed occurred when the older boy gave instructions to his brother to buy him a soft drink at the corner store. In every other case I witnessed, such a request was made in Inuittitut. In fact, all of the boys’ dealings in household and other matters were conducted in Inuittitut. On this occasion, however, I noted that the interchange took place near the kitchen where their grandfather was seated (fieldnotes: November 1993). It seems possible that the older boy chose English to exclude his grandfather (who understood little English) from the interaction. Although I have no direct evidence for this, I did note that on every other occasion that Richard asked William to go to the store for him, their grandfather was nowhere in sight.

While it is not certain, then, that exclusion was a motivating force in the use of English in the above incident, the exclusionary intent of other interactions that I observed (or in which I unintentionally became a participant) and discussed with many people in the community, was quite clear. The relation of language choice to the construction of identities and social boundaries will be the topic of the following section.

6.1.2. NEGOTIATING EXCLUSIONARY BOUNDARIES

The example of English use just described demonstrated how English can be used as a means for younger speakers to exclude elders. English may also be used as a status symbol, representing a form of knowledge acquired in school, which is then used to construct emerging Inuit youth identities. The existence of such a use became clear to me while I was teaching adult education in 1989-1990 in a village on the Ungava coast. One of my students, a woman in her early twenties, had dropped out of school at a young age, and now wanted desperately to learn English. One day she told me why: her classmates, two other young women with whom she had grown up in another village, would use English words and phrases when they were together, and in doing so excluded her from the group. Even though this exclusion might not have been intentional, it was nevertheless real: the
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boy I lived with, who was educated in Inuittitut until September 1993: this was that he readily consulted the Inuittitut telephone book to find the number for the gymnasium, rather than simply asking someone for it. This suggests that his ability to read Inuittitut was quite strong.
linguistic choices her friends made significantly limited her ability to participate in their conversations. This caused her a great deal of frustration—which could be overcome, she felt, only if she learned English. In this case, as in the one described above, English use was related more to the negotiation of power within peer groups and between generations than with the struggle between dominant and minority languages per se, although the fact that English was chosen in these cases strongly suggests that there is an orientation of younger Inuittitut speakers to this dominant language, perhaps linked to its position of prestige in popular culture.

Of course, if some Inuit youth can use English to exclude, others can use French. While I was told that this is happening—that young people are using French around non-French speakers to prevent them from understanding the conversation—I did not actually observe this during fieldwork. In general, the use of French among youth studying in French is quite rare—so rare, in fact, that the first time I witnessed it was seven months after I arrived in the community—and, from what I observed, was generally used in the interests of humour.

The following two examples illustrate this use of French as a source of humour. The first occurred in the household where I was living. A group of children came in one day speaking Inuittitut together, as usual. On this occasion, however, an eight-year-old boy uttered the French phrase, ‘assis-toi William!’ to one of the other boys. His tone of voice clearly suggested authority, and the rest of the boys responded with giggles. Around the same time, I recorded another example in my fieldnotes. A nine-year-old boy who was studying in French approached me outside the school, obviously showing off to his friends and laughing: ‘Bonjour... Il y a des poissons en bas... Un avion!’ Clearly, children were not using French in these circumstances to engage in conversation in the language, but to create humour within their peer groups through the mimicry of classroom-based discourse. That is, through commands like ‘assis-toi!’ and decontextualized vocabulary and phrases drawn from second language classrooms, children were using French as a communicative resource in peer group construction, and as a way of mocking authority figures such as teachers.

To understand why children would mimic classroom-based teacher authority and decontextualized language-learning practices, we must examine the power relations in the school and community. English, as noted throughout this study, has long been the economically, institutionally, and socially dominant language in the area. French, on the other hand, has only recently figured in the economic and political arena of northern
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6 It should be noted, though, that less ‘strategic’ uses of English might be increasing as youth increasingly turn to American culture.
Québec. Children are exposed to it in school, but seem to treat it as a ‘foreign’ language rather than a viable second language for use outside of school. Mocking the way it is taught and used by those in authority is one way to resist its (relatively new) dominant position. Moreover, if Inuit children continue to find French so artificial and so incongruous in the Arctic setting that its use becomes humorous, it is not surprising that they have not yet adopted it over English in certain community contexts.

French also elicits humour in other contexts, a few examples of which I recorded in my fieldnotes. In one instance, a man in his late 40s or 50s was speaking Inuit to a small group of adolescents outside the school. At the end of his utterance, he said ‘Tukisivit?’ (‘Understand?’); then looked intently at the young woman he was talking to, and with a large smile on his face, quickly added, ‘Compris?’ (‘Understood?’), at which point everybody burst out laughing. The humour in this man’s use of French had two plausible sources. One was its incongruousness—this use amounting only to a single word in a conversation conducted in Inuit, and uttered by someone who obviously could not speak the language, and had probably picked up little more French than this. The other was its ironic mimicking of the new ‘power’ language of the community—and perhaps a gentle allusion to a view of francophones as being kind but condescending to Inuit when speaking French to them. Through the use of this one word, the older man made common cause with a new generation of educated youth whose knowledge of French otherwise widened the gap between them, and thereby facilitated his interaction with them.

English and French are two school-based languages with very different effects on language use among Inuit outside of school. English is a language associated with prestigious cultural practices, which has (at least to some extent) become a resource in youth and English-educated peer groups for negotiating new forms of ‘Inuit’ identity. French, in contrast, has little association with prestigious cultural practices, at least for the time being. Almost all of the popular music that young people listen to is in English. (One exception is the group Kashtin, who frequently sing in their native Montagnais rather than in their second language, French.) Even popular francophone ice hockey stars speak English or play for Anglo-dominant teams. French is thus limited to the institutional, economic, and political realms; and as far as the generation currently being educated in French is concerned, the school is the one place where French language practices are developed and valued. Community life hinges on Inuit; while peer group cultural practices depend, at least to a certain extent, on the consumption of English-language media such as television, music, and film (see §3.1.2.3 for a discussion of the results of language and media). If these are the uses of English and French among Inuit speakers, what about
situations that involve speakers with different language backgrounds? The next sections will address this question in more detail.

6.2.1.1. ENGLISH AND FRENCH, INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

In Great Whale River, English is the language of communication between members of the relatively small group of anglophones. It is also the language used for communication between different cultural groups. Under certain conditions, Cree or French may be used in intercultural communication. More specifically, Cree is used if the interaction is between a Cree and an older Inuk who learned Cree in the camps as a child. The use of French, on the other hand, is governed by a more complex set of restrictions, which include the level of fluency of second language speakers; the people present during the interaction; and attitudes toward the language, which can shift over time and from place to place.

Although the vast majority of qallunaat in Great Whale River speak French, the occasions for using this language are limited to interactions with members of their own group; anglophones who have learned French; and Inuit students studying French at school. This means that the use of French in intercultural situations is constrained, and that patterns of use develop from assumptions about who speaks French and how well they do so. When a potential interlocutor is a stranger, these assumptions often proceed along the axis of ‘race’ or ethnicity. More specifically, Inuit are assumed not to speak French or to prefer English even if they do speak French. Assumptions about qallunaat ‘strangers’ do not seem as clear, judging from my own experiences: as a ‘stranger’, I was addressed in English on certain occasions, but in French on others. Sometimes these encounters involved a simple exchange of greetings on the road (if such an exchange took place at all), where either language might be used (including greetings such as ‘hello’, ‘salut’, ‘bonjour’, or simply a nod of the head in recognition), although French (usually ‘bonjour’) was used more frequently.

My position as an anglophone who spoke French allowed me to have closer ties to the non-Native community (than, say, unilingual anglophones) since I could engage in conversation readily with francophones. Interestingly, however, francophones would at times respond in English rather than French if I addressed them in French. When, in these situations, I was not successful in establishing French as the language of conversation, I would switch into English, usually after two exchanges. These instances were rare; and over the course of my fieldwork, I recorded only three of them in my notes. They were significant, however, since such switching had not been part of my experience in Montréal and in other communities in the South. The occurrence of these code-switches (albeit, rare)
suggests the tacit acknowledgement of the socio-historical role and status of English in this northern community.

One of these experiences of code-switching involved a francophone who had recently arrived in the North and wanted to practice his English, and who thus resisted conversation in French. In the other two instances, the francophone interlocutors did not need help with their English, but insisted on its use. One was in the home of two francophone teachers whom I was visiting with William. It may have been that they were used to speaking English with non-Francophone visitors, and were particularly inclined to use English with William present. The other occurred at the health clinic, where a pattern of English use with non-francophone patients had been established.

The circumstances surrounding the latter instance were the following: I had been out on the land the day before in -35° C weather and my toes had become frostbitten, so I had decided to seek the advice of the nurse at the health clinic. What struck me was not that a francophone whom I had never met before insisted on speaking English with me, but that it was a nurse at the public health clinic, where one might expect French to be used or even preferred. The first thought that entered my mind (as recorded in my fieldnotes, December 1993) was not ‘why is she doing this?’, but ‘what would this mean to an Inuk attempting to speak French?’ While I felt capable enough to describe my plight in French, the nurse was obviously more accustomed to serving a non-francophone in English. After two attempts I switched to English.

On subsequent visits to the clinic, I was able to use French with different nurses, except when I was there with William, the eight-year-old Inuk boy under my care. Although William was in the French stream at school, the nurses had no way of knowing this. (In fact, it is impossible for nursing staff to know whether a child is studying in French or in English, unless they have obtained this knowledge elsewhere. My own observations suggested that even a child studying in French will not always say so when asked directly in French. Even school teachers sometimes have difficulty keeping track of which children are in the English or the French stream. This became clear to me when two upper-level French teachers refused to engage in a French conversation with me while William was present, obviously not knowing that he was in the French stream.) So, although the Inuit interpreters greeted William and engaged him in a brief conversation in Inuit, he was treated by the nurses in English without the benefit of Inuit translation, which is reserved for older Inuit. It was unclear, however, how much he really understood about taking his medicine that he was being prescribed, when he was addressed directly in English by the nurse (although, his comprehension was not crucial given his young age and my role in insuring that he took it at the prescribed times).
What was clear in this situation at the clinic was that English was the language of interaction with the nurses at the clinic—that it was English, rather than Inuttitut or French, that health-care providers used when dealing with Inuit, even when both the health-care provider and the client actually spoke French. This demonstrated the existence of institutionalized patterns of English-language use between non-Natives and younger Inuit (that is, those educated in schools), even in settings where one might expect French to be used by second-language learners thus served to reproduce the ethnic boundaries that define this community. The use of English instead of French with Inuit is well-intentioned: francophones are seeking to include Inuit students, patients, clients and others—and to avoid negative reactions, such as being seen as rude or secretive—by using English. It is also perhaps a tacit recognition on the part of some francophones that the position of French (and its place in the communicative hierarchy) is still unstable in this particular aboriginal community where English is so prevalent. These assumptions are in part based on their recognition that English is the second language of most Inuit, and their consequent expectation that younger Inuit, in particular, will be able to understand English, whether they are studying in English or not. Unfortunately, such patterns of language use may also have serious repercussions for students of French who want to master the language for employment or higher education, since they severely restrict the opportunities that young language learners have for using French outside of the classroom.

Some of the most revealing instances of language choice operating in multilingual settings occurred when I myself was participating in an interaction. As a bilingual English/French speaker and a learner of Inuttitut, I had established a pattern in which I used French with francophones, (my limited) Inuttitut with unilingual Inuit speakers, and English in all other situations. At times, however, I was placed in situations in which complying with the boundary construction of one interlocutor meant excluding another from the conversation. In such situations, I simply resisted the former’s boundary construction. To offer a concrete example: in certain contexts, I would resist using French when it would exclude non-French speakers from the interaction, or would use the language with varying degrees of trepidation, wanting social boundaries to remain fluid, and to avoid reproducing boundaries. In the following sections, I will be examine cases in which language choice serves to include and those in which it serves to exclude.

6.2.1.2. THE POLITICS OF INCLUSION

The practice of inclusion through language choice in multilingual settings is a risky business: every time one chooses to speak a particular minority language (that is, one not
spoken by everyone, like French or Inuit, one risks excluding others from the interaction. Yet, by choosing English as the language of interaction one risks weakening solidarity with other minority language speakers.

Choices between two competing languages, and between (possible) exclusion and inclusion, can thus make for extremely uncomfortable situations. One such situation arose one time I was at the airport, about to leave Great Whale. I started talking to Mary, a older Cree woman I knew. We were talking in English about her work—an important position in the community—and about people we both knew, when Céline, a close francophone friend of mine, approached and happily started talking in French. The difficulty was that I had never spoken English with Céline before, and I had been right in the middle of an English conversation with Mary. I thus had to decide immediately whether to respond to Céline in French or in English. I did what had made the most sense at the time, and responded in French, expressing my appreciation to Céline for coming to see me off. I then quickly switched to English, introducing Mary to Céline, telling Mary that she was a friend of mine who worked in a Québec government office. By bringing Mary into the conversation near the beginning of my interaction with Céline, I sought to negotiate the use of English as an inclusive language, without jeopardizing my friendship (and solidarity) with Céline, which had been constructed with the aid of French. I also sought to maintain my solidarity with Mary by choosing not to continue in French, which would have excluded her. The situation was complicated by the fact that broader political relations between the ‘ethnic groups’ to which these women belonged (Québécois and Cree) were highly conflictual at that time (and both of these ‘ethnic groups’ were, to a lesser extent, in conflict with my own—Anglo-Canadian).

This complex set of power relations shaped the context and the outcome of the interaction. My language choices became significant to the extent that I placed value on the relationships I had built with others, and felt that a particular language choice would jeopardize these relationships. Although using English allowed us all to engage in conversation, it did little to address the power inequities in this particular setting. English was a second language for Mary and Céline, whereas it was my first language. Speaking the language of Anglo-Canada is a compromise for Inuit, Cree, and Québécois alike: it is the dominant language of the state and the product of colonial domination and assimilative schooling of indigenous peoples. Experiencing the political complexities of language use firsthand provided me with insight into other situations in which speaking one language over another in intercultural settings can be a matter of political necessity as much as one of personal preference.
Language choice in a given social setting may be constrained by various factors, and result in particular patterns of behaviour with particular consequences. This is illustrated by the following excerpt from an interview with Maryse, a francophone woman who had been a resident of Poste-de-la-Baleine for over five years. When I asked her whether Inuit high school students used French in the community, she responded, 'Non, jamais' ('No, never'). The interview continued as follows:

D: Est-ce qu’ils parlent français avec toi?
['Do they speak French with you?']

M: Pas beaucoup. Mais, moi quand je sais qu’ils étudient en français, je vais leur parler en français. Et c’est drôle que tu dis ça, parce que la fille à Maggie, elle étudie en français et mardi passé j’ai joué à badminton avec, et je sais qu’elle et Eva étudient en français, puis à un moment on jouait et elle m’a posé des questions en anglais. Elle sait que moi je parle français, elle sait que je sais qu’elle étudie en français... mais moi je dis que c’est correct ça. Il faut leur laisser leur temps, mais moi j’ai répondu en français. Mais si elle n’est pas confortable, même si je pousse, je pousse, mais je pense que c’est à développer une bonne relation quand elle sera plus géniale avec moi, peut-être elle va parler français avec moi. [14.39]
[Not a lot. But, when I know that they are studying in French, I talk to them in French. It’s funny that you mention that, because Maggie’s daughter, she’s studying in French and last Tuesday I was playing badminton with her, and I know that she and Eva are studying in French, and then, while we were playing, she asked me some questions in English. She knows that I speak French, she knows that I know that she is studying in French... but I say, well, that’s alright. You have to give them time, but I answered in French. But if she isn’t comfortable, even when I push and push, but I think that a good relationship with her has to be developed and when she is more friendly with me, then perhaps she’ll speak French with me.]

Maryse then described how she continued to speak French with Maggie’s daughter. She noted how other francophones often used English with Inuit whom they did not realize were studying in French. Maryse, however, made an effort to use French, and continued to describe her approach to interacting with Maggie’s daughter:

Mais quelque fois comme quand j’étais avec elle, elle me posait des questions en anglais.
Je vais répondre en français et des fois je vais dire les choses et elle ne comprenait pas.
when she didn’t understand, I use some English words, and then, I switch back to French. But she doesn’t speak to me in French. But I say to myself, it’s okay if she doesn’t do it right away.]  

Maryse had developed a pattern of using French with people who were just beginning to learn French or who were second language speakers like myself. I had witnessed her speaking French slowly and clearly, waiting patiently for responses, and continuing conversations with Inuit and Cree who were taking beginning Adult Education courses. But, as she remarked, she was one of the few francophones who insisted on using French in public places with Inuit French-language students, even though they often replied to her in English.

The experience recounted by Maryse was supported by my own observations of students whom I knew were studying in French but who did not use the language outside of class. I did witness a few instances of high school students using French with teachers, which occurred during school and during preparations for a graduation ceremony. What I heard at the gymnasium or at the store, though, were at most one-word utterances in French—usually greetings—followed by conversation in English if there was any.

The use of English in situations described by Maryse seems to be justified by the following considerations: (i) the feeling of many people in the community, both Inuit and non-Inuit, that Inuit are shy, so that Inuit students of French will use the language only if they feel comfortable speaking it and know their interlocutors; (ii) an apparent unawareness of some in the community of the importance of French in the economy; and (iii) the lack of acceptance of French as a language of intercultural communication in the community. It is arguably just a question of time, then, until French is more generally accepted and used as an informal community language.

While there may be some truth to the view that most young people are shy about using a language that they have not mastered, and that the Inuit community is not yet prepared to embrace a third language for daily interaction, there are other reasons for young people to choose English over French in community situations. This choice is dependent on the language in which the interaction is initiated, the participants in the interaction, and the patterns of language use that have developed for particular speakers under particular social conditions. Underlying these choices is the continued dominance of English in
Nunavik, as a language not only of popular culture, to which young people especially might be drawn, but of interethnic communication established over decades of contact. In the latter capacity, English appears to have a similar solidarity function as Inuktitut; that is, marks solidarity between Inuit speakers when they are interacting with non-Native French-speaking interlocutors, in situations where the use of French or Inuktitut would risk excluding one of the participants in the interaction.

Although I did not observe firsthand exchanges in French between francophones and students of French outside of school contexts, I did observe situations in which no answer, one-word answers, or answers in English were given. One such exchange, which occurred at the gymnasium, reveals the complex interplay of factors involved in this kind of interaction. The gymnasium (where I went quite regularly) was one of the few places where francophones came into contact with French-speaking students outside of school—although this interaction occurred only to a limited extent, when people came together to play on teams, to watch or participate in tournaments, or to engage in recreational sports such as badminton or volleyball. The exchange in question occurred one night, at the end of a badminton game, just as some students were conversing in Inuktitut as they were preparing to leave. Often, during the periods set aside for adult badminton, I would see only non-Native players; but one evening I saw a group of three older Inuit adolescents—two of whom I recognized from school, one from the French senior high school class, one from the English class. At the end of their game, a francophone teacher in the next court greeted the student who studied in French, “Salut Anna! Comment ça va?”, to which Anna replied, ‘Bien’. Anna then quickly started talking in Inuktitut to her friends, and did not continue the conversation in French. The francophone teacher who addressed her was not her teacher; and perhaps Anna did not have a close enough relationship with her to continue the conversation, or was simply too shy to use French in a public place. An even more significant factor in Anna’s language choice, however, was the high social cost that she would have paid for continuing a French conversation in front of her friends: she would have been speaking a language that her friends did not understand, and in doing so forming an allegiance with a teacher and a francophone at the expense of her loyalties to her friends.

From what I observed, this particular interaction between a French-speaker and an Inuk student of French was a typical one. Maryse’s account of a similar interaction with Eva did not mention whether the girl was alone or not. However, since young people in the settlement tended to participate in activities in small groups, one might assume that she was with at least one friend. If she was, then her behavior—given the importance of peer group loyalty, coupled with a loyalty to Inuktitut and to Kuujjuaapik—would not have been surprising. From my own experience at the airport, I knew the potential cost of using
French in front of someone who did not speak the language: its use would have excluded and simultaneously positioned me on the ‘other side’ of an ethnic divide.

The use of English between Inuittut and French-speakers positions them on an equal footing, since they are then both using a second language. Other factors, including the shyness of certain individuals in using French, loyalties to friends and to the Inuit community, and ambivalence about new forms of French domination, may also lead to a lesser use of French outside the classroom. These patterns are reinforced when francophones use English with all non-francophones, even when a francophone knows that his or her interlocutor is studying French. These practices reflect the sociolinguistic norm that English is the language of intercultural communication. However, these sorts of language choices may (as already noted) have the unintended result of a negative learning environment for students wishing to achieve fluency in French.

6.2.1.3. DEFINING ‘US’ AND ‘THEM’:
THE EXCLUSIONARY USE OF INUPTITUT AND FRENCH

As we have seen, language is an important resource for including people in a group and for maintaining important relationships. For this reason, French is not spoken very often in public settings between Inuit and French speakers: English is a ‘brokering’ language; and its use has become established in patterns of interaction. Just as interlocutors can choose a language in order to include, they can also choose one in order to exclude, as Inuit youth might do when they choose to speak English among people who do not fully understand the language, or French among older people, or Inuittut in a class with a non-Native teacher who is not likely to understand it. The same systems of exclusion operate among adult speakers as well, as demonstrated by the following two events, which I observed during my fieldwork.

One evening, I attended a baby shower in Kuujjuaq, at which there were about twenty women in attendance, most under the age of forty-five, and three of whom—a francophone, a Cree, and myself—did not speak Inuittut. It was a pleasant social event, during which a mixture of Inuittut and English was spoken. When the shower was over, I walked down the road with three Inuit women: Mary (in whose honour the shower had been given), another woman with whom I was friendly, and a third from out of town. Given the expectations I had developed since moving into the community, I thought that these three friends would converse in Inuittut; and did not expect them to accommodate my poor Inuittut. However, Mary (who was married to an anglophone who understood very little Inuittut) switched into English and translated some of the conversation that had taken
place, which had been about the shower. The woman from out of town then mentioned something about the weather, before the conversation switched back into Inuitut. I then said in English that I was turning down the next road, and we said goodbye. Though brief, the walk had been memorable for me because it had been marked by the effort of this small Inuit group to include me in their conversation.

In fact, Inuitut use more often served to exclude me from conversations taking place between members of small groups—although at public events like picnics, someone standing nearby might have translated announcements for me; and less frequently, people would switch to English to include me in the conversation, as in the case just mentioned. It became apparent to me, however, that Inuitut had become a valuable resource for maintaining boundaries—whether intentionally or not—between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Inuitut is thus used to negotiate and exchange important symbolic resources (such as social solidarity and friendship) within the social network and the community.

French is also used as an exclusionary language, and as part of the process of reproducing ethnic boundaries and the ‘other’. This became apparent to me one day in June 1993, after I had been in the community about a month. As I was walking through the village towards the river, I noticed a group of people gathered just south of the Northern Store. There were two whales lying in the small grassy area. A man was carving up the meat, and a younger man from the Municipal Council was collecting samples of the skin to send away for testing. The Cree police officer appeared with a francophone officer, and asked the man from the Council to go with him. As I was standing there, I noticed a francophone man whom I recognized from the airport. We had never met, but I had gathered that he worked for Air Inuit, and was a friend of the francophone manager.

To my surprise, he spoke to me in French, commenting, ‘il y a beaucoup de gras’, and showing a little disgust. He then commented on how beautiful these animals were, and how they should have been left alone in the water, since there would soon not be many of these animals left. I told him there were quotas, and that I thought that the whales were protected. He was not convinced that the quotas were effective, and expressed his belief that these endangered animals should be left alone. From his perspective, the animals provided nothing of value—the meat had too much ‘fat’ on it to be of any value—and the symbolic and material value for the Inuit of the hunt and of the butchering of these animals was of no consequence. In expressing his views, which were completely at odds with the values that lay behind Inuit hunting practices, he seemed oblivious to the presence of the twenty or so Inuit gathered there. By expressing his views in French, he used a particular set of symbolic resources to contest the material and symbolic value of the whale, which were at odds with local values. I first felt surprise at his reaction to the whale, then
discomfort that he had chosen to express his views about this right where Inuit were gathered, and finally relief that the conversation was in French, and thus could not be understood by anyone else present. This situation demonstrates how ideological differences can be formulated, presented, and represented through language choice, and how they are reproduced, since they effectively go unchallenged.

In the above instance, French became a valuable resource in a situation where different cultural values (‘Western’ and Inuit) were in conflict. The use of French in this case provided speakers with a means of reproducing ethnic boundaries and constructing their own boundaries to define their ethnicity. This was a case of intentional exclusion: my interlocutor had chosen French over English, and I had chosen to continue the conversation in French, because this language was able to conceal the cultural inappropriateness of the comments and thus to avoid cultural conflict. Exclusionary language practices can involve either (i) the use of minority languages to exclude speakers of a dominant language, or (ii) a politically and economically dominant language (such as French in the above case) to exclude people who do not have access to that language. In either case the ‘exclusionary’ language can serve to access important symbolic resources such as social solidarity; to reproduce cultural and social values with respect to both material and ideological matters (such as the cultural value of whales and cultural attitudes toward fat, environment, and the natural world); and to hide remarks that might be considered offensive to others present in the speech context.

The use of Inuititut or French in intercultural situations also carries a social risk, particularly when these situations involve people who do not speak the language. In one case, French was used between two francophones to clarify a Cree cultural practice of tanning caribou hide. The incident occurred during the first celebration of what has become an annual event known as the ‘Gathering’, which involves workshops and activities based on traditional Cree cultural practices.7 Although it was geared specifically toward the Cree, many Inuit also participated; and more than once I noticed an Inuk elder conversing in Cree in friendly interchanges about food preparation, net-making, and the preparation of skins and hides. At the ‘Gathering’, I met up with a small group, consisting of an Inuk elder; his two nieces, one in her late twenties, the other in her early thirties; and two francophone men, who were of about the same ages as the Inuit women, and who worked with them on a nearby archeological dig. The Inuk elder was leading us around the different demonstrations and workshops, asking questions and gathering information in Cree, and then translating it into Inuititut for his nieces. One of them, Linda, then translated the Inuititut into English.

7 For a recent description of this ‘Gathering’, see Adelson 1997.
Our first stop was a site where some Cree women were preparing caribou skins. We arrived just at the point when they were rubbing oatmeal paste on the stretched-out skin as part of the preparation. After much discussion in Cree, then in Inuitut, Linda told us how long the process of scraping and treating with oatmeal would take, and the reasons for its use. It immediately became clear that one of the francophones, Stéphane, spoke English better than the other, and did most of the conversing with Linda. His colleague, André, questioned Stéphane in French: 'Qu’est-ce qu’elle a dit? ('What did she say?'); then, pointing to the oatmeal, 'C’est quoi ça?' ('What is that?'). ‘Gruau’ (‘Oatmeal’), the other answered. Stéphane then went on to explain in French how they used oatmeal to help clean and prepare the hide.

At this point, Linda became annoyed, and asked them what they were talking about, sarcastically answering her own question: ‘Probably about fat. White people are always talking about fat and how we Native people eat too much fat.’ Before they could respond, she added, ‘It’s not fat, it’s oatmeal!’ Despite Stéphane’s protests that he had only been translating what Linda had told him, the use of French in this situation had led Linda to distrust him. In some situations—like the whale-butchering incident described above—French, like Inuitut, is an exclusionary language, permitting negative remarks about the ‘Other’ to be communicated. This, coupled with the social context in which we were learning about Cree preparation of hunted game, established a typical context for disparaging remarks in French about Native practices. What surprised me was the reference to ‘fat’, which echoed the remarks made by my francophone acquaintance during the butchering incident two months earlier. It was quite obvious that Linda had already heard negative comments from Euro-Canadians about the Inuit use of fat, which has long been an important element of the local diet.8 This background knowledge led to a reasonable suspicion that French was being used negatively in the current context.

Directly after this incident, Linda made a clear shift towards her cousin, engaging with her in Inuitut conversation and distancing herself from the men. She did not translate the explanation of the process that followed, but provided some explanation when I asked her directly what the Cree woman had said. Although I had not been directly involved in the French dialogue, I was still ‘White’ and was only an acquaintance of Linda, who had joined the group to learn something about Cree practices.

Cross-cultural communication is a sensitive, risky practice, especially since domination, misunderstandings, and abuse have historically characterized cross-cultural encounters. The assumption that a ‘foreign’ language was being used to restrict comments

---

8 For a discussion of the importance of fat in the Cree diet and in their belief system of ‘good health’ and well-being, see Adelson 1992.
from entering the public domain was an understandable one under the circumstances—particularly since Inuititut might be used in a similar way to talk about Western or Euro-Canadian practices. Of course, the use of Inuititut in the latter situation involves a recognition of fundamental power differences between the two situations. Western practices, knowledge, and values have been in a dominant position since the introduction of European goods almost 400 years ago, although they did not reach this position of dominance without encountering resistance, which was mounted in part through the use of Inuititut.

As regards the last example, although French was not used in the same way as it was in the whale-butcher ing incident, the Inuit women clearly felt that it was. This is not to say that the use of French always brings suspicion on the users. Rather, specific contexts—such as the discussion of ‘traditional’ aboriginal practices—are more sensitive than others. Boundaries are produced and reproduced through cultural practices, and reinforced through language choice. From an Inuit perspective, the use of French in such situations reinforces a boundary between ‘us’ and ‘them’. It is a boundary which English admittedly does not erase, but which French nevertheless reinforces. French, as an exclusionary language and thus a potential resource for negative discourse, can serve to increase negative attitudes to the language among some non-French speakers.

In this section we have seen how language choice becomes a strategic means to reinforce relations between ‘us’ and ‘them’, or to cross boundaries and include everyone present in the interaction. In some interactional settings speakers of one language may intentionally or unintentionally exclude, include, or define speakers of different language backgrounds. In Great Whale River, Inuititut and French operate to exclude those who do not speak these languages—although not all francophones and Inuit will necessarily position themselves in this way—while English, at least in certain contexts, serves to include speakers in a particular exchange.

6.2.1.4. NEGOTIATING POWER AMONG ANGLOPHONES

The previous discussion has focused on language choice and the practices that serve to construct French and Inuit ethnicity. In addition to such practices—in which, for example, particular ideological positions are presented and contested by individuals employing French- or Inuititut-language resources, who reinforce ethnic boundaries through such actions—some anglophones who do not speak French may also place themselves culturally in positions similar to those of francophones as regards ‘Western’ cultural values. The difference between this relatively small group of unilingual English speakers and the larger
group of French speakers is that for the former group the use of English does not have the same role in consolidating social solidarity that French or Inuittitut does, since English is the language of power and the norm in intercultural communication, being used by almost everyone under the age of 45 in the community. Thus for unilingual anglophones, speaking English serves them well in all aspects of community life. For this group, however, solidarity is achieved more by a common recognition of the symbolic resources that they do not possess (including French, Inuittitut, or Cree language skills) rather than by their active use of English. This does not mean that these individuals have no way other than a shared language to become more integrated into or accepted by the aboriginal or francophone communities. However, it does mean that their participation is limited through their reliance on English language brokers to participate fully in intercultural group activities.

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The above analysis of language use in Kuujjuaraapik has centred on the importance of Inuittitut, Cree, French, and English in the community; and on how and why these languages are used by speakers in various contexts. The survey and the ethnographic data that have figured in this analysis have led to the same conclusions about language proficiency and language use in the Inuit community: namely, that these are closely tied to political economic factors; and that language plays a key role in constructing ethnic group identities, and in reproducing cultural and social values specific to these ethnic groups. In particular, the results reveal that Inuittitut language proficiency is widespread across all age groups of Inuit speakers; and is highly valued in such key domains as the home, the workplace, hunting, and the community. English language proficiency, on the other hand, is highest among those under the age of forty, and valued almost as much as Inuittitut at work. In addition, speakers over the age of forty are as fluent in speaking and understanding Cree as speakers under the age of twenty-eight are in French.

These survey data were corroborated by ethnographic evidence that language choice plays a significant role among speakers in constructing and maintaining ethnic boundaries, social identity, and cultural values important to their specific groups. Inuittitut is thus highly valued in maintaining social solidarity in friendship, family and community settings, and in negotiating and maintaining the cultural and economic value of resources associated with the ‘traditional’ hunting economy (like whales and other harvested products). Other social boundaries, such as those that define ‘francophone’ or ‘anglophone’ (or a more general ‘non-Native’) ethnicity, are constructed through similar linguistic processes. Thus, while a harvested whale might signify prestige and a valued form of food for Inuit, who will use
Inuitut while engaged in hunting, butchering, and distributing it, it might represent an endangered species with no economic value for certain non-Natives, who might assert or affirm these values in French or English. Symbolic resources are thus bound up with control over the definition and valuing of other symbolic and material resources; and within particular social groups, constitute a site of political struggle which has consequences for the maintenance of both linguistic and cultural practices.

Language choice is thus a key element in boundary processes and in the construction and negotiation of relations of power and solidarity. Through an examination of these processes in this chapter, I have attempted to demonstrate the importance of Inuitut for Inuit and the role of English as a lingua franca, and suggested the reasons why some students may be reluctant to speak French even in a community with a relatively high proportion of French speakers. In a particular context, a language may be chosen because of its habitual use or because it simplifies communication. Language choice may also be an explicit solidarity marker, indicating difference and, in some cases, resistance. In the latter instance, it can signal an intense struggle for the maintenance of distinct French and Inuit social spaces, where cultural and linguistic meanings associated with these groups and their languages can flourish, distinct from each other and from anglophone pressure. Language choice can be an effective way to negotiate and maintain the historically constructed boundaries that form the specific ‘ethnic groups’ that structure indigenous language communities. One is not so much a ‘member’ of a group as engaged in interactive practices that are part of a process of group formation. Group boundaries are constantly being defined and redefined in the process of articulating some form of cultural identification regarding ‘Inuitness’, ‘Creeness’, and ‘Whiteness’. Sociolinguistic analysis can be an effective way of gaining insight into these processes.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has offered a political economic analysis of the processes of language choice in the quadrilingual settlement of Great Whale River. It has focussed on the Inuit community of Kuujjuaarpik, where many of the older residents are fluent in Cree and Inuktitut and many of the younger residents speak Inuktitut, French, and English. The study has addressed the related questions of how and why Inuktitut persists, despite increasing pressure from English and French, the two dominant colonial languages in the region; and suggested that the answer lies in the role of Inuktitut and the settlement’s three other languages in boundary maintenance, the establishment of national, ethnic, and social identities, and the accessing of education, employment, and positions of power. It has also suggested that French and Inuktitut hold transitional sociopolitical positions in Arctic Québec—consequences of the relatively recent roles of these languages in the ethnic mobilization of the French in Québec and of the Inuit in Nunavik, respectively, and in the changing political economy of the region. Both languages have accordingly entered into competition with English, the historically established language of power, in the dominant linguistic market.

1. SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

The discussion of these issues was organized into four chapters, as follows. Chapter 1 provided a theoretical framework for this study, drawing on Heller, Gal, Woolard, Rampton, and others; and defined the terms ‘discourse’, ‘ideology’, ‘ethnicity’, and ‘power’ relevant to the discussion. In addition, this chapter provided some background information on aboriginal politics in Canada and the settlement of Great Whale River, including a discussion of the material and symbolic resources at stake in Arctic Québec. It also introduced the ethnographic methodology and the specific methods of data collection employed in this study. In addition to this background information, this chapter presented the overall argument of this thesis: that in order to understand the processes of language choice and the persistence of minority languages, one needs to consider the relationship between historical, political and economic processes that have shaped Euro-Canadian and aboriginal articulations of ethnicity, and everyday language practices within and across social groups.

Chapter 2 discussed the colonial history of the region, including the political economic shifts, the economic and cultural consequences for the Inuit, and the place and
value of language varieties within this history. Drawing on world system theory as developed in Wolf 1982, the chapter focussed on the relationship of dependence and interdependence between the Inuit and European traders, missionaries, and others involved in the colonization and exploitation of northern territories and peoples. It also included an analysis of the writings of scholars, missionaries, and traders that have served to frame and represent the aboriginal ‘Other’, showing how certain images of Inuit have changed over time, and arguing that the production and distribution of these images—which are often at odds with the picture of pre-settlement Inuit life that emerges from interview data gathered from Inuit elders—coincided with particular political economic shifts and served as legitimating ideologies in the colonial enterprise. These ideologies or discourses about the Inuit have legitimized colonial practices and domination, and constructed particular notions of ethnicity in Arctic Québec. These notions have included the stereotypes of the ‘savage Eskimo’; the ‘impoverished, heathen Eskimo’; the ‘noble savage’ and the ‘happy, smiling Inuk’. These images, I argue, have masked both the complex power relations between Europeans and Inuit, and the changing political economic circumstances that have shaped Inuit ‘traditional’ practices and life associated with survival on the land.

Chapter 3 examined the most recent historical period, beginning in 1955 with the construction of the army base and the growth of the community of Kuujjuaq. It focussed on the shift to the wage economy, the subsequent rise of Québécois and Inuit mobilization, and the importance of English, French, and Inuittut in these processes. Historical developments that were central to this discussion were the rise of Québec nationalism in the 1960s, the development of hydroelectric power in Québec in the 1970s and the negotiation of the JBNQA, which led to Inuit control over language policy, education, and other key institutions in Nunavik. Also central to this discussion was an examination of the complex political economic reality of Nunavik and the relation between dominant and ‘alternative’ linguistic markets. This examination, which made significant use of interview data, revealed the competition between English, French, and Inuittut in the dominant market. It also highlighted the paradoxical role of Inuittut, valued in both dominant and alternative ‘traditional’ markets; and the transitional status in Arctic Québec of French—a language which, though perceived as important because of its political and economic dominance in the province, and though used in many government offices and private enterprises, still has a limited place in the lives of most Kuujjuaq residents.

Chapter 4 presented results from a survey on language use in Kuujjuaq; and showed, by means of ethnographic data, how language choices in face-to-face interaction serve to construct social boundaries through processes that define, include, and exclude social players. Such choices thus become a key element in negotiating and constructing
ethnic boundaries and relations of power and solidarity. The chapter also demonstrated how these articulations of language, ethnicity, and social identity have become linked to larger political and economic struggles. More specifically, it showed how Inuittitut is highly valued as a language of solidarity in community settings, and in the negotiation and definition of the cultural and economic values of resources associated with the 'traditional' Inuit economy (including locally harvested animals such as whales). It suggested, similarly, that articulations of 'francophone' and 'anglophone' (or more generally 'non-Native') ethnicities, and the values that members of these groups attach to particular material and symbolic resources, are likewise constructed through linguistic practices. The chapter thus demonstrated how the value assigned to particular symbolic resources is linked to the values and definitions of other symbolic and material resources.

2. DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY

In this study, I have shown how language use in Arctic Québec is linked to the political, economic, and social reality of Inuittitut speakers. I have presented a political economic analysis that describes this reality in terms of a dominant Southern-controlled linguistic market, in which French, English, and Inuittitut compete; and an alternative 'traditional' linguistic market comprising a hunting economy and other 'traditional' activities, in which local forms of Inuittitut are valued. I have argued that a tension exists between these two markets, since Inuit participation in the dominant market is dependent upon legitimate claims to power, based on an inherent right to self-government and justified through claims of Inuit 'difference'. One way of articulating this 'difference' has been to maintain the harvesting economy and the symbolic practices associated with this 'traditional' market. A paradox lies in the fact that in order for Inuit to engage in a modern political struggle for control over economic resources in Nunavik, they must rely on legitimization through the maintenance of alternative 'traditional' linguistic, cultural, and economic practices. At the same time, a continuation of the alternative 'traditional' market and the harvesting economy relies on the resources gained through modern political struggles.

This study has also shown how a historical analysis of the political economic shifts linking Inuit to a system of world trade can help to explain how dominant and alternative linguistic markets, and the value of languages within these markets, have developed. I have argued that social groups, which each value particular material and symbolic resources over others, have been historically constructed through relations of colonial power and the material economic practices associated with the fur trade. During this stage of social history, Inuit ethnicity was constructed through 'traditional' Inuit practices associated with
the fur trade and the exchange of resources harvested from the land for European goods at the post. At the same time, Inuit 'others' were constructed and defined by Europeans through the production of images that served to legitimize the dominant role of Europeans in both 'civilizing' the 'natives' and subsequently exploiting indigenous labour and resources in the pursuit of profits from the fur trade.

The shift to wage labour in the 1950s brought a new era to the Inuit of Kuujjuaarapik and to the development of the dominant linguistic market. It became clear, at that time, that access to particular linguistic resources, like English, French, or Inuttitut, accessed particular material resources in the wage economy. This form of social stratification, based on the inequitable distribution of material and symbolic resources, fuelled the rise of Québécois nationalism in the 1960s, and the subsequent mobilization of Inuit in the 1970s. This political mobilization, in turn, created a dominant linguistic market in which all three languages would now compete for a place in Nunavik, since language and 'cultural distinctiveness' were key elements in legitimizing the political struggles of both the Québécois and the Inuit. Material resources obtained in the dominant market were thus allocated for the maintenance of the minority languages, partly in order to maintain 'cultural distinctiveness' and, in the case of the Inuit, to help maintain a 'traditional' alternative economy which defines 'Inuitness' and local community practices.

Inuit mobilization has created not only greater financial resources to preserve local harvesting practices and other 'traditional' activities that define 'Inuitness', but also institutionalized roles for Inuttitut in the dominant market. The latter has increased the need for the standardization of Inuttitut and for the unification of Inuit within Nunavik. Understanding these unifying practices, and local resistance to them, means understanding the value of material and symbolic resources in both the dominant and the alternative markets. At the local level, this tension is played out through the language forms valued in the school and the everyday language practices of local residents. In this study, I have sought to analyse this tension between legitimate language use and everyday practices by exploring (by means of both a language survey and ethnographic observation) the value of certain languages as used by various speakers in different settings.

While the language survey data confirm the importance of Inuttitut in various domains, such as the home, workplace, and community, they also reveal relatively high levels of English language proficiency among those Inuit under the age of 40, and high English language use in the workplace. In contrast, use of French was confined almost exclusively to younger speakers, and their levels of French were considerably lower than those of English among their English-speaking counterparts, and comparable to the level of Cree among those older Inuit who could understand and speak that language. The survey
data provide us with a limited profile of the population and their access to languages valued in the dominant and alternative markets. In order to explore the extent to which certain language varieties are valued, ethnographic observation and interview data were used to supplement the survey results.

The ethnographic component of this study included an analysis of the dominant language market. The present study has characterized this market in terms of the languages valued in the workplace, since this is the site where symbolic resources are most directly exchanged for material ones. More specifically, the study explored the transitional role of French in the community, given its status as a relatively new language of power in Arctic Québec. Interviews with employers and employees at various workplaces revealed the existence at these sites of what appear to be symbolic gestures that French is recognized as important, rather than actual requirements that Inuit employees speak the language. What this means is that French is often asked for, but not actually required of an Inuk employee on the job. What is more, francophone employees of Québec government offices or private enterprises often push for English translations of documents and other work-related material coming from the South, in order to accommodate non-French-speaking employees since English is the lingua franca between all groups. The delicate position of Nunavik within the Québec state, as an Inuit nation moving toward self-government within Canada and Québec, seems to necessitate this sort of accommodation of English from Southern French-speaking offices.

Ethnographic study has further revealed how particular language practices serve to construct ethnic boundaries and social groups. Within these boundaries, particular forms of Inuit, Québécois, and Anglo-Canadian ethnic identities are constructed, and the values of certain material and symbolic resources are defined. This means that ethnicities emerge within these socially constructed groups; and are defined and maintained through the negotiation of the cultural, social, and economic values of resources ranging from friendship networks to harvested food. The values of the symbolic resources represented by Inuit, Cree, French and English are thus determined as much by the respective positions of these languages within dominant and alternative linguistic markets as by the values accorded to them by social groups. Thus the sources of the values accorded to symbolic resources are derived not only from their exchange value for material resources in the workplace (although this determines a large part of their value in the dominant market), but also from the social value of linguistic resources in negotiating ethnic identity, social solidarity, and the value of goods, such as whales and fish, that are part of the alternative market.
The construction, maintenance, and transformation of ethnic boundaries are crucial processes in assigning values to particular languages and in using and maintaining certain language varieties in the community. Language choice plays a key role in these boundary processes, which serve to include and exclude social players from particular social groups and to define others as either Inuit or French speakers. In turn, these processes create a distance between these groups, while at the same time promoting Inuit and French language use. Since English remains the lingua franca of Kuujjuaq, unilingual English speakers are defined more by processes of exclusion by others—by the use of French or Inuit—than by their use of linguistic resources to exclude others. Thus, while this group of anglophones enjoys a position of power through their access to the dominant language in Great Whale River, they are excluded from French- and Inuit-speaking groups, and hence have no influence over the way in which the resources valued by these groups are defined and controlled. Power is ultimately negotiated through language choice: resources are defined and controlled by social groups, which articulate particular forms of ethnicity, and thereby assign particular values to these resources, in part through the language choices that they make.

In the dominant language market, French, Inuit, and English compete for access to the same material and symbolic resources, each negotiating a place of importance in the verbal repertoires of speakers. Depending on the circumstances, friendship and solidarity might outweigh a desire for economic advancement, and hence influence language choices in everyday settings. In this study, I have provided examples of delicate negotiations of social relationships in which the use of Inuit or English has been favoured over French. As such, French has a transitional status in Great Whale River. Although it is the language of state, private enterprise, and administration in the province, it has not gained the position of dominance that one might expect in this multilingual community. Only time will tell whether French achieves greater acceptance as a language of intercultural communication, and whether there are changes in the social constraints on its use. The social conditions necessary for such changes might include increased numbers of students enrolled in French classrooms, a greater economic influence of Quebeck in North America and a resolution to the larger political question of the status of Quebeck and French within Canada.

An important goal of this study has been to gain a better understanding of why certain languages have persisted in Great Whale River, and how power is linked to particular language varieties and forms of ethnicity. I have shown how historical, political, economic, and social processes are linked to linguistic and cultural practices, through forms of dominance, resistance, and persistence of particular social groups and ethnicities over others. In the study, resistance has been seen as linked to political mobilization and access
to the material resources needed to support minority languages, in part through the development of institutional domains of language use. Among these institutional domains are local and regional governments, which can legitimate particular forms of language use; and the school, which can foster the development of language curricula. Each of these is thus an integral part of the larger historical and political economic picture of language use and organized resistance against and accommodation to the cultural, ideological, and economic dominance of English and French in Arctic Québec.

3. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

In this study, which is addressed to Native and non-Native people alike, I have sought not only to understand the historical complexity of settlement along the Hudson Bay coast and the role of language choice in structuring the patterns and politics of interaction, ethnicity, and social groups; but also to document Inuit perceptions of their use of languages in various domains. The results of this study suggest that social ‘difference’ does not translate into social inequality; that ‘ethnicity’ is not composed of unifying, absolutist elements, traits or dispositions; and that subjectivities and social identities are constructed in complex ways, in which language choice plays an important role. As such, the study might be of use to those who wish to understand and respond to the local concerns of Inuit and non-Inuit about the role of language education and language issues in building a future for Nunavik.

This study might also have implications for second language teaching and for language policy more generally. In Québec and Nunavik, historical, political, and economic processes have worked to promote, maintain, and provide political and social meanings to English, French, Inuititut, and Cree. While English has been in a position of dominance, French, Inuititut, and Cree have each been the objects of language legislation initiated by their respective governments. It is only through an examination of what people do with language that we can begin to see what effects, if any, language policy has on everyday language practices. In this study, we have seen how an examination of social and linguistic interaction can be a step in this direction.

Finally, the study might have implications for an understanding of the mechanisms involved in the maintenance of minority languages. The study has shown how minority language maintenance is crucially dependent on social, cultural, political, and economic values attached to these symbolic resources—values which are clearly linked, yet distinguishable, and which include the maintenance of community social networks and cultural practices that define ‘Inuitness’; values place on political resistance to assimilative
measures which could undermine 'Inuit' identity; and the maintenance of the supply of harvested game to supplement material resources obtained in the wage economy. Thus in Kuujjuaraapik, the survival of Inuttitut appears to be intricately linked to its role (i) in consolidating social solidarity through local social networks; (ii) in structuring and maintaining cultural practices and local ideologies related to Inuit values, beliefs, and practices; (iii) in Inuit political mobilization, as an element in the construction and legitimation of Inuit 'difference' and traditional rights to the land; and finally, (iv) in the local economy, in particular for participating in the 'traditional' alternative economy, and in obtaining certain forms of employment in the wage economy. It is the increased use of Inuttitut in this last domain that would most reliably ensure its linguistic survival in modern Inuit communities.

4. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The research reported in these pages must, admittedly, be seen as only a first step in the investigation of a very complex situation; and more detailed study of various aspects of this situation is in order. Further research might therefore include (i) a more detailed and systematic investigation of linguistic requirements in the workplace; (ii) a supplementation of self-reported linguistic data with more detailed analysis of reading and writing proficiency in the three languages taught in school; (iii) a systematic investigation of the impact of English on the younger speakers of Inuttitut, and (iv) related to this, a tracking of the progress of French language acquisition and use in the Inuit community; and finally, (v) a more detailed investigation of the construction of ethnicities in Great Whale River—of what defines being 'Inuit', 'francophone', 'anglophone', and 'Cree'—and of the role that language and culture play in this construction.
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INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

It is important to understand every question. Should you have any difficulty understanding or answering any of the questions, please ask for help by calling the school (929-3409) between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm.

1. In all questions which provide several possible answers followed by line, please put a mark on the line next to the answer which is true for you.

   Example: Do you hunt, trap or fish:
   Full-time _____  
   Part-time _____  
   Not at all _____

2. In all questions which have a rating scale, please circle a single number on the scale. Do not circle the words below the numbers. It is the number you circle which will represent your opinion. Feel free to select any number from 0 to 10. Please circle only one number on each scale.

   For example, if I was an Inuk whose mother tongue was Inuititut and I use Inuititut most of the time then I would probably circle 9 or a 10 in the following example:

   Example: How well do you speak each of the following languages?

   **Inuititut**
   
   Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

   If I studied English at school, I might be fairly fluent but not as good as I am in Inuititut. Then I might circle a 6 or a 7.

   **English**
   
   Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

   Finally, if I speak almost no French I might circle 0 or 1.

   **French**
   
   Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well
1. Sex: Male _____
    Female _____

2. Your Age: Years _____

3. Your Ethnic Heritage:
   Inuit _____
   Cree _____
   French Canadian _____
   English Canadian _____
   Other _____

4. Ethnic Heritage of Your Mother:
   Inuit _____
   Cree _____
   French Canadian _____
   English Canadian _____
   Other _____

5. Ethnic Heritage of your Father:
   Inuit _____
   Cree _____
   French Canadian _____
   English Canadian _____
   Other _____

6. Ethnic Heritage of your Spouse:
   Inuit _____
   Cree _____
   French Canadian _____
   English Canadian _____
   Other _____
7. How well do you speak each of the following languages?

**Inuktitut**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

**English**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

**French**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

**Cree**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

8. How well do you understand each of the following languages?

**Inuktitut**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

**English**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

**French**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

**Cree**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well
9. How well do you write each of the following languages?

Inuktitut

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

English

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

French

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

Cree

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

10. How well do you read each of the following languages?

Inuktitut

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

English

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

French

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well

Cree

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all ----> A little ----> Adequately ----> Fairly Well ----> Very Well
11. What are your sources of income? (You may check more than one)

Full-time job _____
Part-time job _____
Hunters Support _____
Old Age Pension _____
Family Allowance _____
Government Assistance _____
Carving _____
Sewing _____
No Income _____

If you have a full time or part-time job, please answer questions 12 and 13.
If not go to question 14.

12. How much do you use each of the following languages when you are talking with friends or coworkers at work (during lunch, coffee breaks)?

**Inuititut**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**French**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How much do you use each of the following languages in order to do your actual work on the job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inuttitut</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite alot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite alot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite alot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How much do you use each of the following languages in the community (outside your home or your job)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inuttitut</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite alot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite alot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite alot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>About Half of the Time</td>
<td>Quite alot</td>
<td>All the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. How much do you use each of the following languages when you are hunting, fishing or camping?

**Inuititut**

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of the Time ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

**English**

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of the Time ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

**French**

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of the Time ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

Cree

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of the Time ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

16. To get a job in Kuujjuaapik how important is it to be fluent in each of the following languages?

**Inuititut**

Not at all ----> Somewhat ----> Important ----> Quite ----> Extremely Important

**English**

Not at all ----> Somewhat ----> Important ----> Quite ----> Extremely Important

**French**

Not at all ----> Somewhat ----> Important ----> Quite ----> Extremely Important
17. How much do you use each of the following languages in your home?

**Inuktitut**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

**English**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

**French**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

**Cree**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Never ----> A little ----> About Half of ----> Quite alot ----> All the Time

18. How much responsibility should the school have for teaching each of the following languages?

**Inuktitut**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Responsibility ----> A Little ----> Some ----> Quite alot ----> Total Responsibility

**English**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Responsibility ----> A Little ----> Some ----> Quite alot ----> Total Responsibility

**French**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Responsibility ----> A Little ----> Some ----> Quite alot ----> Total Responsibility
19. How much responsibility should the family have for teaching each of the following languages?

Inuit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>A Little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Total Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>A Little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Total Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>A Little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Total Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How much time do you spend listening to radio in each of the following languages?

Inuit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. In a normal, average day how many hours of television and videos do you watch in each of the following languages?

   Number of hours in Inuitut ____
   Number of hours in English ____
   Number of hours in French ____
   Number of hours in Cree ____

22. What are your favorite television programs?

   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

23. How much time do you spend listening to music on the stereo in each of the following languages?

   **Inuitut**
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   None at all ------> A little ------> Some ------> Quite a lot ------> Very Much

   **English**
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   None at all ------> A little ------> Some ------> Quite a lot ------> Very Much

   **French**
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   None at all ------> A little ------> Some ------> Quite a lot ------> Very Much
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