1

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

Underdevelopment in the Canadian North:

The Innut of Sheshatshiu

by

John Patrick Crump, B.J.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in Canadian Studies

Carleton University

OTTAWA, Ontario

August 1988

(© 1988, John Patrick Crump

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-46306-6

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis
"Underdevelopment in the Canadian North: The
Innut of Sheshatshiu"
submitted by John Crump, B.J.,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements of
the degree of Master of Arts

..... *James Able*

Thesis Supervisor

..... *Bill Fisher*

Director,
Institute of Canadian Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

August 1988

Abstract

The thesis examines the historical process which has led to the underdevelopment of the Innut of Sheshatshiu, Labrador. It argues that the Innut have been incorporated on the margins of Euro-Canadian society through the increasing industrialization of their region, Nitassinan. This work maintains that the Innut have not been passive victims of outside oppression; rather at each historical juncture decisions were made and the people attempted to use elements of Euro-Canadian culture which suited their needs and wants at the time. In spite of 500 years of contact, the Innut mode of production has been retained, albeit in an altered form from pre-contact days.

However, the Innut's choices have been increasingly curtailed since the advent of the industrial mode of production--in the form of the construction of an airbase at Goose Bay--during the Second World War. Military development was followed by other forms of industrial development over which the Innut had no say. At the same time, the role of government greatly increased in their lives and members of a nomadic culture were required to settle in villages and send their children to school. Now Innut culture is confronted with further expansion of military activity in Labrador in the form of low-level flying. It is argued that this activity is yet another manifestation of the industrial mode of production which has placed their culture under increasing duress.

In order to understand existing conditions, the thesis examines the history of the Innut from a number of points of view. There is a chapter on outsiders' interpretations of Innut culture and society. A subsequent chapter looks at how the role and powers of the state in Labrador have increased in concert with industrial development from outside. The role of the military in this process of the "development of underdevelopment" is then considered. This is followed by the Innut analysis of these forces and their effects. Finally, a number of conclusions and possible outcomes of the interactions of these social formations are offered.

Acknowledgements

Many people contributed to this work, too many in fact to name them all individually. First, I would like to thank the members of the Sheshatshiu Innu Council for allowing me to live in their community and carry out my research. Thanks to Clayton for lending his house. David Nuke spent several days showing me around introducing me to people and helped me to begin to understand some of the great differences between our worlds, and through this learn about some of the similarities in our lives.

I am grateful as well to all the people who welcomed me into their homes and patiently answered questions from yet another outside researcher. Without their forbearance and help this work would not have been possible. Lyla Andrew kindly provided me with information from her own community research. And special thanks to Greg Pastitshi, whose translations and friendship were invaluable.

In Ottawa, thanks to Stan Mealing and Fred Bienefeld for reading numerous drafts and offering advice that was always clear, concise and concrete. Thanks as well to Daiva Stasiulis for her help as examiner. I cannot forget to mention Susan Holland, graduate secretary for the Institute of Canadian Studies at Carleton, whose long-distance logistical assistance is much appreciated.

Thanks to Chris Dornan, my old friend, for the occasional use of his equipment when I couldn't figure out how to make mine work, for letting me sleep on his floor, and for helping during the last stages of assembly.

I owe a special debt to my advisor, Frances Abele, who introduced me to Labrador. Her deep commitment to Native peoples and her unequivocal sense of justice were a constant source of inspiration and support through all the stages of my work.

Finally, to Leslie, whose love and courage never fail, and by whose example I have learned to climb mountains.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Note on Spelling and Pronunciation.....	i
Map of Quebec-Labrador Peninsula, showing northern and southern low-level flying zones.....	ii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter I Underdevelopment in the First World.....	12
Chapter II The Innut of Sheshatshiu.....	45
Chapter III Innut History Through Outside Eyes.....	66
Chapter IV From the Top Down: The State and the Innut.....	112
Chapter V Industrial and Military Development in Labrador.....	157
Chapter VI Reaction and Resistance: The Innut Fight for Self-Determination.....	186
Summary and Conclusions.....	238
Bibliography.....	252

A Note on Spelling and Pronunciation

The Innut language, Inueimun, has many words which are difficult to translate into English, thus many works cited will contain different transliterations and spellings of the same word.

For instance, the Innut homeland can be spelled either "Nitassinan" or "Ntesinan". "Sheshatshiu", the village where the Innut this paper discusses now live, is also spelled "Sheshatshit". (It has several pronunciations, varying with Innut dialect, and in English comes out something like "Shesh-ah-shee".) Both of these probably come from the Inueimun word "Secacit", meaning "Narrow Place".

This thesis will use "Nitassinan" and "Sheshatshiu", both for the sake of consistency and because they seem to be the most acceptable approximations to the Inueimun words.

As well, there is a difference between Innu and Innut, although once again there is no common version in the sources. The former is used in the singular; the latter in the plural (the guideline for usage being similar to that governing "Inuk" and "Inuit"). No attempt has been made to change usage in quotations.

Finally, while most early visitors to Nitassinan agreed the southern Innut should be called "Montagnais" (or in English, "Mountaineers"), a debate seemed to rage for centuries over just how to spell "Naskapi" (the name given the northern or barren ground Innut). Several variations of this word appear in the sources, and it would be too confusing to list them all here. The variations of spelling in the sources have been left as written.

LOW LEVEL FLYING AREAS

(From Environmental Assessment Panel 1987. Newsletter No. 1).

Introduction

Labrador is a frontier, a peripheral region largely outside the main focus of Canadian consciousness. Many Canadians have little idea of its peoples or history, yet it was probably the first part of North America to be "discovered" by Europeans, and its aboriginal population among the first indigenous peoples to feel the pressures of a foreign civilization. If Labrador is on people's minds at all these days, it is likely because plans to build a large NATO jet fighter training centre at Canadian Forces Base Goose Bay have been the object of vocal protests by the Innut of the region.

The Innut, who the "discoverers" of Labrador called the Montagnais and Naskapi Indians, are small in number but have succeeded in publicizing their opposition to low-level jet fighter training, and in so doing have brought their demands for justice and a recognition of their aboriginal rights to a national, and international, audience.

The initial assumption of this study is that modern Labrador constitutes an underdeveloped region in Canada, and that this condition of underdevelopment is a product of the relations of production in the region and the country as a whole. This condition of underdevelopment affects all the cultural groups of

Labrador, but its effects are especially noticable on the Innut.{1}

Canadians are accustomed to counting themselves as members of the industrial "advanced" world, and indeed much of the country fits that description. However, there are regions which appear to have more in common with the "underdeveloped" countries of the Third World than the rest of Canada. The people most affected by this condition of underdevelopment (although not exclusively so) are the members of the aboriginal nations--Indian, Inuit and Metis. A region that is chronically underdeveloped is the North. This paper is concerned with one part of the North and a small number of its inhabitants--the Innut of Sheshatshiu.

The Innut have lived for millennia in the region they call Nitassinan ("Our Land") and pursued a nomadic existence in the often unforgiving interior of what we now call the Quebec-Labrador peninsula. The Innut language, Inueimun, is part of the Algonkian linguistic stock. A hunter-gatherer people, they followed a yearly round of wandering that had both pattern and purpose. Their society was sophisticated and well adapted to the environment. In fact, they were very much a part of that environ-

1 There are several cultural groups in Labrador: the Innut, who originally occupied the interior; the Inuit, who live on the northern coast; and the Settlers, long-time inhabitants whose occupation predates the introduction of the capitalist mode of production.

ment and possessed no notions that human beings had to conquer the environment in order to survive.

The most important source of food was the caribou, an animal which formed the very basis of Innut culture. In the northern regions of Nitassinan the "Naskapi" followed vast herds of migrating barren ground caribou. Practically their entire stock of material goods came from this animal: skins clothed them and provided tent walls; bones were turned into all manner of tools and implements; sinews were used for sewing; and the meat provided nourishment and spiritual strength. Further south, the "Montagnais" hunted the woodland caribou, beaver and many other animals. Human beings took animals only when the latter offered themselves to the hunters; desecration of animal carcasses or carelessness led to starvation.

This thesis will explore how the once nomadic Innut came to live in villages in the 1950s, and argue that their society has been underdeveloped since then through the expansion of the role of the state in their lives. Turning the Innut into a sedentary people was one of the key events in their recent history and precipitated numerous changes that have resulted in their increasing powerlessness.

There are about 1,000 Innut in Labrador and another 9,000 or so living in communities along the North Shore of the St. Lawrence river in Quebec, such as Mingan, Natashquan and St. Augustin. The Innut of Labrador live in two villages: Davis Inlet on the northern coast, and Sheshatshiu, near the commercial-

military centre of Goose Bay. Regardless of which political jurisdiction the Innut now happen to live in, they have all faced, and continue to face, similar pressures to conform to Euro-Canadian values.

This thesis concentrates on the history of the Innut who now live in Sheshatshiu. While the Innut communities share common experiences, there are also significant historical differences which make concentrating on a single group the only feasible approach for a Master's Thesis. As it is, since the people of Sheshatshiu have not existed in isolation from other Innut groups the early historical scrutiny is not confined simply to Labrador. As well, it looks at the earliest interactions between the Innut and Europeans in the Quebec-Labrador region in order to provide sufficient background to understand how the situation now faced by people of Sheshatshiu came about.

Concentrating on the Sheshatshiu Innut also allows for a coherent examination of the process of underdevelopment as it has taken place in the region. It is also the people of this small community who have been the vanguard of the protest against military development, and whose resistance to assimilation forms the basis of an aboriginal anti-colonial struggle in the region.

The outcome of their struggle is uncertain at best. However, this study is not merely concerned with the latest military development; rather, such proposals may be seen as examples of the forces that create conditions of underdevelopment in Labrador. Military development will be shown to be a

manifestation of the capitalist mode of production in the way it influences economic and social change. The actual political struggle against low-level flying then is seen as an effort by the Innut to gain a measure of control over how development will take place in their territory. At the heart of this, of course, is the question of who controls that territory, the Innut or those they see as newcomers? What mode of production should prevail? How should economic and social decisions be made? Who should make these decisions? In short, the Innut are demanding recognition of their aboriginal right to self-determination. To be self-determining, at the very least, means having a say in whether or not low-level flying--and other forms of capitalist development--should take place.

That said, it is important as well to mention what this work will not attempt to analyze. First of all, there is no room here answer the question of whether or not Canada should be a part of the NATO alliance and, following that, the strategic question of whether or not this country should permit a part of its territory to be used for low-level flying. No attempt will be made to evaluate the military necessity of these exercises; however, the context of the work will provide a response to the normative political question of whether or not this activity should be taking place in the Innut homeland at this moment in history.

Likewise, this paper will examine the effects the Innut say low-level flying is having on their way of life, but it will look at neither the process which led the Canadian government to

sign bilateral agreements with several allies to permit low-level flying, nor the negotiations involved in trying to influence the NATO decision-makers to put a training centre at Goose Bay. Also, while touching on the matter of economic benefits of military-industrial development, this work will not attempt to analyze their significance to the local economy.

Method and Approach

The paper is divided into six chapters. Chapter I presents the theoretical outline, and moves from a general theory of underdevelopment to its application in Labrador and effect upon the Innut. It offers for consideration the idea that in Labrador, as in other regions of the North, two modes of production co-exist, although not always harmoniously.

Chapter II illustrates life in the community of Sheshatshiu today through the use of data and interviews carried out with Innut respondents during August, 1987. It is an attempt to see conditions through the eyes of the Innut.

Chapter III traces the history of the central Labrador region and the Innut through the eyes of early explorers, fur traders, adventurers and, during the 20th Century, anthropologists. It covers the period from about 1000 A.D. to approximately 1950. Central to this section is the role of the Innut in the fur trade.

Chapter IV examines the growth of government agencies in Labrador, and their expanding influence over Innut life.

Beginning about 1930, this chapter looks at early government-inspired development schemes for Labrador, as well as the rationale behind the push to incorporate the Innut into the dominant society during the 1950s and 1960s. This drive to assimilate aboriginal people in Labrador reflects similar moves elsewhere in the Canadian North and came in the form of education, health, housing and economic development.

Before the construction of Goose Bay, the domestic mode of production was dominant in Labrador. Chapter V will describe the change in modes of production in the region and the effects of industry on both the Innut land and way of life. Recent military developments in the area will be analyzed as forms of industrial development.

Chapter VI will examine the effects industrial development has had on Innut society. It will also describe Innut resistance to recent development plans, including low-level flying, through protest campaigns, lobbying and use of the media. It will also touch upon the reaction to this campaign by some non-Innut members of Labrador society.

Finally, conclusions will be drawn about the success of Innut in resisting assimilation to this point, and an assessment will be made of their chances for ameliorating the conditions of underdevelopment in which their community finds itself.

Material for this work was collected on trips to Labrador in January and August 1987. During August, the author lived in Sheshatshiu and conducted interviews with numerous Innut

residents, hunters and community leaders. Interviews were also carried out with provincial and federal government officials.

Considerable archival material was retrieved from the Public Archives of Newfoundland and Labrador in St. John's, as well as the Memorial University campuses in that city and Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

The archival and secondary sources provided a good historical overview of events in the Quebec-Labrador peninsula since the early 1500s and a context for interviews with Innu informants in Sheshatshiu. The purpose of this work was to look at the historical development of underdevelopment as much as possible from two points of view--that of the Innu and outsiders.

History is a collection of memories recalled in different ways. The western, rationalist tradition relies on documentation and provable "facts" and veracity in objective terms is the stated goal. However, success in this endeavour can be a question of perception. History is often a summation of points of view, the product of different analytical tools and approaches. When something happened is often (although not always) easier to agree upon than why it happened. One is "objective", the other is "subjective"; in truth both simply reflect different subjectivities. In western tradition, reliance is placed on the written, and therefore verifiable, word. Cultures with a written history are believed to be easier to analyze than those, like the Innu, which lack such traditions. The latter's history,

remembered and passed on orally from generation to generation, is considered to be mutable and evolutionary. But this rejection of Native historical recollection creates a problem of its own.

"When archaeologists and other 'experts' challenge the Indians' own idea of their history, they implicitly undermine the Indians' sense of absolute and eternal belonging to particular places."

(Brody 1981,15)

Thus it was crucial that this work escape as much as possible the trap of evaluating Innut history and experience solely in Euro-Canadian terms. That is why, whenever possible, Innut voices have been used to describe their view of history; Euro-Canadian interpretations have been used to provide a context for what is being discussed. Nevertheless, the author is aware that the effort is likely to be imperfect for the simple reason that to understand how the Innut think and feel and view the world, one must be born a member of their society. All other attempts will be analytical approximations, subject to the pitfalls of ethnocentrism. That said, it is felt that the combination of the "subjective" and "objective" interpretations of history will lead to a clearer understanding of how and why Labrador and the Innut have come to be underdeveloped.

Some Initial Considerations

In attempting to analyze the political economy of northern Native societies, one must be aware of the possible ramifications such research can have in the North. This work will not attempt

to provide the definitive answer to the problem of under-development in Labrador, nor will it offer a set of prescriptions to the Innut for the immediate amelioration of their situation. To do so would be misleading because it would assume that the complex questions taken up here permit simple solutions. If they did, quite likely the answers would have been discovered and the problems rectified.

In general, however, we can consider several prospective outcomes of the clash between the social formations represented by the Innut and Euro-Canadian societies: (i) the first is the destruction of one group by the other, commonly referred to as genocide; (ii) the stronger of the two subordinates the weaker and comes to completely dominate it; (iii) one of the forms is assimilated; (iv) the two forms live in peaceful coexistence;—or (v) some form of integration is arrived at which does not require the complete assimilation of the weaker group.

It is impossible to say what will be the final outcome of the process of historical change introduced by the capitalist mode of production in the Innut homeland. However, through the analysis offered here, it will become apparent that the fifth option--integration of the two competing social formations--is most desirable, and in fact has occurred already to a certain degree. The data and historical information offered herein will be discussed from this perspective.

It is important to note that in order to advance the cause of justice and attempt to rectify past injustices, further

integration, whether through the successful conclusion of a land claims settlement or some other process, must be of a form that would guarantee the Innut the right to self-determination. However, given existing political realities in this country, the form of this new entity would have to be a product of negotiations with governments the Innut now have difficulty dealing with. These negotiations should be carried out between equals. This implies that while the Innut must deal with governments whose sovereignty over them they have never recognized or accepted, these same governments must also recognize that the Innut, and by extension all aboriginal peoples in Canada, have the right to self-determination, that they are indeed separate peoples with separate traditions and ways of doing things.

It is a tall order. The state of relations between Canada and the aboriginal nations is the product of the kinds of distortions created by colonialism in the social body of peoples, both colonized and colonizer. Nowhere is this malady of colonialism better illustrated than the situation in which the Innut of Labrador find themselves today.

Chapter I

Underdevelopment in the First World: The Case of Labrador

We are inclined to think of hunters and gatherers as poor because they don't have anything; perhaps better to think of them for that reason as free.

Marshall Sahlin^o
Stone Age Economics

This thesis will illustrate how Innut society has come to be "underdeveloped" and argue that this condition is the result of certain identifiable material and subjective processes. It will use a neo-Marxist approach to examine the interplay of the Innut and capitalist modes of production in Labrador, and show how domination by the latter has directly contributed to the creation of underdevelopment--conditions which the Innut face in very real terms in their day-to-day existence.

This first chapter will lay the theoretical foundation for the discussion and analysis of the underdevelopment of the Labrador Innut found in the following five chapters. It will begin by exploring the concepts of modernization, development and underdevelopment, and colonialism. It will also show that forms of dependence in underdeveloped regions are not accidental. Following this will be an outline of the dependentista critique of modernization, and then the Marxist critique of the dependency school. The concept of modes of production will be introduced and a possible synthesis of disparate modes will be offered. Finally, the chapter will show how these concepts have been applied to the

North in general and Labrador in particular, and a method of analyzing underdevelopment in northern Canada will be introduced.

Before proceeding any further, it is necessary to define underdevelopment as it will be employed in this study. Mel Watkins (1977) has argued that underdevelopment can be precisely defined as the "'blockage of potential, sustained economic and social development geared to local human needs.'" (1977,91)

Since the purpose of this work is to examine a particular case of underdevelopment, it has been necessary to omit much of the debate about how development occurs, or should occur, that has gone on over the last four decades. Approaches and concepts are used when they help explicate the problem at hand. For instance, there is no room in this work for a discussion of Marxist theories of imperialism or a wide-ranging examination of all the variations of the neo-Marxist theoretical approaches to problems of development. As well, there is no space to delve much into the Marxist reaction to the dependency school. Where references are made, the appropriate works will be cited; where concepts require them, definitions will be provided.

Neo-classical and Liberal Development Theory

World War II accelerated the end of the old European colonial empires. In the years after the war, the former political colonies in Africa and Asia were transformed into independent nations. However independence did not mean economic

autonomy. The new countries were tied into a world economic system dominated by the United States. While international bodies such as the United Nations urged the disbanding of political empires, economic empires quickly formed. Neo-colonialism emerged in the form of economic dependence by the new countries on the powerful forces of American (and European) capital. During this era underdevelopment (although the term was not widely in use) was conceptualized as "synonymous with backwardness, with an earlier stage of development." (Brewer 1980,18) It should be pointed out that development refers to capitalist economic development.

There is, of course, no single, universally accepted "theory" of development. The optimism of the early post-war years was reflected by neo-classical economists who saw international trade and new technologies as the key to economic growth in the developing countries. Development meant economic growth. "The neo-classical theory of trade stated that development in one part of the world would lead to development in other parts through various 'spread' effects." (Blomstrom and Hettne 1984,15)

During this period many economists applied ethnocentric analyses which held the newly independent nations would progress through a series of predictable, measurable stages to full development based on the western industrial model. W.W. Rostow (1960) listed five such stages, moving from the traditional to a society of "mass consumption". Development was equated with

progress towards industrial capitalism. Some would reach the goal, others would not.

The theorists gradually moved from this ethnocentric economic point of view to a more interdisciplinary approach which incorporated factors such as health care, education, politics, and the working of national institutions to name a few.

"Modernization" became the key to successful development.

Development was seen in an evolutionary perspective, and the state of underdevelopment defined in terms of observable differences between rich and poor countries. Development implied the bridging of these gaps by means of an imitative process, in which the less developed countries gradually assumed the qualities of the industrialized nation. (Blomstrom and Hettne 1984,20)

The "modernization" paradigm was the ethnocentric product of liberal economic theory. Seen in its most rudimentary form, it "served as a development ideology, simply rationalizing cultural colonialism." (Blomstrom and Hettne 1984,22) As we shall see, government administration of the Innut of Labrador, like similar relationships in other parts of the North, reflected this development approach.

From the standpoint of the "advanced" nations of the 1950s and 1960s, the newly independent countries were backward and thus underdeveloped. Despite liberal economic assertions to the contrary, underdevelopment is a matter of perspective.

It does not mean undeveloped, for all societies are the end products of thousands of years of development. They are under developed in relation to the 'advanced' industrialized countries. But when Europeans first arrived in Africa and the Americas, they often found themselves dealing with societies whose levels of economic development and cultural sophistication were superior or equal to anything Europe could show. Their

underdevelopment today is not a natural condition, but an unnatural one, a social state which is the product of history; not a passive condition, but the consequence of conscious action; not something that just happened, governed by a logic of an impersonal system, but something that was done to people by other people. Underdevelopment did not mean ossification--the absence of change. (Worsley 1984,3)

Modernization and Colonialism

The argument over what constitutes "true" development has raged for decades. An analytical link was made between the process of underdevelopment and the effects of colonialism. (Blomstrom and Hettne 1984) For the newly decolonizing nations, the classical view held that becoming developed meant striving to be like the former colonialist mother country. The dependence of the new countries on their former rulers became less direct but perhaps more pervasive and persuasive. It was not just an economic domination, it was also social, political, spiritual and racial. Worsley explains, using relations in South America and the Caribbean to illustrate:

The economic exploitation of the Indian thus bore no resemblance to the theoretical categories developed in laissez-faire economic theory to describe a later phase of capitalism. The bonds between encomendero and Indian were not those of the cash nexus or of a market in labour: they were extra-economic, political ties of bondage. They also involved the construction not merely of an economic system, but of a whole new social order based on racial categories. (Worsley 1984,9)

The writings of European colonialists are sprinkled with phrases pointing out the obvious superiority of western culture over those of the newly "discovered" and dominated peoples.

For some, this meant the permanent inferiority of the

"unfit" races; for others, it was compatible with the notion that, unlike animals or plants, human beings could acquire the prerequisites of social development, not just via religious conversion, but through learning European ways. Simple techniques (like how to work) might be acquired quickly; others (like how to govern themselves) might take generations. Either way, what to be learned was what had already been learned in Europe. (Worsley 1984,16-17)

It became the duty (or "burden") of the civilized nations to lift the backward natives from the thrall of darkness. Francis Jennings writes that "the civilized-uncivilized distinction is a moral sanction rather than any given combination of social traits susceptible to objective definition. It is a weapon of attack rather than a standard of measurement." (1975,8)

It is important to recognize the link between colonialism and the penchant colonialists everywhere had for "developing" their subjects. For the colonized people, this development had both a material and subjective connotation. "Colonialism must be seen as an experience, and not simply a structural relationship." (Puxley 1977,104) Peter Puxley quotes Paulo Freire:

"Every relationship of domination, of exploitation, of oppression, is by definition violent, whether or not the violence is expressed by drastic means. In such a relationship, dominator and dominated alike are reduced to things--the former dehumanized by an excess of power, the latter by lack of it. And things cannot love." (1977,103)

The association of development solely with economic relations objectifies human beings because they are seen as a means to an end and not the end in itself. Puxley attacks this perspective.

"Men develop themselves. They are not developed, or subject to

development by others. The word 'development' can only describe a process through which men develop." (1977,107) This process is internal, not external. "Just as development cannot occur where one idea dominates us and stands between us and a better understanding of reality, so development cannot occur when someone else's idea dominates us." (1977,108) Puxley argues this true development cannot take place within a colonial relationship.

Puxley maintains this state of relations existed in the Mackenzie Valley during the period of the Berger Inquiry in the mid-1970s. In his view, the colonial domination of the North was carried out by southern economic and bureaucratic interests. Puxley and Worsley agree that the dependence of colonized regions is not an accident. "Each colony was the product of a peculiar colonial equation in which the two sets of terms were never identical with those of any other colonial equation...." (Worsley 1984,11) These differences were social and cultural as well as economic and political.

A colonial relationship can be seen as degrading and dehumanizing, but does it lead naturally to underdevelopment? The answer to that question depends, of course, on how one defines underdevelopment. It has already been stated that the liberal economic interpretation of what was taking place in the decolonizing countries in the 1950s was based on a perceived dichotomy between "advanced" and "backward" nations. Underdeveloped was what these countries were before they became

like western nations, i.e., before the establishment of capitalist relations of production.

The emerging nations had only to "modernize" and their problems of underdevelopment would be solved. If they failed, it would be through some internal fault and not because the model they sought to emulate was unworkable. The importation of western technology and "know-how" would lead to increasing levels of wealth and self-sufficiency--and would permanently link these countries to world markets dominated by the same countries that were graciously providing the assistance. "For the materialists, it was technology that was needed, or capital; the only kinds of ideas that were relevant were scientific knowledge and technical know-how. For the idealists, it was modern values and modernizing attitudes." (Worsley 1984,18-19)

The modernizers divided world economies into modern and traditional. They envisioned a struggle in which the latter would ultimately give way to the former. Any failure by the new countries to survive this struggle was

a consequence of the deficiencies internal to the underdeveloped countries themselves, the heritage, not of colonial, but of their pre-colonial past: feudal rulers interested not only in maintaining their stake in archaic agrarian systems; cultural deficiencies, such as other-worldly religions or the irrational peculiarisms of tribal loyalties. It was not just a cognitive theory...the blame for underdevelopment was laid on the Third World itself. (Worsley 1984,19)

At the same time, the modernizers assumed development was "a non-contentious process" that did not involve "irreconcilable conflicts of interest between developed and underdeveloped

countries or between different social groups within the latter...." (Foster-Carter 1976,172) This worldview is not shared by either the dependentistas or Marxists who have examined the processes of underdevelopment.

Dependency Theory

The dependency school emerged in the 1960s as a critique of modernization approaches based on observations made in Latin America and other Third World regions. Andre Gundar Frank is perhaps the best-known and most controversial spokesman for this school. Frank states that underdevelopment is a direct product of capitalist development, the result of the internal contradictions of capitalism itself.

These contradictions are the expropriation of economic surplus from the many and its appropriation by the few, the polarization of the capitalist system into metropolitan centre and peripheral satellite, and the continuity of the fundamental structure of the capitalist system throughout the history of its expansion and transformation, due to the persistence or re-creation of these contradictions everywhere and at all times.
(Frank 1969,3)

In Marx's view, societies passed through various stages of economic development, one of which was capitalism. Frank, who was not a Marxist, disputed this view of progress. Rather, he felt the historic development of the capitalist system along with its internal contradictions "have generated underdevelopment in the peripheral satellites whose economic surplus was expropriated, while generating economic development in the metropolitan centres

which appropriate that surplus...." (Frank 1969,3) According to Frank, this process is continuing.

The centre-periphery metaphor has been used by social scientists since the 1920s. It was borrowed by the adherents of dependency theory to formulate their critique of modernization. Frank and his followers reject the notion that the poorer countries are to blame for their own state of underdevelopment (or as the modernizers would call it, "backwardness"). Frank argues that underdevelopment is "defined by incorporation into a world system in a subordinate position." (Brewer 1980,18)

As Frank sees it, the process of capitalist accumulation draws wealth from the periphery to the centre. The world is divided into a series of hinterland regions, each subordinate to a metropolis. These metropolitan centres were spread out over an area that was in reality a hinterland to an even more powerful metropolis. While the theory is useful as an illustration of subordinate economic relationships, its logic impels it to keep swallowing hinterlands until the entire planet is dominated by a single, all-powerful metropolis. In fact, Frank has been criticized for just this reason. Nevertheless, Frank's work is important because he was one of the first to make the link between capitalist relations of production and what he has called "the development of underdevelopment." Thus development is not a stage (as Rostow and the modernizers would argue) but a created condition. While this view distanced Frank from the

modernizers, it also precipitated a Marxist critique of his views.

Marx and Development

Marx considered capitalism to be "progressive" in that it represented a predictable stage of development on the way to communism. Just as capitalism developed from the socio-economic conditions that led to the demise of the previous stage of feudalism, so too it created the conditions necessary for its own downfall. There is no room in this paper to outline the adaptation of Marx by others, including Lenin and Luxemburg, and the development of theories of imperialism (see Blomstrom and Hettne 1984, Barone 1985, Brewer 1980) nor the permutations of "neo-Marxism" (see Foster-Carter 1978, 1976) which have attempted to apply Marx's ideas to existing situations. Suffice to say Marx was a precursor to the other "schools" of development thought which either reacted to his world view and tried to dismiss it, or accepted it and attempted to modify it. As well, since the Second World War neo-Marxists have used their forms of analysis to challenge the ideas of both the modernization and dependency schools. Marx's influence is being discussed at this point because it is the Marxist critique of Frank and the dependentistas which is most relevant to this study.

Marx did not use the term underdevelopment. Instead, he saw the transformation of feudal to capitalist economies as a process

of development.[1] The growth of capitalism in regions which had non-capitalist (or in Marx's terms, pre-capitalist) economies was part of a predictable historical process. In this Marx shared the optimism of the 19th Century that industry would be the liberator of humanity. (It is also important to note that Marx was not immune to the Euro-centric ordering of the universe common in his day. This problem has also plagued later Marxist theory.)

Marx's view of history is best outlined in his Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy:

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.
(Marx and Engels 1977,182)

A mode of production can be defined as encompassing

not only the resources and technology by which a people make their living, but also the social organization and ideological system which combine the factors of production (land, labour, resources, technology, and capital) into a functioning productive system. It is a means by which a people provide not only for their material needs--food, clothing and shelter--but also for their social and spiritual needs. (Usher 1982,418)

In short, the mode of production is not just what a society does, but how it does it, and why it does it.

1 An outline of this process is found in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels 1978. The German Ideology. (C.J. Arthur, ed.) pp. 42-48.

Marx has been criticized for over emphasizing the importance of economic factors on human development. There is no room to cover this debate in this work, but even conceding the point that economics is not the most important factor in the human equation, it still must be considered one of the most crucial. (Wood 1981)

Frank has been attacked for departing from the fundamentals of Marxism. Marx placed his emphasis on the relations of production and the ensuing tension between classes. This was an historical process, he said, which illuminates all stages of development. In Marx's view, the development of capitalist relations of production is simply the latest in a series of socio-economic formations, each a product of a specific historical period. Frank argues that the dominance of the world market system by capitalism has been going on since the 15th Century. In short, there have been developed and underdeveloped countries, with the former subordinating and exploiting the latter, since the outset of European expansionism. Since this time there has been only one mode of production--capitalism. (Blomstrom and Hettne 1984; Foster-Carter 1978)

It is this idea of a relatively stable world system based on dominance of the weaker nations by the stronger which goes against the traditional Marxist grain. This definition of capitalism has been criticized for being "so general that it lacks historical specificity and ignores the critical importance that productive and social relations play both in specifying

modes of production and in determining their rise and fall."

(Barone 1985,103) Since he ignores the relations of production in favour of a larger model of a working, exploitive market, Frank does not view capitalism as a mode of production--the product of a particular set of historical conditions--but as the mode of production to which all historical development has naturally led.

For Marx the key element in the development of capitalist relations of production was the emergence of an industrial labour force, the proletariat. In Frank's view wage labour is not important to capitalism, which is defined as production for exchange in the world market. (Brewer 1980,264) This constitutes a fundamental shift of position. Where Marx considered capitalism to be an engine of development, Frank states it creates both development and underdevelopment. In fact, "capitalist development requires its opposite, capitalist underdevelopment: you can't have one without the other." (Barone 1985,93) In Frank's conceptualization there is no room for different or competing modes of production, a position which limits his usefulness when discussing underdevelopment in the North. Nevertheless, many of those who have written about these problems--in both the North and the Third World--owe a philosophical debt to Frank.

The Modes of Production Synthesis

According to Frank's Marxist critics, underdevelopment could not simply be explained by a transfer of wealth to the metropolis from the periphery. It is also necessary to examine class relations in these regions. Different modes of production imply different class relations, not all of which can be explained by capitalism, and it is this distinction which is useful to keep in mind when examining the North.

A lengthy account of the Marxist reaction to the dependency school is outside the scope of this discussion. For our purposes, it is important merely to note that from this debate emerged an analysis that emphasizes the relationship between different modes of production. A number of French anthropologists developed the concept of the "articulation" of different modes. This refers to the coexistence of several modes of production "which, rather than being parallel, constitutes a structured, hierarchical whole, characterized by the domination of one mode of production over the others." (Blomstrom and Hettne 1984)

The mode of production analysis is an attempt to link Frank's centre-periphery metaphor with ethnographic data emerging from studies of the Third World. It emphasizes the primacy of relations of production over relations of exchange. The world capitalist system is not homogeneous, and capitalist relations of production do not exist exclusively. "Rather, it is conceived to be an economic system in which both capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production coexist and which is characterized by the

predominance of the capitalist mode of production." (Ruccio and Simon 1986,212)

The situation in underdeveloped countries can be more easily understood as a product of this "articulation", rather than by simply applying Frank's world capitalist model. Articulation has stages and is thus closer to Marx's historical perspective.

In the first stage, the capitalist mode of production is "imported" into the non-capitalist peripheral society and proceeds to reinforce and, in some instances, to create non-capitalist modes of production. Second, capitalism "takes root" and uses, from its dominant position, the non-capitalist mode of production. Finally, at some point not yet reached by most developing countries, the capitalist mode of production supplants all non-capitalist modes of production. Non-capitalism disappears. (Ruccio and Simon 1986,214)

In the next section, we will examine how these ideas have been used to attempt to explain conditions of underdevelopment in the Canadian North.

Underdevelopment Theory Applied to the Canadian North

In analyzing the nature of underdevelopment in the North it becomes apparent that some model of "articulation" might well apply. Frank's view of an all-encompassing capitalist system does not exactly fit either historical or contemporary evidence. Plainly, there are different modes of production at work in many areas, one "domestic", or non-industrial, and the other capitalist, or industrial. What is needed is a synthesis of viewpoints within the Marxist paradigm. This has been attempted with reasonable success by a number of writers [Usher (1982),

House (1980) and Watkins (1977)] and will be outlined below to explain the situation of the Innu of Labrador viz ~~a~~ viz the expanding military-industrial use of their homeland.

While the situation of the Innu is similar to conditions other Native groups confront, there is no single "model" of aboriginal underdevelopment. (Lithman 1982,13) However, for the purposes of analysis, a certain level of generalization about the domestic mode of production is necessary.

Peter Usher has produced a workable synthesis of the dependency and articulation approaches. He has attempted to examine the North as a dependent region while employing an analysis which assumes the coexistence of different modes of production.

Usher sees a "dual economy" existing in a not always harmonious relationship. One part of the duality is based on a hunting, trapping and fishing mode of production, while the other, the capitalist mode, relies on the absorption of Native people into the wage economy. (It is important to note that "dual" does not imply two separate economic systems; rather two modes of production operate within the same socio-economic environment.)

Usher calls the non-capitalist system the domestic mode of production, a term taken from Marshall Sahlins (1972). In the North in general, and Labrador in particular, discussion of a "traditional" mode of production presents more than semantic difficulties. What exactly is meant by traditional? Those modes

which existed among Native societies before contact with Europeans? Or is traditional to be considered post-contact, and if so, at what point was it defined? Rather than try to reply to these possibly unanswerable questions, it is better to abandon unwieldy terms like "traditional". Sahlins' "domestic" implies forms of production carried out by indigenous people in their own territory, and that is an appropriate definition for our purposes. In the Canadian North in general, domestic mode of production is used when discussing activities following contact, that is after Native societies came to participate in the European fur trade. Just what aboriginal economies should be called in the pre-contact era is a piece of intellectual archeology outside the scope of this paper.

However, it must be remembered that what we are dealing with is a way of life of a people, not simply a theoretical construction. The Innuit of Labrador-Quebec do not refer to their "domestic mode of production". Their way of life is simply their way of life. The fact that their system operates does not explain why it operates. The explanation can only be found "in the ideals, the beliefs and the feelings of those who have inherited the tradition which makes this life possible, and whose ideas and struggle enable them to live to reproduce and to alter the way of life, as a total system." (Tanner 1977, 116)

Nevertheless, the key to understanding the differences between the domestic and industrial modes of production lies in the distinction Marx made between production for use and

production for exchange. Commodities are produced under capitalism in order to be sold for the highest possible profit in order that more capital might be accumulated. In the domestic mode of production these relations do not apply.

The domestic system entertains limited economic goals, qualitatively defined in the terms of a way of living rather than quantitatively as an abstract wealth. Work is accordingly unintensive: intermittent and susceptible to all manner of interruption by cultural alternatives and impediments ranging from heavy ritual to light rainfall. Economics is only a part-time activity of the primitive societies, or else it is an activity of only part of the society.

Otherwise said, the domestic mode of production harbors an anti-surplus principle. (Sahlins 1972,86)

When Usher talks about a "dual economy", he is borrowing from Frank in a way the latter might dispute. Frank does not believe in dualities. "Evident inequalities of income and differences in culture have led many observers to see 'dual' societies and economies in the underdeveloped countries." This approach would lead to mistakes when it came time to make policies that would only exacerbate the problems of underdevelopment. Frank argued

that the expansion of the capitalist system over the past centuries effectively and entirely penetrated even the apparently most isolated sectors of the under-developed world. Therefore, the economic, political, social, and cultural institutions and relations we now observe there are the products of the historical development of the capitalist system no less than are the seemingly more modern or capitalist features of the national metropolises of these underdeveloped countries. (Frank 1970,6-7)

Economists have long debated the existence, role and importance of the dual economy. Frank is not the only one to deny its existence. Economists generally doubt the importance of the

domestic mode of production to the "real", i.e., cash-based, economy. Usher would agree with Joan Robinson, who has challenged this perspective:

Economists speculate about this so-called informal employment and debate the question whether it should be included in the statistics of national income. This is typical of economic analysis, which concerns itself with physical products, not with people. Informal business arises from the obstinant desire of human beings to remain alive. (Robinson 1979,6)

Usher has borrowed Frank's dominant metaphor. He sees the North as a series of hinterlands, each subordinate to a different southern metropolis. The Yukon is part of Vancouver's hinterland; the Mackenzie Valley is connected to Edmonton; the Keewatin is dependent on Winnipeg; and Baffin Island is the hinterland of Montreal. (Usher 1982,417-18) Using this framework, Labrador can be recognized as part of the hinterland of St. John's, Newfoundland.

Usher's dual northern economy is characterized by the dominance of one mode of production over the other.

The capitalist mode has been superimposed on the pre-existing mode, but the latter survives in a modified form. The two co-exist not as isolated, unconnected enclaves, but rather as inter-related parts of a larger social formation, that of industrial capitalism on the frontier. (1982,418)

Here Usher is not presenting a duality of the kind to which Frank objects, rather he is describing a system with two separate but connected economic branches--"articulated" modes of production. Capitalism is the more powerful element and thus dominates the relationship.

The domestic mode was originally based on subsistence hunting and an exchange of goods. Trade of items needed for daily use took place among many between northern Native groups, but this trade was not linked to capitalist relations of production. The European fur trade introduced mercantilistic ideas of commodity exchange and furs began to be taken in far greater numbers than would have been needed for domestic use. The result was a transformation of the Native economy, but one that still fit within the overall Native lifestyle. {2}

The same cannot be said for the importation of southern industrial capitalism in the latter half of the 20th Century. Usher says until recently the key element in northern relations was "not the sale of labour but the sale of commodities. Although the relations of exchange were determined by European capital, the ownership of the means of production remained in the hands of native people." (1982,420-21) Industrialization began to change things on an unprecedented scale.

The tendency of any mode of production is to strengthen, both practically and ideologically, the ties and obligations involved in the social relations of production. In the industrial mode, this means strengthening attachments and obligations between the owner and the employer, between the corporation and the community, and between the job and the individual. The industrial economy, especially in the North, requires a labour force that is footloose and individualistic. Northern development needs

2 Ron Bourgeault has examined the change of modes of production among the hunter-gatherer peoples of the Hudson Bay basin. Native labour was not organized for commodity production, at least of a kind the fur traders found useful. "It was, therefore, incumbent upon mercantilism to alter the relations of production in the Indian society." (1983,111-112)

people who are prepared to move from job to job and from place to place, sometimes frequently and on short notice. A premium is placed on mobility. Ties of family and friends and the desire for a stable community life are at odds with the needs of industrial development. (Usher 1982,419-20)

Michael Asch suggests the influence of an alien mode of production is changing fundamental social values. He says aboriginal economies were based on the principle of co-operation and sharing, both in small groups and among all people in a specific region. Such co-operation was necessary for survival. Wage labour is undermining these values by

acting as a subtle influence to change values away from mutual sharing and towards individualistic ones.... [I]t is concentrating wealth in the hands of those who are least capable or willing to use it in socially useful ways, while at the same time helping to undermine the respect for others who perform socially more valuable labour. (Asch 1977,57)

As we have already seen, the alienation of which Asch speaks is not an accident, just as conditions of underdevelopment are the products of human endeavour and not accidents of history.

How the North Was Underdeveloped

Northern history since contact began between Natives and Europeans is often divided into three phases covering the pre-fur trade, fur trade and industrialization eras. In this part of the paper we will use categories outlined by Usher which correspond to these historical periods, and later examine how they apply to Labrador.

Usher's first stage of development is the period of discovery and commercial penetration of the North. During this period,

despite influences from outside (such as missionary proselytizing and the spread of southern values) and the adoption of white technology and customs, Native people continued to engage in their domestic mode of production. (Usher 1982,427) Seasonal and unskilled wage labour fit easily into Native lifestyles. Native people were relatively independent and could still live much of their time on the land. At the same time, their economy became increasingly dependent upon the outside mercantile and, later, capitalist economy. Eventually choice and independence were eroded. "The creation of economic dependence was a deliberate policy...." (Usher 1982,428) This echoes Worsley's statements about underdevelopment being an unnatural condition.

The Canadian North became the focus of intense government activity in the 1950s. This was partly due to reported cases of starvation among the Inuit which got wide media coverage in the south. At this time, development was "imposed according to metropolitan perceptions and imperatives." (Usher 1982,430) This is the second stage of development, which Usher calls administrative colonialism.

The southern influx precipitated a massive assault on traditional cultures. In many places a nomadic lifestyle gave way to a sedentary, urbanized existence as the government set up schools, health care facilities and welfare. The introduction of welfare accelerated the disintegration of traditional values systems,

created the individualization of poverty and helped relieve the community of the traditional responsibility

to help one another. This then led to the undermining of the values of collective responsibility which are part of the reciprocal economy and subtly led to the forced acceptance of the value of individual responsibility which is characteristic of our economy. (Asch 1977,56)

This change of consciousness, as Marx would have called it, is the product of the change in the material conditions of life. The road was then cleared for the introduction of Usher's third stage, dominated by the capitalist mode of production. This particular set of conditions could not have been introduced without the active participation of the federal government during the second stage. From John Diefenbaker's "Roads to Resources" of the 1950s to the Liberal National Energy Policy of 1980, successive federal governments have played key roles in influencing the change from the domestic to industrial mode of production.

The growth of government employment and spending in the North now proceeds on the assumption of steady and immanent progress toward the industrialization of the region's economy [and] the widespread establishment of capitalist relations of production. (Usher 1982,436)

Perhaps in an effort to ameliorate the impact of the industrial mode of production, governments have offered Native employment, which can also be seen as a way to "develop" aboriginal populations. However Native people do not have much say over the terms of their employment and training. They are in a position which, for the most part, allows only a reaction to industrial development. They do not make the important decisions. With industrial development has come an increase in

administrative colonialism, which in turn acts to reinforce Native feelings of powerlessness. (Paine 1977; Brody 1975)

A colonial analysis has also been used in the Western Arctic and sub-Arctic. Mel Watkins has referred to the Dene Nation as an internal colony, and has used Harold Innis's "staples thesis" to explain the existence of underdevelopment in the Mackenzie Valley. In the staples thesis export commodities such as fish, fur, timber, wheat, pulp, paper, minerals, and now oil and gas move from the hinterland to the metropolis. "The history of Canada...is as a succession of staple exports from successive geographic frontiers to serve the needs of more advanced industrial areas." (Watkins 1977,85) In this economic relationship the benefits flow out of the region in which the commodities are produced. Economic value is added during further stages of production and, in the case of raw resources, these activities invariably take place in the south. Watkins argues this form of development suits the needs of capital, but not the Dene. In this, his critique resembles that of Frank.

Watkins has portrayed the Dene as rapidly falling victim to the marginalization that has destroyed other Native societies. He quotes anthropologist Peter Douglas Elias: "'an examination of the history of Native, white contact reveals the process that culminated in the total integration of Native peoples into contemporary Canadian society as permanent members of the underclass.'" (Watkins 1977,93)

The creation of an aboriginal underclass is a side effect of industrialization in the North. The articulation of the domestic and capitalist modes of production tends to produce this Native underclass (although it may not be exclusively Native). Both modes may be operating, but capitalism dominates. In the capitalist mode, Native people must compete with non-Natives for employment. The latter are usually better trained and thus get the few available industrial jobs. Native people are often victims of racial discrimination which also limits their chances of participating equally in the capitalist mode of production. Native resistance to being permanently consigned to the underclass as the clearers of bush or collectors of garbage creates a tension between the two modes of production. In few regions is the tension greater than in Labrador.

Underdevelopment in Labrador

The three stages of development outlined by Usher can be applied across the North as a means of describing socio-economic change. Here they are treated schematically and their application will be developed in succeeding chapters. Before the construction of the Goose Bay air base during the Second World War, the central Labrador economy was based almost exclusively on the domestic mode of production. It was a lifestyle shared by Innut, Inuit and a white Settler population. (While a few settlers and Inuit did occasional wage work for the fur trading companies and missions, the income from this employment

supplemented what was earned by trapping and did not represent a general change in the mode of production.)

Construction of the base in 1942 heralded the creation of a new, capitalist mode of production in Labrador. It brought with it a chance to work full-time for wages, an opportunity many settlers, some Inuit and only a few Innuit accepted. Elizabeth Goudie, a descendant of a mixed Inuit-Settler union and the mother of a large family in the 1940s, wrote about what the introduction of wage labour meant to many people:

Everyone was so happy. There was going to be work for our men. We were going to have a chance to earn a steady income.

Jim worked all winter that year." (Goudie 1983,131)

Goudie's account is interesting because it documents a time of transition from one mode of production to another. Many people were happy to have wage employment because they could no longer make a living as simple commodity producers. Trapping had become a precarious existence due to changes in world market prices for fur which occurred for reasons Labrador trappers could hardly comprehend. In turning away from trapping, the settlers (and Inuit) substituted one form of dependence for another.

Among the different structures of commodity production Clement (1981) identified a dependent form which exists when market relations are bypassed and a direct producer is "compelled" into a contract or monopoly relation with capitalism. In this relationship the latter appropriates the economic ownership while the former retains formal ownership and possession of the means of production. Labour is performed by

individuals or family units but control at this level is nominal. Although there is co-ordination of activity and a certain amount of unity between the many producers, they are engaged in a form of social labour organized by capital. This formation illustrates that the dependence on capital of simple commodity producers in Labrador--Native and Settler--existed even before an "official" change in the mode of production. "The post-contact society has a mode of production distinct from aboriginal society due to technological innovations and trade acquisitions, but it is a mode of production that is also distinct from that of dominant society." (Tanner 1979,66)

Trappers lived almost constantly in debt to the Hudson's Bay Company, a situation which Goudie says often created hardship and almost always meant a penurious existence. Once drawn into a wage economy the trappers were no longer in thrall to the Company. However, they quickly became dependent on wage employment for their livelihoods (although many continued to hunt and trap part-time) and thus tied their well-being to the health of the new industrial economy. When the boom-bust cycle hit a low point, as it was to do over several times over the next few decades, the fortunes of the new Labrador proletariat declined with it.

J.D. House has identified three stages of development in the Labrador economy, and his model closely resembles that of Usher. He calls the stages subsistence, commercial, and industrial. House has written that the dominant characteristic of the Labrador economy up to the construction of the military base was

"its transformation by and partial incorporation into a world-wide commercial capitalist system. While suffering from various forms of exploitation and cultural degradation, the native peoples of Labrador were able to accommodate fairly well to that change." (House 1980,98) That is because aboriginal people and settlers lived as independent commodity producers employed in the domestic mode of production.

The base opened the door to other kinds of industrial development. Besides military personnel, it drew other outsiders to Labrador. In nearby Happy Valley-Goose Bay businesses of all sorts developed and wage labour and fixed working hours replaced the domestic mode of production and seasonal work as the dominant economic formation in the region. Nevertheless, production for use continued. A dual economy developed in Labrador which, as we have seen elsewhere, was dominated by the capitalist mode of production.

As in the Arctic, the reach of the industrial mode of production grew quickly in Labrador to encompass mining and other resource-based operations, hydroelectric development, and offshore oil and gas exploration. With the rapid development of this mode has come what House calls the moral imperative of incorporation. "Incorporation is the process whereby the local population is incorporated into, made a part of, the social institutions that characterize the dominant society. Throughout most of Labrador's recorded history, incorporation largely took on a religious form." (House 1980,100) Since Confederation in

1949, incorporation in Labrador has been state-sponsored. Hugh Brody has examined a similar process at work in the eastern Arctic:

There has been a continuity in the nature of the changes the Eskimos have undergone, a continuity best explained in terms of incorporation: whereas missionaries and traders desired moral and economic incorporation, the newer institutions aim at incorporation that is broadly ideological (through education), national (through law and medicine), and finally political (through local government). (Brody 1975, 31-32)

In all regions of the North, this form of incorporation is connected to the development of an industrial economy. The necessary centralization of industrial authority leads to sharp disparities in wealth between metropolis and hinterland. (House 1980, 100) The state becomes an agent of wealth redistribution in order to reduce these disparities. In Labrador, as in other parts of the North, this meant the establishment of schools, health services, and the expansion of government. While helping to improve the general standard of living, incorporation has also meant the Innu, Inuit and settlers have had to abandon their old lifestyles. Change has created some familiar problems.

Economic and social programs succeeded most in the past when the aim was to establish a self-sufficient regional economy through sustained use of the local resource base. But as programs were directed more to integrating northern Labrador socially and economically with the rest of the province, the region lost its self-sufficiency and people's dependence on outside goods and assistance increased. The change in approach is well-illustrated by the development of fish plants, which began with large community freezers intended to store fish and game for resale to local residents and concluded with blast freezers preparing all the fish produced on the coast of export from the region. People cannot

purchase char, salmon, cod, turbot, scallops or any other species found locally, at the retail store in their community but they can buy Highliner cod sticks, frozen scallops from Nova Scotia, Canadian salmon from British Columbia, and canned seal from Newfoundland. (Brice-Bennett 1986,64)

The increasing reliance on outside goods and services has been at the expense of local individual and social needs. Once again, we see the development of underdevelopment in a northern context.

Not only does the economy of the coast lack an internal dynamic of development, but its resources are being exploited, or are about to be exploited, by and for outside interests. Furthermore, every one of its major institutions is tied in a dependent and subordinate fashion to the metropolitan centres of St. John's and Ottawa. (House 1980,102)

Echoing Frank, the result is "structural underdevelopment. Each of the major institutions of the local hinterland society is controlled by outside agencies through their local outsider representatives." (House 1980,106)

The Innut and their supporters view the low-level flying at Goose Bay and the proposal to build a NATO training centre as the latest manifestations of outside control. Those fighting the proposal are not doing so simply because they do not like military activity in Labrador--although that is certainly a part of the argument--but they also see that to have real development, they must have more control over what happens in their region.

From the foregoing discussion it is possible to draw a number of conclusions. First and most important, underdevelopment, whether in the Third World or the Canadian North, has not occurred by accident. It has been created by

particular sets of historical and material circumstances. Common to all of these situations is the dominance of the domestic mode of production by an imported capitalist mode of production.'

Ideas about how to "develop" peoples or societies have changed. The early post-Second World War years were dominated by the notion that development meant "modernization", a situation where the newer nations would have to imitate the capitalist countries in order to progress, and that meant importing capitalist relations of production. In the North, this development came in the form of southern ideas about what constituted worthwhile economic activity and how people should live.

The idea that modernization equals progress was criticized by Frank and the dependency school who saw that rather than developing economies, capitalism created underdevelopment through a process of increasing marginalization of hinterlands by a succession of metropolises. Marxists and neo-Marxists in turn have criticized this perspective for seeing world history since the 1500s as the product of capitalist domination and for ignoring the complexities of historical class relations.

Some of these critics have drawn upon the Marxian notion of modes of production and attempted to show how two apparently contradictory modes (the domestic and the capitalist) could coexist. Called "articulation", this idea has been used by a number of writers to analyze the development of underdevelopment in the Canadian North. These analyses point to the coexistence of

a domestic and industrial mode of production in the region today. The terms of this coexistence are defined by capitalism, which dominates the relationship.

Finally, this chapter also began to explain how this dual economy developed in Labrador, and the effect it had and continues to have on the people who live there. The rest of this work will describe in more detail the change in the lifestyle of the Innut of Labrador, and examine how their society has reacted to the increasing encroachment of outside modes of production. This discussion begins in the following chapter, which will briefly outline conditions of life for the Innut of Sheshatshiu today.

Chapter II

The Innut of Sheshatshiu

The hunting societies of the world have been sentenced to death. They have been condemned, not in any one verdict, but by a process, an accumulation, of judgments.... Would be civilizers concluded that hunters never had, or had lost, the means to achieve a decent way of life; should welcome the benefits of trade, wage employment, and proper religion; should allow their lands to be differently used; and must accept whatever changes are brought to them, however the changes are brought. That is the death sentence.

Hugh Brody
Maps and Dreams

This chapter briefly describes the community of Sheshatshiu and shows that despite the dominance of the industrial capitalism in Labrador, the domestic mode of production remains vital to the lives of the region's Innut. The Innut view of land "ownership" and the relationship between the land, animals and hunters is also covered. Included in this chapter is a short description of a government program being used to enable the people to return to the country for part of the year in order to participate in the domestic mode of production. This program is one of the few government efforts that can be seen as reinforcing "traditional" activities. Existence in the community of Sheshatshiu is contrasted with what is, to most Innut, a more desirable life in the country. Finally, this chapter touches on adaptation to wage work and illustrates that when the Innut participate in the industrial mode of production, they find themselves relegated to the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchy.

Sheshatshiu is a community of 700 Innut at the end of an inland sea known as Lake Melville, about 30 kilometres from the town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay in Labrador. A large modern bridge spans the channel that separates it from the more prosperous Settler village of Northwest River. Almost all local amenities--stores, hospital, post office--are on the settler side.

Standing on the bridge between Northwest River and Sheshatshiu, one looks west up Grand Lake to the interior. To the east is the vast expanse of Lake Melville and, in the distance, the Mealy Mountains, an important Innut hunting area. The Innut refer to this entire region as "Nitassinan".

During the fur trade era Indian "bands" became associated with particular trading posts. While some Native people have used such European terms to identify themselves, the real situation was much more complex. Groups of Innut were linked to one another by ties of marriage, adoption and migration and bands were not static units. Trappers and their families would also change the posts at which they traded, depending on the source of game and other factors. Adrian Tanner (1977) says there are four main subdivisions of people around Northwest River, each associated with a herd of caribou, the most important animal hunted by the Innut, and two linguists have identified six "folk groupings" in the community based on language. (MacKenzie and Clarke 1983)

One Sheshatshiu informant explained the community's population could be broken into three groups based upon where people hunted, although any one person might operate in several

different areas during his or her lifetime. There are the Meshuanunut from the nearby Mealy Mountain area; the Uashaunut/Mekentsheut from Lake Michikamau in the interior; and the Mushuanunut, the barren ground or Davis Inlet Innut from the northern coastal area. Common to all Innut, whether they be from Labrador or Quebec, is a strong connection and identification with Nitassinan.

All Sheshatshiu residents speak Inueimun as their first language, with virtually everyone over the age of 40 being monolingual. The degree to which younger people speak English or French depends on the individual, but a large number of those in their 30s do not consider themselves proficient in a second language. (MacKenzie and Clarke 1983)

Sheshatshiu itself is composed mostly of small houses, many badly in need of repair. Roads are unpaved and rough. The "heart" of the community is a small white clapboard Catholic Church with its cemetery of simple white crosses. Nearby are the band council and provincial social services offices. A road runs a couple of kilometres along the lakeshore leading to a row of new houses constructed by the band in the last couple of years.

There is only one small, privately-run store in Sheshatshiu. Owned and operated by a Settler family, the Innut complain about its limited stock and high prices. The people of Sheshatshiu still depend on "country food"--caribou and other animals, wildfowl, fish--for part of their diet. Many older people say they "aren't used to buying groceries in the store. They are used

to eating wildlife." (Monica Nui, interview, Aug. 6, 1987) Poor health and a general physical weakness is attributed to the unhealthy store-bought foods.

Throughout the North, increased contact with European culture has led to a "modernization" of aboriginal diet. (Cole 1988) For the Innut this process began with the fur trade when flour, tea and other items were used by families in the country. Today many Innut cross the bridge to the Northwest River Hudson's Bay grocery store or shop in Happy Valley. No matter where they buy, food prices are uniformly high.

On warm August afternoons the beach at Sheshatshiu is populated by dozens of young children, some clad only in diapers. Fifty-one per cent of the community's population is under 18 years of age; 21 per cent is under five. Three-quarters of the population of Sheshatshiu is under age 30; only five per cent is older than 50.[1] For the Innut this means there are few elders who remember a time before the advent of the wage economy in their region.

Pien Selma is 80 years old. His face is deeply lined and his hands are gnarled from years of labour. He remembers when the only Euro-Canadians in Nitassinan were either traders or Settlers who lived much the same kind of life as the Innut.

The government didn't give us any assistance. People went without food for long periods. You had to worry about matches and salt. You'd run out of things like flour, sugar, bread. Sometimes when they hunted

1 Population and housing statistics were compiled by Lyla Andrew in 1987 for a study of the Sheshatshiu group home.

they didn't eat in the morning. They would go until night without any food. Sometimes we were hungry.

In those days life was hard... Sometimes we had 10 bags of flour in the country and it had to last for a year. People sometimes stayed in the country all year round and came back [to Sheshatshiu] in the summer when they were out of supplies. Sometimes a hunter would have bad luck and not get anything. On a lucky day he would bring home a lot of wildlife.

In those days people had to depend on their feet. Canoes were portaged by foot. People would come to rivers and have to haul gear until they found a place to cross.... (Pien Selma, interview, Aug. 12, 1987)

Pien said he has a bump on his back from carrying canoes and supplies. His hands, thick with callouses, were often painful following a long day of paddling. These are the physical effects of a style of life followed by the Innut for thousands of years. As another man put it: "We depended on our legs and strength, not technology." (Pien Penashue, interview, Aug. 3, 1987)

Pien Selma used to hunt in the territory around Sept-Iles and often visited his father in Sheshatshiu. The Innut of the time lived in conical tents of caribou skin, a construction material that gave way to canvas acquired from Euro-Canadian traders. "In those days there were no houses in Sheshatshiu--only tents on the beach. People would land their canoes on the beach. From there they would go to Lake Michikamau by foot. In winter they hauled their canoes there by sled [a distance of nearly 200 kilometres]." {2}

2 Until the 1950s, Sheshatshiu (or Northwest River) was the site of a trading post visited by the nomadic Innut a couple of times a year. The development of the post and the settler and Innut communities will be taken up in later chapters.

The interior of the Labrador-Quebec peninsula is criss-crossed by travel routes. In the summer, the Innut used rivers--the Kenamu, Kenemish, Hamilton (Churchill), Naskaupi, Mulligan--and lakes Michikamau, Grand, Little and Melville. (Mailhot et Michaud 1965,2) In winter, they travelled by snowshoe and pulled sleds loaded with equipment, tents, game and people. There were major routes known to all and minor routes, about which information was communicated orally. The average family journey was 320 to 400 kilometres. (Mailhot et Michaud 1965,15) The Innut language has a vocabulary and structure which allow accurate description of landforms and points of reference in the country. (Tanner 1977) One 89-year-old man in Sheshatshiu said his family used to travel hundreds of kilometres overland between Fort Chimo (now Kuujjuaq) on the Koksoak River near Ungava Bay, and Sept-Iles on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. (Luke Nui, interview, Aug. 6, 1987)

Monica Nui says life was hard for her parents:

Everything they needed they had to make for themselves. My father would say up all night tending the fire in the tent to keep the family warm. Then the next day he would go out hunting. If he ran out of shells for his gun, he used a bow and arrow. You don't see anyone doing that now. Guns are easier to get. Now kids play with bows and arrows and use them to shoot partridge or other small game. (Monica Nui, interview, Aug. 6, 1987)

Although the fur trade changed Innut hunting patterns, {3} and the introduction of wage labour made further alterations, the

3 For a sample of the considerable anthropological debate on this issue, see Speck (1935), Leacock (1954), Tanner (1969).

Innut have retained much of their "traditional" culture. Hunting and trapping remain central to their self-perception as a people, and many Innut continue to live much of the year in the country. The Innut consider their "claim" to the land to be undisputable. They have always used it, and they continue to use it. As Pien Gregoire states,

"In the old days people hunted and trapped in an area year after year. By living off the land on a yearly basis, they regarded that area as theirs. These hunting and trapping grounds they passed on to their children, who continue to carry on the traditional way of living. This system continues to the present day." (Tanner 1977,122)

While certain families trapped in specific areas, the reader must be careful not to confuse this system with private ownership.

"Where I now hunt other generations have always been there before--my parents and my grandparents have always been in this region. Within our own system, the land is legally mine by virtue of my parents and grandparents having occupied, hunted and trapped the land in question. I know the rivers, the lakes and the portages by their Indian names. I would never turn away Indians, because they are my own people. Indians have no need to ask because all the land belongs to them." (Tanner 1977,123)

At one time the Innut hunted caribou in large communal groups. This was the main pre-contact socio-economic formation and it was altered by the fur trade and the disappearance of caribou at different times in different parts of Nitassinan.

Mailhot and Michaud wrote about the Innut of Sheshatshiu:

Vers les années 1940, aucune des formes traditionnelles de grande chasse collective au caribou ne subsistait. Elles devaient avoir disparu vingt ou trente ans auparavant. Il est certain que certaines de ces anciennes techniques aient été pratiquées par le père d'un informateur vers 1900 et par un vieil Indien vivant encore à Northwest River, avant son mariage en

1910. Il semble qu'elles aient toujours été pratiquées beaucoup au nord que le lac Melville, dans les régions d'arbres très clairsemés qui permettait des mouvements d'énormes troupes. (1965,31)

Henriksen (1973) says the acquisition of high-powered rifles reduced the need for the Naskapi Innu to hunt in large groups because success no longer required the ambush of great numbers of the animals at once.

Although they provided not only meat and life, but material for Innu tools, weapons and clothing, caribou were not simply a commodity. These animals played a key role in the society's social and spiritual value system. (Tanner 1977; Henriksen 1973) Harvesting caribou and other animals was, and still is, a religious activity. The religious ideology of eastern subarctic peoples has been examined in detail by Tanner (1979) and need not be elaborated here. But in order to even begin to understand the question of why the land is so important to the Innu, one must try to comprehend the link between the necessity of hunting and its effect on the well-being of both the individual hunter and the society as a whole.

The Innu have retained a larger measure of their traditional beliefs in spiritual beings such as the animal masters despite hundreds of years of contact with Christianity. They see no contradiction between belief in God and Jesus Christ on the one hand, and animal masters, and forest spirits on the other. God is responsible for overseeing the activities of human beings, people of all races, while the animal masters, for their part, oversee the activities of the animals.

The Innu believe that both their spiritual and material well-being is dependent upon the important relationships maintained between them and the animal masters. Each animal species has a spirit, or animal master, of which Papakasiuku, the master of the caribou, is the most powerful.... (Armitage 1984,50)

The hunter has a reciprocal relationship with the animal masters: they provide animals for him to kill and thus sustain Innut society; in return, the hunters must follow certain rules and show respect to the animal masters. This includes placing animal bones on outdoor scaffolds or in trees (or returning the bones of aquatic animals to the water), not allowing dogs to chew bones of animals killed in the hunt, placing animal fat in the fire, and wearing decorated clothing while hunting.

It is important to treat the bones and other remains with great respect, the Innut believe, because the animal masters need them to regenerate new animals. Respect must also be shown by making sure that no animal species is overharvested, that no animal flesh is wasted, and that bush food is shared with other people. (Armitage 1984,51)

A hunter must obey the laws that govern his world in order to be successful. As his success grows, so do his powers to communicate with the spirits that govern the world around him.

"An Indian sometimes dreams. This is why he sings. The old men usually play the drum and sing at the same time, after having had a dream. The dream tells him of something important, and he tells about it while he is singing. A person dreams while sleeping and remembers it and tells about it by singing. He can understand the dream, and the message gives him the direction to take in hunting--what to do and where to go. I suspect that even white men have dreams like old Indians." (Tanner 1977,130)

The quotation above by Pien Penashue is significant because it indicates that the power to dream and learn the whereabouts of animals is the provenance of older men, the most experienced hunters. In the last few years deaths among the elders of Sheshatshiu have deprived the community of not only the people with the most knowledge about the practical day-to-day skills

needed to live on the land, but also those who possessed the valuable ability to "see" the way through the country. More than one informant mentioned the fear that the younger generation, which has limited experience in the country, will never be able to learn these skills. If this happens a vital part of Innut culture will have been lost.

As young men, many of the current elders of Sheshatshiu worked for the Hudson's Bay Company as simple commodity producers. They trapped beaver, fox, lynx, marten and other animals and traded them to the Company for money to buy food, traps, rifles, tents, and other supplies needed to live in the country. Camps were moved every week or so as people searched for game. Fur prices were low and trappers were paid very little. (Pien Penashue, interview, Aug. 3, 1987)

Many Innut continue to hunt and trap for trade, although fur prices have been poor in recent years. But they no longer have only to compete with Settlers for prime trapping country, as was the case before the advent of industry in their region. Nowadays, the land, how it is used, and who shall use it is the focus of often bitter debate. There are many competing interests: the Innut, Settlers, new residents or "Come From Aways", the provincial and federal governments, and the military.

To European and to most Canadian eyes, the bush is essentially a part of nature, meaning that it is something beyond their present control. To the Indian hunter and trapper the bush is something familiar, his home and his workplace. Names of places, traditions and stories are associated with all parts of the land. The land is looked after, the resources conserved, and the accumulated knowledge about how to successfully use

it is passed on to later generations... There is no frontier, and, there is no wilderness. (Tanner 1977,116-117)

There are two cultural groups in southern Labrador, one aboriginal, the other Euro-Canadian. When the latter asks the former what it wants, the question is inevitably the product of a particular set of values. The assumption is made that the future of Labrador is to be defined in terms of the currently dominant mode of production, industrial capitalism. The Innut are told that the only way to survive and develop themselves is to participate in the wage economy. When the Innut reply that they wish to control what happens in their land and choose their own lifestyle--be it living off the land or working for wages or both--they are denounced as unrealistic or obstructionist. Lately, those denunciations have been made in increasingly racist terms. (Armitage and Kennedy, 1987) Little or no attempt is made to understand the importance of the land and hunting to the Innut, or to understand their crucial link to the Innut value system.

Unlike the settlers, the Indians do not care to leave their families behind when they go hunting. The Indians do not care to concentrate all their effort on trapping, or to trap only the species which happen to be fetching the highest prices. This is because what they value about the life in the bush is not the cash return, but the living in the bush itself, and the enjoying of non-cash returns of a whole variety of bush products. Thus we cannot evaluate the Indian land use pattern unless we see it as part of a value system. (Tanner 1977,116)

The relationship between the Innut and animals is one that has been widely commented upon by anthropologists during the last

50 years.{4} Since the Innut of Sheshatshiu began moving into houses in the late 1950s, there has been considerable modification of their lifestyle. Where once the entire population lived year-round in the country and came out only to trade at Christmas and in the summer, now a large portion of the population lives for much of the year in the community. It is a difficult existence for many people, young and old.

Most of the older hunters and their wives spend as much time as possible in the country. They go out in the early fall and return to the community for Christmas, then go back to the country until spring. During this time they hunt caribou and trap fur. At one time Innut trappers, like their Settler counterparts, received credit from the Hudson's Bay Company which they used to outfit themselves. This gave the Company considerable control over the hunter's activities since credit could be withheld from those who were deemed "inefficient".

Today the Innut acquire their supplies in a different way, but control over how they do it is still exercised by a "foreign" agency. The provincial social services department advances credit to the Innut at one of the regional stores. To qualify for this credit, a person who is going to the country must register with the band. The Innut buy their supplies and anything leftover in their accounts goes back to the government. This system provides only enough money for three months in the country, periods which correspond with the fall and spring hunts. Transportation is

4 For summaries, see Harper (1964) and Preston (1975).

provided by small aircraft contracted by the band. The flights are funded through the federal government's Outpost Program (although the money is dispensed by the province).

Through this program 350 people went to the country during 1986-87. (This does not include any who made the journey without assistance.) According to the program administrator, a band member, there are usually between 150 and 180 people in the country at any one time. In spring 1987, the number was 230, or about one-third of the community's population. The number of people going to the country is increasing annually, although records have only recently been kept. (Charlie Andrew, interview, Aug. 18, 1987) Even those who do not go regularly to the country can benefit from the hunting others do, either by being given food or simply feeling an emotional connection to the land through those who have recently been there.

While some older hunters say the system run by social services has made life much easier for the Innut, others resent the control the government exercises over how long they can stay in the country. Nevertheless, some older hunters spend as much as 10 months of the year away from the community. Despite the fact that provincial policy makes no distinction between aboriginal and non-aboriginal peoples, local social service officials say they are able to provide a service unique to the Innut at the village level. (Gillian Mullins, interview, Aug. 10, 1987)

In the country skills are passed on by the elders to the younger generation. As one middle-aged woman explained, it has always been that way:

For me, I like to go to the country because that's what I was taught. The people who taught me are all dead but I still remember what they taught me and I continue the tradition. (Anne-Marie Penashue, interview, Aug. 11, 1987)

Matthew Penashue was taught to hunt by his father. Until he could survive on his own he travelled through the country and worked with his father. Now he is passing on the skills he learned to his grandson. "I don't want to give up my hunting. I will not give up my hunting as long as my legs will take me to the country." (Interview, Aug. 11, 1987)

The older generation is unanimous in its scathing commentary on the quality of life in the community, and its effects on the younger generation. They maintain the greatest evil is inactivity and purposelessness, which almost inevitably lead to alcohol abuse. In the country, they say, there is no drinking and people are happier. The young take their rightful place in society and learn from their elders.

Life in the country is better than in the community because you can do more than drink. You can hunt, trap, fish, make snowshoes. A tent is more comfortable than a house. In the country young children learn to set traps near the tent. The older people try to teach the young how to do things in the country. They keep them busy. In the community, children get lazy. (Monica Nui, interview, Aug. 6, 1987)

The destructive effects of compulsory schooling on Innu culture will be discussed in a later chapter. Many older (and some younger) people blame the education system for both the

large portion of the younger generation which lacks the skills to survive in the country, as well as the education necessary to "make it" in the Euro-Canadian economy.

Right now, those who finish Grade 12 have no luck finding work. I think the Innut young people who are trying to finish will have no jobs. But if they go to university they will have a better chance at jobs. But the kids who aren't learning their culture will have no success.... (Sylvester Andrew, interview, Aug. 14, 1987)

Many younger people (including some in their early 30s) feel trapped between two worlds. Only about a half-dozen Innut have gone "out" to university and so far no one has finished with a degree. Paul Rich is 20 years old and has been studying at the University of Regina. His time at university makes him different from most of his peers, but with them he shares a common lack of experience in the country. It had been eight or nine years since he was in the country when he went out for a short period in 1986.

I loved the country. It was really great. Really free. You can do anything you want--hunting, fishing. There is no pressure from other people to distract you.

Not many people my age go to the country. They are more involved in community things like recreation and school. Some stay back to have fun and go drinking. There isn't much in the way of entertainment here. Some sports but they are not very well organized. Mostly there is nothing for young people to do, except drink.

The young are more interested in making money than going to the country. Most who go out just go because their families are going. If they stay in the community they just blow their money on junk or booze. (Paul Rich, interview, Aug. 21, 1987)

In many ways, the older hunters have been most able to adapt to new economic and social conditions imposed on the Innut by outside agencies. The construction of the airbase at Goose Bay

marked the ascendancy of the industrial mode of production in Labrador, but it did not mean the annihilation of the existing domestic mode. Instead, many hunters adapted their lives to wage work and used it to supplement their trapping incomes. In the 1940s most of the Innut men did some form of manual work for wages with the military. Some worked in construction gangs at Goose Bay. Others cleared the land for a U.S. army base at Northwest Point, near Sheshatshiu. For years several older hunters worked for the provincial forestry department during the summer fighting fires or doing odd jobs. Still others did things like work for the local priest or tend the Northwest River hospital garden. Some men also built houses in Sheshatshiu and in Innut communities on the north shore of the St. Lawrence River.

Since the base was built, the alternative to subsistence hunting and trapping has been participation in the wage economy. However, it has not been a regular source of employment for the Innut, nor have other industrial projects in the region.

Labrador is a depressed region which had an "official" unemployment rate of 22 per cent in 1986. (LeBreton 1986,1) However, measuring the unemployment rate in Sheshatshiu is a difficult exercise constricted by ethnocentric assumptions. Certainly there are very few permanent full-time jobs in the community (the largest employers are the band council and the Department of Social Services). Many who would regard themselves as hunters would not be viewed by government agencies as

"employed" because hunting is not counted as an occupation.{5} As the Naskapi Montagnais Innu Association stated in a brief to the 1985 Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment:

"The assumption is made that we are a totally unskilled, useless race of people who don't work, who aren't able to work and even if we were given jobs we would choose not to work." (Brice-Bennett 1986,108)

The main source of wage income for the Innut of Sheshatshiu come from temporary job creation programs run by the Department of Social Services. Using a system common to many Newfoundland communities, short-term, unskilled work--fighting fires, clearing brush, picking up garbage--lasts just long enough to allow the Innut to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits. A lack of work-related skills, as well as a chance to acquire them, consigns most Innut to repetitive cycles of temporary labour. Some hunters make use of this system and work in the summer or when they are not in the country in order to be able to afford to pay for supplies and equipment. However, for many young people who lack country skills, it is a dismal and demeaning existence.

Racial discrimination is another reason cited for lack of Innut (and Inuit) participation in the local economy.

Inuit and Innu believe that potential employers are dissuaded from hiring them by an assumption that all native people drink alcohol to excess and are prone to violent social or criminal behavior. To a large extent the assumption is self-serving because it justifies opportunities being given to non-native

5 "The concept of unemployment is related to the work ethic in industrial societies and does not apply to the customary activities composing work in the hunting culture of Inuit and Innu." (Brice-Bennett 1986,108) This observation echoes Robinson (1979) in Chapter I.

candidates before any native person is considered for employment. Native people are acutely aware of the fact that their services are usually sought only when hard or dirty labour work is involved and that they rarely have a chance to prove their abilities and skills. (Brice-Bennett 1986,120)

Today the Innut exist on the fringe of Euro-Canadian society. Around them they see the relative prosperity of the Settlers and other newcomers. There is widespread resentment in the community towards "government" and its agents. It is impossible to ignore either the desire of the Innut to be treated justly and fairly, or their demand for an amelioration of existing inequities that have contributed to a cycle of welfare dependence and poverty. Plans by the Canadian government to lure a large NATO training centre to Labrador, and announcements that low-level flying activities will increase despite aboriginal (and other) protests, have made the Innut even more determined to fight for control over their land.

If the military and the government win the fight, the Innut argue, their culture is doomed. They will no longer be able to use their land. Life in the country will become impossible. The jets will drive away the wildlife on which they depend, and the people will be relegated to a permanent life in the community, a life with no purpose and no hope. Like other indigenous peoples around the world, the Innut argue they will become victims of cultural genocide.

To conclude, it has been shown that it is the elder members of Sheshatshiu society who possess the greatest store of indigenous knowledge about hunting and life in the country in

general. The older people are the ones who can "see" their way through the country and, in order to ensure cultural continuity, they must be able to open the eyes of the younger generation, which now forms by far the largest proportion of the population. This need is aided to a limited extent by the federally sponsored Outpost Program, which helps a portion of the community return to the country in the spring and autumn.

However, the struggle for cultural survival is taking place in the face of enormous obstacles. Among these is the institutional framework in which Innut society is now required to function. The manner in which this framework affects people's lives is apparent even in the means many use to return to the country--credit controlled by the local office of the Department of Social Services. This is not to say that the Innut must use social services credit in order to escape the community; a number of older hunters remain in the country for most of the year without social assistance. But most Innut are in some way tied to social services by an economic dependence that has increased as welfare services have expanded.{6}

This chapter has also illustrated the almost universal condemnation by the Innut of life in the village, and the impact substandard living conditions have on young people. Most people maintain there is nothing to do in the community and idleness translates into excessive alcohol consumption and anti-social

6 The connections between the growth in government control and services and the expansion of the capitalist mode of production will be explored in subsequent chapters.

behavior. Many Innut say there is a direct correlation between poor health and remaining year-round in the village.

The ability of the Innut to return to and use their land is today circumscribed by competing interests in that land. The competition comes from representatives of the dominant culture in Labrador, and is expressed by different perceptions of what the land is to be used for. These philosophical differences reinforce a definition of land use that denies the values of a people whose life is based on the domestic mode of production.

A final, important element in the preceding pages is the idea that it is the older Innut who retain the most comprehensive knowledge about living in the country and who have also been able to adapt the best to the industrial mode of production. Where many younger people find themselves caught in a cycle of short periods of marginal work followed by long stretches of unemployment and idleness, many older hunters use periodic wage work (usually funded by the social services department) to help finance their trips to the country. This pattern began with the construction of the airbase at Goose Bay in 1942 when a number of Innut men worked in seasonal construction gangs.

While these hunters remain part of an underdeveloped society, they have managed to find a way to make use of the limited options available to them. However, this advantage depends entirely on their continued ability to use the resources of their country and participate in the domestic mode of production. The Innut fear this ability is going to be destroyed

by the continued and increasing use of their territory for low-level jet fighter training.

Low-level flying is but the latest incursion of outside forces and agents into the Innut homeland. To understand the current Innut struggle against military development, it is important to first understand the people's history. The next three chapters will outline the history of Innut-outside contact, the growth of government in Labrador, and the emerging dominance of the industrial mode of production.

Chapter III

Innut History Through Outside Eyes

It has been said that images of "others" are always selective and often only serve to confirm the images that one has of oneself. So, the perception of other people's "underdevelopment" corresponds to the idea that the "developed" have of themselves and of their society.

Charles-Henri Foubert

In the summer of 1987 there was considerable discussion in central Labrador about an archeological discovery at Northwest River, a small Settler community about 30 kilometres from Goose Bay. The discovery, one of a number made over the years in the area of the Hamilton Inlet, was of special interest to the Innut of Sheshshiu, whose community sits across a narrow strait from Northwest River. The president of the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, a political organization which is responsible for negotiating the Innut land claim, told a radio interviewer that he believed the site belonged to his ancestors. He added that subsequent investigation by Government of Newfoundland and Labrador archeologists would substantiate his statements.

This most recent discovery may add to the Innut argument that their occupation of Nitassinan dates from primordial times. Certainly, it predates European contact and occupation by many thousands of years.

This chapter will look at the history of the Innut through the eyes of the foreigners that came to their country, beginning

in the 15th Century. It starts with an examination of conflicting archeological theories concerning the predecessors of the Labrador Innut, and goes on to a short discussion of the problems with anthropological perspectives on Native people in post-contact history. The role of the Innut in the early fur trade is taken up, followed by some discussion of the effect of European settlement on their lifestyle. From there, the chapter moves on to examine the conflicting viewpoints of early explorers, travellers and scientists who commented on the Innut in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. We also look at what influence these commentaries had may have had on the early ethnographies of the Innut. Finally, the conclusions of these ethnographers concerning the influence of the fur trade on the Innut mode of production will be used to show the continuity and adaptability of the Innut lifestyle.

At the basis of this chapter is the question of how historical experience is recorded and explained, and since it relies on written material, the observations have inevitably been those produced by outsiders. The Innut had no written language and their culture has been passed on orally, from generation to generation, since long before Europeans first arrived off the Labrador coast or attempted to penetrate the country's interior. For this reason, Innut history is not going to be scientifically ordered and verifiable. However, to talk about Innut "history" is somewhat misleading. The Innut would not necessarily divide their collective past from their present or future. History has been

imported to Nitassinan, just as forms of government administration and the capitalist mode of production have come from the outside. It is the European tradition that orders the past and separates it from the future on the basis of artifacts and "verifiable" information. What does not fit the pattern is examined, speculated upon and, often, discarded.

This is not to argue that archeological or ethnological investigations are without merit. They are merely the intellectual tools of the society which produced them, and for this reason quite often are not directly applicable to Native experience. Or perhaps it is more accurate to say they do not often give a complete picture. If there is a flaw in ethnological research generally, it lies with the perspective of the outsider, which in some ways will always be an approximation of what is really happening. It is hoped that in examining past misinterpretations these errors will not be repeated.

Archaeological-Ethnographic Perspectives

Ten thousand years ago, the undulating plateau that forms most of the Labrador-Quebec peninsula had only recently been abandoned by the retreating ice fields of the Wisconsin glaciation. At points nearly two kilometres thick, the great ice fields ploughed deep gullies in the rock. From the air today its path of retreat can still be traced. The melting ice filled lakes and ponds and roared out to sea through hundreds of valleys along the coast. Much of what is land today was then submerged.

The earliest human occupation of Labrador is reported at the Strait of Belle Isle around 6000 B.C. According to William Fitzhugh, tools from this site resemble Paleo-Indian assemblages found in other parts of North America at the end of the last glaciation. (Fitzhugh 1977,6) Other archaeological investigations show occupation in the Northwest River region from about 2500 B.C. (Fitzhugh 1972,v) Four different cultural traditions have been traced in the Hamilton Inlet region--two Indian and two Inuit. The Indian precursors are from the Maritime Archaic Traditions (2500-1800 B.C.) The second tradition, called the Shield Archaic of the Canadian boreal forest, has been dated in the Hamilton Inlet area from the early centuries A.D.

In the Hamilton Inlet traces of the Dorset Eskimo culture of the Arctic Small Tool Tradition date from 800-200 B.C. Fitzhugh maintains that a second group, the "Thule-derived" Labrador Eskimos, arrived around A.D. 1500. The fact that there is an apparent gap in Eskimo or Inuit occupation is important. "The lack of Eskimo culture in central Labrador at the time of the Viking visits indicates that here at least the Skraelings were Indians of Algonkian linguistic stock. Algonkian related cultures can be traced back archeologically to about A.D. 600 in Labrador." (Fitzhugh 1976,v)

The Skraelings are the indigenous peoples referred to in the Norse sagas which describe the Viking voyages to what is now North America 1,000 years ago. While Fitzhugh argues that these pre-contact aboriginal inhabitants were the ancestors of the

Naskapi-Montagnais or Innut of today, this claim has been disputed.

James Tuck (1976) has written that archeological remains in the Hamilton Inlet tell of a people well adapted to coastal life who lived between A.D. 600 and 1300. Tuck says it is very difficult to connect these people with the modern Innut, who until the 20th century were an entirely interior people. (Tuck 1976,104) Rather than concede the ancient occupation of the area to the Innut or their ancestors, Tuck presents another argument: "Coupled with their very close linguistic ties to the west, and at least some vague legendary references to a recent migration to the Labrador-Quebec barrens, it might be well to hold open the possibility of a very recent migration, perhaps even in the historic period...." (Tuck 1976,105)

It is possible that the gap in Inuit occupation reflected in Fitzhugh's data exists simply because he has not found the relevant archeological sites. While it might be prudent from an academic point of view to withhold final conclusions about who arrived where and when, it is not an argument that is going to be very convincing to the Innut, for whom this is not merely an academic exercise in dating. The longer the Innut can prove their occupancy to be, the stronger their claim to the land will be.

However, for our purposes the exact number of years that the Innut have occupied Nitassinan is not really important. Elders in the community of Sheshatshiu do not work with dates. They say merely that their people have been there for a "long time". There

are many similarities between the Innut yearly round and that of other subarctic native peoples, just as there are similarities between how they were affected by Euro-Canadian culture.

The debate concerning the correct interpretation of the "prehistory" of the Innut is found in the "historical" records as well. Like most Native peoples, it was the Innut's fate to have their history written for them by outsiders, people who held widely divergent cultural values and who rarely, if ever, understood the culture and social organization, to say nothing of what their subjects were thinking or feeling at the point when they were being observed. This is not merely a trap of "historical" interpretations: it is also a problem with modern research.

According to Bruce Trigger, most historians have tended to view Native history as an extension of, or an adjunct to, colonial history. Native actions were merely reactions to the activities of the newcomers. In The Children of Aataentsic Trigger argues that "to regard Indian history merely as an extension of colonial history, in the manner of some historians, is to confuse what actually happened with the manner in which Indian policy has been recorded." (Trigger 1976,25) This approach is now being challenged as some scholars argue that Native people did not become immediately dependent and the victims of rapid, uncontrolled culture change upon first contact with Europeans. Rather, they were more than able to decide upon what elements of the alien culture (such as tools) to incorporate into

their societies and how much they wanted to participate in the mode of production based upon the fur trade. (Thistle 1986)

Not only were Native societies seen as dependent for their historical actions upon the activities and decisions of Europeans, but anthropological methods produced a limited perspective on these cultures. "Because of extensive reliance on native informants and historical documents, native cultures were not viewed as groups of people interacting with each other and with their environments. Rather, each culture was conceptualized as a distinctive pattern of norms which governed the behavior of its members...." (Trigger, 1985:115)

This viewpoint has not been confined to studies of the eastern woodland peoples, about whom Trigger writes. In his analysis of cultural contact on the west coast, Robin Fisher (1977) says the main themes of Canadian history have perpetuated the invisibility of Native peoples.

Invisibility connotes powerlessness, and in this native people are not alone in their lack of a self-defined historical voice. Trigger says their situation parallels that of millions of European peasants who have disappeared from the historical record.{1}

Indians stand in much the same relationship to history as do the working classes, peasantries, and other less literate members of European society in earlier times. The records that we have of both were produced by a relatively small,

1 In Canada, invisibility in the pages of history and political economy has been the fate of both Native peoples and immigrants from "ethnic" groups. See Abele and Stasiulis.

privileged class that had no personal experience of the ways of life of these people. It is therefore no accident that the techniques developed to study the history of less affluent Europeans resemble so closely those we propose to use for the study of the Canadian Indian. (Trigger 1976,24)

Even in those analyses where Indian peoples played a crucial role, such as adaptations of Harold Innis's "staples thesis", their position in history is contingent on Euro-Canadian activities. "A further effect of staples theory history has been that the Indians drop from view with the decline of the fur trade." (Fisher 1977,xi) Granted it is difficult to compile the history of a people for whom the written word was not a part of their cultural tradition. History demands "facts" but facts are culturally determined.

These problems are also evident in anthropological analyses of native societies. Critiques of culturally-biased studies are legion. Anthropological theory has been greatly influenced by the prevailing social assumptions of the age in which it was formulated. During the latter half of the 19th century the Darwinian theory of evolution was modified to provide a rationale for racially-based theories of cultural change and historical development. The prevailing ideology of the day held that western, White European society was the apogee of civilization and progress. All other societies were placed on an evolutionary scale with "primitive" at the bottom. The American Lewis Henry Morgan was one of the foremost advocates of this approach and his views were readily accepted by a society that was used to competing with native people for land and power. "Morgan's view

that no indigenous people of the Western Hemisphere had evolved their own civilization was supported by many White Americans, who saw little to admire in the native peoples of their own country." (Trigger 1985,10)

Morgan's conceptual framework was borrowed by Frederick Engels in his Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State. In this work, Engels dealt with the developmental stages of mankind's history and illustrated the relation between "primitive" and "civilized" societies with their commodity-based production and class systems. For Engels, civilization was not based on racial attributes but economic relations. It is "the stage of development in society at which the division of labour, the exchange between individuals arising from it, and the commodity production which combines them both come to their full growth and revolutionizes the whole of previous society."

(Engels 1972,233) Marx, Engels and the earliest Marxists were obviously not immune to Euro-centric conceptualizations of the world, and thus of history.

The view that hunter-gatherer societies occupy the lowest level on the scale of "civilization" has informed many accounts of the life and economy of the Innut. One theme dominates the literature: the Innut are part of a vanishing way of life and they have only one option--to adapt to new ways or to die out. As with other aboriginal societies in northern Canada, reports of the Innut's demise have been greatly exaggerated. The Innut of Labrador-Quebec were among the first aboriginal people on this

continent to come into contact with the European strangers. Without a doubt they have been greatly influenced by this contact and their society has been--and continues to be--much battered by the experience. Yet they have not vanished. This fact alone speaks volumes about the relative strength of Innuit culture.

Initial Contacts (1498-1700)

There is considerable evidence to support the idea that maritime traffic had developed between Europe and the northeastern coast of North America before the first voyage of Columbus in 1492. One of the first Europeans to reach Labrador is thought to have been Gaspar de Cortereal of Portugal, who made a 1,000-kilometre voyage along the coast. His feat is recorded on a map published in Rome in 1508, at which time Labrador was labelled "Terra Corteralis". (Hind 1863,126) Unrecorded is the fate of seven "Nascapees" Cortereal took with him to his country. (Boas 1905,75) {2}

P.W. Browne (1909) wrote that the Labrador coast was visited by Breton fishermen 100 years before Columbus, but he does not say how he came by this information. Browne also said maps of the day referred to Labrador as "Baccalaos", Portuguese for "cod". (Browne 1909,15)

Besides the Portuguese and Bretons (whenever they might have arrived), Basques, Normans, English and French made the long

2 Tanner (1977) says 40 people were taken back to Portugal and made into slaves.

journey across the Atlantic to Labrador. From a very early stage, the newcomers began assessing the potential of the newly discovered lands. Sebastien Cabot was the son of John Cabot, whose voyage in 1497 became the basis of English claims to North America. His memoirs contain a letter written around 1500 by Pietro P~~as~~-quiligi, the Venetian ambassador to the Portuguese Court. Hind says the letter contains references "to the voyage of Cortereal to the coast of Labrador, and a description of the inhabitants.... This description doesn't apply to the Esquimaux; but in some points it is a rude picture of the Nasquapees...." (Hind 1863,108)

"They have a great plenty of salmon, herring, stockfish, and smaller kinds of fish. They have also abundance of timber, and principally of pine, fitted for masts and yards of ships; on which account his serene Majesty anticipates the greatest advantage from this country, both in furnishing timber for his shipping, of which at present he stands in great need, and also from the men who inhabit it, who appear admirably fitted to endure labour, and will probably turn out the best slaves which have been discovered up to this time...." (Hind 1863,109)

There is, however, no record of a slave trade in Labrador, nor was there much contact between the Innut and Portuguese. Jacques Cartier's voyage of 1534 heralded the beginning of sustained contact between the Innut and Europeans. W.G. Gosling wrote that the Indians Cartier described meeting on this voyage were Montagnais.

"There are people in the said land who are well enough in body, but they are wild and savage folks. They have their hair tied upon their heads in the fashion of a fistful of hay trussed up with and a nail or some other thing passed through it, and therein they stick some feathers of birds. They clothe themselves with skins of beasts, both men and women, but the women are closer and

tighter in said skins and girded about the body. They paint themselves with certain tawny colours. They have boats in which they go by the sea, which are made of the bark of birch trees, wherewith they fish a good many seals. Since having seen them I am sure this is not their abode, and that they come from warmer lands in order to take the said seals and other things for their living."
(Gosling 1910, 76-77)

Trigger says Cartier met a group of Montagnais that summer who had come from further up the St. Lawrence to the region near Baie des Chateaux to trade with Europeans. (1985:128) This would make the Montagnais, at least those whose lands were close to the St. Lawrence, among the earliest participants in the fur trade.

Like aboriginal peoples in other parts of the North, the Innuit have been profoundly influenced by two competing and contradictory alien forces and philosophies. On one hand, the fur trade tended to tie Native people to a mercantile system of commodity exchange by encouraging the retention of traditional nomadic hunting patterns. This economic system required mobile people who knew the country and were willing to scour it for much coveted furs. On the other hand, the missionaries, who arrived in North America at the same time as the traders, made different demands on Native people. To learn "civilized" ways it was necessary to stop wandering, settle down and learn how to do "productive" things like farm or fish. Under the watchful eye of the priests and ministers, the Indians would learn to be good Christians. Eventually these two competing interests reached an accommodation. This is especially evident in Labrador where missionaries made a habit of visiting the Innuit at trading posts in the interior during the summer.

For nearly 200 years, contact between the Labrador Innut and fur traders took place along the Gulf coast and north shore of the St. Lawrence. A few traders and missionaries made their way into the interior, but for the most part the Labrador Innut were exposed to European influences through their southern relatives. The first missionaries to visit the Innut were the Recolets or Franciscans who worked among the Montagnais near the early French settlements in Quebec, beginning in 1615. A decade later the Jesuits took over the missionary work in Nouveau France.

The only substantial early ethnographic account of the Montagnais is found in the Jesuit Relations, the detailed records kept by that society of French Catholic missionaries. One of the first Jesuits to spend any time with the Innut was Père Paul Le Jeune, who travelled with a party of Montagnais hunting families in the winter of 1633-34. A century ago, Francis Parkman wrote an account of Le Jeune's travels. He began with a description of the Montagnais:

[W]hen, in spring, the French trading-ships arrived and anchored in the port of Tadoussac, they gathered from far and near, toiling painfully through the desolation of forests, mustering by hundreds to the point of traffic, and setting up their bark wigwams along the strand of that wild harbor. They were of the lowest Algonquin type. Their ordinary sustenance was derived from the chase; though often, goaded by deadly famine, they would subsist on roots, the bark and buds of trees, or the foulest offal; and in extremity, even cannibalism was not rare among them. (Parkman 1887,xxiii)

From this historical vantage we are able to recognize the ethnocentricity of Parkman's observations. However, he is important for this very reason: his writings tell us a lot about

the way early anthropologists viewed the world, and the societal prejudices they took with them into "the field". For instance, through Parkman's eyes Le Jeune's winter with the Naskapi-Montagnais at times reads like a descent into hell.{3}

Le Jeune set out at the end of October in a party of 20 people. By the middle of the next month they had been joined by two other "bands" and now numbered about 45. The Jesuit carried with him a winter's supply of food, including biscuits, flour, corn, prunes and turnips, as well as a small keg of wine which Parkman states his friends had convinced him to take "in an evil hour." (Parkman 1887,23;

Parkman describes in detail the foreboding lands through which the party travelled that winter in the area of Quebec where the St. John River rises.

Winter had set in, and already dead Nature was sheeted in funereal white. Lakes and ponds were frozen, rivulets sealed up, torrents encased with stalactites of ice; black rocks and the blank trunks of the pine-trees were besplashed with snow, and very heavy masses crushed the green bows into the drifts beneath. The forest was

3. Parkman wrote about the differences he observed between North American Indian peoples. He praised the Iroquois for being the most successful of all the groups. "Their success was attributed to their inherent energy, superior mental ability and moral capacity, and their ruthlessness. Though they remained 'thorough savages,' he believed that they were 'finished and developed' to the highest level that could be reached without emerging from the 'primitive condition'. While Trigger says Parkman was "a careful student of American anthropology", he was also guilty of perpetrating some vicious stereotypes, including the one which cast the Montagnais as inveterate cannibals. "These biases echoed the biases of Parkman's sources and the prejudices of his own society. In particular, economic reliance upon hunting was felt to betoken a 'visible descent in the scale of humanity'." (Trigger 1985,12-14)

silent as the grave.

Through this desolation the long file of Indians made its way, all on snow-shoes, each man, woman, and child bending under a heavy load, or dragging a sledge, narrow but of prodigious length. They carried their whole wealth with them, on their backs or on their sledges--kettles, axes, bales of meat, if such they had, and huge rolls of birch-bark for covering their wigwams. The Jesuit was loaded like the rest. (Parkman 1887,25)

The group moved when game in their immediate camping area was exhausted. In early winter, Parkman wrote, they hunted beaver and the "Canadian porcupine"; later, when the snow was deep, they chased moose and caribou. (Parkman 1887,27) Le Jeune's task was to bring God to the Montagnais. The Jesuits had decided early that it was important to take their message directly to the potential converts and to live with them in order to learn the best ways of rooting out their paganism. Le Jeune's presence created considerable suspicion on the part of the band's shaman and much space in his account is devoted to his battle with this Montagnais spiritual leader. At one point, the priest is threatened with death but the shaman is dissuaded from the act by his companions.

Parkman tells us the priest suffered the same privations as the Montagnais. "It was the ordinary winter life of all those Northern tribes who did not till the soil, but lived by hunting and fishing alone." He described the Montagnais' existence as "a desperate pursuit of the mere necessities of life under the worst conditions of hardship, suffering, and debasement." (Parkman 1887,40) In April, Le Jeune found himself back at the St. Lawrence, sick and exhausted.

Goodman and Leacock (n.d.) have written about the effects of the early Jesuit sojourns among the Montagnais. From the beginning, there was a clash of ideologies:

Personal autonomy was central in the structure and ethics of native Canadian society, while obedience to authority was central to 17th century Europe. Therefore the Jesuit commitment to remaking native Americans in the image of European society meant far more than formal conversion to Christianity. It meant the introduction of hierarchical principles in the ordering of personal relations in Indian society. (Goodman and Leacock n.d., 77)

This impact was felt economically by native societies which were also influenced by the individualizing force of the fur trade.

The Early Fur Trade in Labrador

The most influential factor in the recent history of the Innuit is the European fur trade. There is some doubt about just which French trader was the first to build a post in Labrador, but the credit usually goes to the Seigneur de Courtemanche who was granted a licence by the King of France in 1702 to carry out trade with the "les sauvages". Courtemanche's holdings ran from the river Kegaska, about fifty leagues west of Mingan on the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, to the Hamilton Inlet and what is now called the Churchill River, which empties into Lake Melville. (Zimmerly 1975, 44) Courtemanche established himself at Bradore Bay and in 1704 toured his vast territory. Zimmerly says he surveyed the Hamilton Inlet, which he called "the river Kesesakiou". There he found

"salmon and seals are in great abundance. Inland, caribou, foxes, lynxes, martens and beaver can be found in large

numbers. It is at this place that the Esquimaux take up abode because of the easy means of subsistence to be found there.... The Esquimaux are becoming more sociable and beginning to trade with the French who are settled there and who trade in their commodities. I have also attracted in the interior a tribe of Indians who had not as yet come into contact with the French. They are very intelligent and a missionary would have no trouble to implant Christianity among them." (Zimmerly 1975,44-45)

Zimmerly says there were already other French settlers in the Hamilton Inlet area at this time. The interior "tribe" Courtemanche referred to was likely Innut.

Another French trader, Louis Fornel, built the first post at what is now Northwest River in 1743. During Fornel's time the area "was the southern stronghold of the Eskimos and their hostility toward Europeans precluded settlement of Hamilton Inlet for all but the hardiest of traders." (Zimmerly 1975,48) There was also mutual antipathy between the Inuit and Innut. Nevertheless, the two aboriginal populations quickly adopted many European trade goods.

[I]t was customary even in the 16th and 17th centuries for northern Labrador Eskimos and Naskapi Indians to undertake long trips into the southern regions to obtain iron, birch bark, and other important trade materials. While birch bark trade may have been aboriginal, the new changes in material culture generally did not affect the sociocultural patterns of the northern peoples. (Fitzhugh 1972,45)

The material culture of these peoples was not greatly influenced by European contact and they easily incorporated elements of the new technology into their daily lives. From the Inuit they borrowed the toggling harpoon, dog sled, semi-lunar knife and other things. Fitzhugh sees this kind of adaptation in a positive light, but McGee (1961) argues that the seventeenth

century was a period of increasing dependence for the Innut. Trade goods--"food, clothing, utensils, and arms"--became essential to their survival. (McGee 1961,127) However, McGee is probably overstating the case. The Innut selected the implements that would be useful to them. In return, they taught the newcomers about how to live in a country in which they were ill-equipped to survive. Rather than the one-sided relationship McGee implies, more than likely the early fur trade contacts in Labrador were what Thistle (1986) has called "symbiotic".

Nevertheless, over time, the fur trade had an increasing influence on the way the Innut lived and modified the domestic mode of production. Hunting patterns were altered. To hunt fur-bearing animals required spending long periods in the forests during winter when the fur was at its best; however, Innut culture depended on the caribou, which is found in large herds on the barren grounds or in smaller numbers in the forests during the same season. Fitzhugh says the more the Innut became involved in the fur trade, the first form of white economy in Labrador, the less mobile they became. (1972,45)

The second immediate effect of the fur trade and the sustained contact with Europeans that went with it was the introduction of diseases that wiped out entire populations. Those who were not killed by disease had to deal with other threats, such as the rampant abuse of alcohol, which was used by many traders as a commodity for exchange or an inducement to trade. A.G. Bailey paints a sorry picture of the Jesuits' ineffectual

attempts to halt the liquor trade in Quebec. According to Bailey, if the Jesuits were unable to save the body, they could still derive some comfort from saving the native soul. He quotes a Catholic father: "'The joy that one feels when he has baptized a Savage who dies soon afterwards, and flies directly to Heaven to become an Angel, certainly is a joy that surpasses anything that can be imagined.'" (Bailey 1937,80)

In 1603, Champlain described how the Montagnais were trading up the Saguenay River and around Lake St. John with other Indians. (Innis 1962,15) These Montagnais were early intermediaries between the northern Indians and the French and retained this position until they were edged out by the Huron. However, these Montagnais lost control of the trade and were forced to hunt and trap for themselves. Use of European weapons soon caused a decline in the animal population on which they depended. (Innis 1962,27) These southern Innu had quickly come to depend on the fur trade and when the fur frontier moved on the Innu were left to cope as best they could.

With the introduction of the fur trade and Catholic missions in the 17th Century the subsistence pattern of all Algonkian peoples began to change. It was a movement from an economy based entirely on the natural environment, and subject to the whims of nature, to one that was, in the beginning, partially dependent on market forces that could be as capricious as nature.

At the end of the 1600s there were a dozen French settlements on the periphery of Labrador and traders were already

penetrating the Lake Melville area. "As early as 1645 some of the Montagnais were complaining about the numerous white men invading their trapping grounds and about the consequent shortage of game." (McGee 1961,127) This pressure was to increase as Settlers moved into Labrador and began to compete with the Innut for the prime trapping territories.

In 1775, Captain George Cartwright set up a trading post at Sandwich Bay, south of the Hamilton Inlet. Cartwright lived in Labrador for many years and kept detailed journals. On October 4, 1786, he wrote about the "Mountaineers" or Montagnais:

"As these people never stay long in a place, consequently they never build houses, but live the year round in miserable whigwhams; the coverings of which, are deer-skins and birch rinds: the skins of which they use for this purpose, as well as for clothes;... As to the morals of these people, I cannot speak much in praise of them, for they are greatly addicted to drunkenness and theft. They profess the Roman Religion; but know no more of it, than merely to repeat a prayer or two, count their beads, and see a priest whenever they go to Quebec." (Cartwright 1911,352)

Despite his tone, Cartwright's observations are valuable for two reasons. First, they show that the Innut lifestyle, though influenced by the fur trade, was substantially unchanged. At this point the Innut had succeeded in incorporating trapping into their way of life. Second, they had also incorporated elements of European religion. Initially, this religious incorporation did not mean major changes; however, the adoption of elements of Christian belief would later provide missionaries with the power of moral suasion over the Innut. Cartwright's journals have recorded the first major period of transition in Labrador--the

consolidation of the fur trade. Social problems caused by disease and alcohol were taking their toll on Innut society, but the people continued to live a nomadic way of life. There had been changes in that way of life, but the Innut were by no means acculturated. Nor were they prepared for the next major change, the coming of the Settlers.

Settlement and Expansion of the Fur Trade

The first Englishmen to winter in Hamilton Inlet arrived in 1778, but there are no reports of "settlers" in the area for another quarter century. (Zimmerly 1975,57) Settlement, whenever it "officially" began, represented a major change in Innut-European relations. Fisher has written that European-Native relations during the fur trade were based on a form of reciprocity that is defined in the word "relationship". Following settlement, the word "impact" more appropriately describes the effect of one culture on the other." (Fisher 1977,xv)

Many of the original Labrador settlers were fishermen who jumped ship or were hired to winter over and guard fishing posts. They did some trapping and hunting to prepare for the next season, and some left the posts to become Settlers rather than return to a regimented life at sea. (Zimmerly 1975,57) Other Settlers were former employees of trading companies who had decided to remain in Labrador once their contracts expired in order to escape the rigid class system of England. Many of these early Settlers took Inuit wives and adopted a trapping lifestyle

similar to that of the aboriginal peoples of Labrador. They were referred to as "planters", "freemen" or "liveyeres". (Zimmerly 1975,66)

In 1841, W.H.A. Davies, an employee of the Hudson's Bay Company, described the Settler way of life:

"[T]hey most commonly winter on the immediate shores of the Bay if possible, for the convenience of hunting ducks in the spring, for the subsistence of their families. Their number may be on an average, about forty-five souls, of these eight are white men, the remainder half-breed Esquimaux. They are very uncertain in their movements, often wintering in places widely remote from their former habitations, for as they invariably carry all their property with them, in their annual migrations to and from their summer residence, they are not at all under the necessity of returning to the winter-house they last occupied, unless the situation should happen to be a favourable one; their migrations are performed in open whale boats, in which they will often make voyages of a month's duration, the women managing the boats as well as the men, and pulling an equally good oar. Even in summer, some of them are continually changing their quarters; passing the first part of the summer in fishing salmon, in the neighbourhood of Rigolet, and then going to the entrance of the Bay, to pursue the cod fishery, until it is time to return to winter quarters. The life these people lead is one of great hardship and fatigue, from their constant exposure to the weather, and the necessity of using the most strenuous exertions, to subsist their families, for the provisions they are enabled to purchase from the traders are never sufficient to support them during the long winter...." (Zimmerly 1975,67-68)

It is a description which, at first glance, would also apply to the Innut at the same time. While the Innut were incorporating elements of European culture into their lives, the Settlers were learning from the original inhabitants of Labrador. From the Innut, the white trappers learned how to hunt, fish, trap and survive in the interior. They also adopted tools such as the

tobaggan, canoe, snowshoes, and the crooked knife. (Zimmerly 1975,72)

The influx of white settlers led to a competition for space with the Innut. McGee says the strain began with the establishment of the Hudson's Bay Company in Hamilton Inlet in the 1830s.

As time went on the white people encroached more and more on the land which the Indians had claimed as their own. The preemption of the best lowlands in the Lake Melville basin for village sites, depots, trading fisheries, Protestant churches, schools and the Protestant medical mission, as well as large areas surrounding these for trapping, increased the transportation problem for the Indians. They were forced to go further and further afield to hunt and trap.... (McGee 1961,133-134)

This competition continued throughout the 19th century and exists today in the form of different conceptions of how the land is to be used and who actually "owns" it. Vaino Tanner, a Finnish geographer, commented on the effects of this competition.

When the Indians are hungry they must take what they can; the whites call it: stealing; they examine the trappers' 'tilt' (blockhouse) and eat up the flour, while their dogs sniff up the larder under the snow, say the trappers. Need knows no law, say the Indians in response: we are starving. But the Indians are always hungry, say the trappers; year after year it is the same thing.... (The Indian) is in his attitude to life a naive communist. (Tanner 1944,602)

The establishment of the Hudson's Bay Company in Northwest River was followed by an intensification of the fur trade, and with it increased competition for territory between Settlers and the Innut. Trading posts were set up by rival companies in the interior as a way of gaining access to the Innut fur stocks before they travelled to trade at Northwest River.

2

RESOLUTION TEST CHART
MICRO
100% COPY QUALITY

Besides the furs they could provide, outsiders were interested in the Innut for other, less mundane reasons. The Oblate order took over missionary work from the Jesuits in 1844. In Labrador they found seven centres that had been used to administer to the Montagnais which had been abandoned for about 80 years "--from the time of the English occupation of Quebec-- due to the shortage of clergy, and according to the English plan." {4} By the middle of the last century the Oblates were visiting the Innut in their summer camps and occasionally they travelled to the interior with them. (McGee 1961,129-130)

McGee says records show that Innut of Northwest River were baptized at various places along the Gulf of St. Lawrence coast, and that by 1852 they were "begging for a priest" of their own. After several unsuccessful attempts to reach Northwest River, an Oblate ministered to the Indians there for the first time in 1867. The following year, Father Louis Babel reported 154 Innut at this summer camping place. By 1870 a chapel had been built at Northwest River but the missionaries continued to visit only in the summer when the Innut gathered to trade. Besides trading, summer became a time when weddings, baptisms and other ceremonies were held.

4. McGee, a Catholic priest, commented on the lot of Catholic Indians in the hands of Protestant administrators during the time he spent in Labrador in the late 1940s. McGee said one reason the Innut's culture had been so stable was due to a "historical distrust and fear of the English-speaking Protestant majority which surrounds them...." (1961,146) Whether or not religious and linguistic reasons were at the root of Innut feelings is debatable.

Despite more than two centuries of contact with missionaries, indigenous Innut beliefs and practices were not completely extirpated. In 1881, the Oblate Father Pafard "said ~~that~~ in spite of their Catholicism the Indians still retained some superstitions and taboos." This list included the use of drums at births to make boys into strong hunters and to drive away sickness, and the practice of the ritual feast or makushan. (McGee 1961,133)

Missionary visits stopped after 1895 and the Innut were told they would have to travel to Sept-Iles to see a priest. The Oblates stopped coming "due to an ecclesiastical dispute over jurisdiction, which reflected the old civil dispute between Newfoundland and Quebec over Labrador." (McGee 1961,133) A quarter of a century later, the Diocese of Harbour Grace again sent a priest to Northwest River and the traditional summer visits continued until the Oblates took up permanent residence in Sheshatshiu in 1946.

The jurisdictional dispute meant the Innut had to travel much greater distances to receive the sacraments. One 89-year-old Sheshatshiu man said he was born at Fort Chimo on Ungava Bay but was baptized the next spring in Sept-Iles, a journey of about 700 kilometres. (Luke Nui, interview, Aug. 6,1987)

Tourists, Scientists, and Adventurers

During the mid-1800s, a third group of outsiders joined the priests and fur traders in their interest in Labrador and its inhabitants. These outsiders were drawn there by both the lure of potential resources and adventure. Over the next generation dozens of books were written about the wild interior of Labrador and its "savage" inhabitants. As well, Labrador was fertile ground to members of the nascent science of anthropology who were searching the world to record the "traditional" lifestyles of "vanishing" peoples. Nineteenth-century anthropologists "made no formal provision for studying cultural changes amongst native peoples since European contact... Such changes were viewed as a process of disintegration that would terminate with the physical extinction of most native people and the cultural assimilation into White society of any surviving remnants." Any evidence that Native people had incorporated elements of European society into their lifestyles was seen as "impediments to the study of traditional cultures" and often ignored. (Trigger 1985, 18-19)

Similar attitudes informed much of the popular writing about the Innut during the same period. The aboriginal peoples of Labrador had been in contact with European society since the 15th century and had incorporated many aspects of the former's material culture and had adapted their way of life to the fur trade. Nevertheless, many of their observers in this period felt the Innut were doomed to extinction. That was certainly the impression conveyed by Henry Youle Hind when he described the

epidemic that raged through the Innut community of Mingan on the Gulf Coast in 1862. Hind was relatively sympathetic to the Montagnais. He said they were aware that living on the coast was leading to their "slow but sure decline... but they find it far more easy to procure food, and prefer to live on fish and seals, with the certainty of being always able to avoid starvation, to living in the woods which wide-spreading forests fires and the fur trade have converted into a desert." (Hind 1863,115)

However, later Hind goes on to say:

The Montagnais have shown themselves... incapable of resigning the wild freedom of their forests, and living a settled life in villages. It may be urged in defense of the Indian character, that they ought to have been taught the common and useful mechanical trades, and also how to till the earth. Many have been so taught, but they have gone back to their old forest life, for which they seem to have an innate love incapable of being rooted out. (1863,169)

Hind has presented a conundrum. On one hand, the Montagnais die of diseases when they live in villages in order to avoid, as he says, the routine starvation that was their lot in the interior. On the other hand, they cannot live a settled life because something draws them back to the forest. In the end, Hind shrugs his rhetorical shoulders over just what should be done for these perplexing people.

It should be pointed out that Hind was observing part of the normal yearly round of the Innut. While they may have appreciated the ready supply of food on the coast, they returned to the country to hunt and trap. This domestic mode of production fit well with the needs of the fur traders, who wanted the product of

the land and not, at this point, the land itself. Only when Euro-Canadian interests turned to the possession of territory was the existence of the domestic mode threatened.

By 1860 fur trading activity at Northwest River had become well established. That summer saw the arrival of what may well have been Labrador's first tourists, a group of American adventurers who planned to watch a solar eclipse from Cape Chidley, the northernmost point of land on the peninsula. Among them was Charles Hallock, who wrote an article which was accompanied by engravings made from photographs taken by another member of the expedition. Hallock described Northwest River as a

"long line of buildings belonging to the post, with a red flag flying before the agent's house. There the river is some 300 yards wide, the shore sandy and quite level, though sloping gradually to hills in the rear. The general features of the fort are similar to those of Rigolette (a small settlement nearer the mouth of Hamilton Inlet), the buildings comprising store-houses, shops, etc., some twenty in all. A little apart from the houses are the frame poles of numerous Nascopie lodges, disposed in a large circle. These are covered with skins and occupied when the Indians come down to trade." (Zimmerly 1975,155)

At this point, Northwest River was being visited by groups of Montagnais and Naskapi Innut. Besides to trade, the Innut came to the area to see the Catholic priest. (Zimmerly 1975,116) However, the Innut say they have been coming to "Secacit" or "the narrow place" since long before the fur trade began. (Personal communication)

Hallock described the Naskapi he saw:

"They are tall, straight, graceful, of light complexion and pleasing features....The men are passionately fond of dress; and their native garments, of softest buck-

skin, are of most faultless cut, and fancifully decorated with pigments of various colors, and wrought with silk, in designs representing birds, flowers, canoes, etc. Their yellow dye is obtained from the spawn of trout. A scarlet sash, which girds the coat, is worn about the waist, the flowing ends reaching to the knees. The women affect the Bloomer costume--petticoats and trousers; but their dress is far inferior to their lords' and masters'. Tall conical caps of gaudy flannel are invariably worn, ornamented with beads, and sometimes with bears' and eagles' claws." (Zimmerly 1975, 116)

The picture Hallock gives us conflicts with the ones painted by Hind and Parkman. Early ethnographers and travellers often sounded as if they adhered to the Hobbesian view that life in a "state of nature" was "solitary, poore, nasty, brutish and short." Since aboriginal people existed in a "pre-civilized" condition, it followed that their lives were a constant struggle simply to stay alive. Certainly, there were periods of hunger and starvation in Nitassinan, but if this was a constant state of existence, then how does one explain the elaborate costuming described by Hallock? It seems unlikely that a society perennially poised on the brink of oblivion would take time out for the apparently frivolous pastime of decorating clothing. In light of this it might be more accurate to assume the periodic disasters visited upon the Innut were just that--localized calamities which came about due to particular sets of circumstances in the regions in which they occurred.

Seeing the question of hunger in this way will help us to better understand the 19th Century perspective shared by many authors being discussed here. They tended to generalize about conditions for all Native people based on limited observations.

For this reason, we would err if in turn we generalized too much about Victorian ethnography. These observers, many of whom came from privileged classes, carried out work that was circumscribed by the limited geographic and ethnological knowledge of their times.

The first scientific exploration in Labrador was led by A.P. Low in 1893-94. Low, a member of the Geological Survey of Canada, wintered in Northwest River and described the Settlers' life and how they were "all deeply in debt to the Hudson's Bay company and Newfoundland fishing firms for supplies advanced." (Zimmerly 1975,138) Low also wrote about how the Settlers moved into their trapping grounds at the close of the fishing season.

"Each 'planter' has a 'path,' or line of traps, often extending fifty miles or more inland, and as these paths cannot be covered in one day, he has small 'shacks,' or log houses, at convenient intervals along them, where he can pass the night with some degree of comfort. Some of the paths are so long that they require a week to go over and attend to the traps on the way." (Zimmerly 1975,139)

As the Settler population increased, so did the pressure on Innut trapping territory. "By 1900...the Indians were complaining to the Hudson's Bay Company that the settlers were encroaching on their hunting grounds and several incidents occurred. The settlers, however, emerged victorious in their westward quest for more trapping grounds." (Zimmerly 1975,146) The Settlers, who at one time relied on fishing for their livelihoods, were being forced into the interior to trap by economic necessity. By 1900, stocks had been depleted and fishing accounted for no more than

10 per cent of the earnings of Northwest River residents. The rest came from trapping. (Zimmerly 1975,149)

The beginning of the 20th Century also saw an increase in the number of outside adventurers braving the Labrador wilderness. Their books and articles led to an increase in knowledge about what had previously been an obscure part of the continent. Much of this material is devoted to the exploits of the authors and tends either to romanticize both Labrador and the people who lived there or offer prescriptions about what the inhabitants should do to improve their existence. These writers were both simple adventurers and precursors of the ethnologists that would penetrate the Innut territory in the next generation. Seen through the eyes of these outsiders, the Innut were still "a wild and savage folk".

The writers contradicted each other frequently in their descriptions. Dillon Wallace was part of the ill-fated Hubbard expedition of 1904 during which his partner Leonidas Hubbard died of starvation. Before leaving on their journey in search of the headwaters of the George River, Hubbard and Wallace had vowed that "if one of us falls", the other must complete the work. (Wallace 1907,2) In 1907, Wallace, already well-known after he published an account of the first expedition, retraced the route Hubbard had planned. On this trip he met a group of Naskapi Innut.

The Nascaupes are not nearly so clean nor so prosperous as the Mountaineers, and, coming very little in contact with the whites, live now practically as their forefathers lived for untold generations before them--just

as they lived, in fact, before the white man came. They are perhaps the most primitive Indians on the North American continent today. (Wallace 1907,208)

According to Wallace, the Montagnais were somewhat better off than the Naskapi because they had more white blood in their veins--and they were Catholic. "While it is true that their faith is leavened to some extent by the superstitions their ancestors have handed down to them, yet even in the long months of the winter hunting season they never forget the teachings of their father confessor. The Nascaupes are heathens...." (Wallace 1907,209)

Wallace pointed out that the Church had tried to change the irreligious nature of the Naskapi. In 1877 or 1878, a "Fr. Père Lacasse" travelled overland from Northwest River to Fort Chimo on Ungava Bay to do missionary work among the Naskapi. However, hunting was bad that year and the Indians blamed the priest. "No one was converted." Another priest was now at work, he said, though he had little chance of success "for these Nascaupée tarry but a very brief time each year within his reach." (Wallace 1907,209-10)

Wallace also commented on the changing food habits of these Innuit. He noted the "deer" (caribou) were erratic and without them the people starved. In 1892-93, he said, starvation had claimed half the Naskapi population. Despite his earlier comments about the Naskapi living exactly as they had before the coming of the white man, Wallace noted "All these northern Indians are

passionately fond of tea, and drink unbelievable quantities of it." (Wallace 1907,210)

As for spiritual matters, Wallace noted the "Indian religion is not one of worship, but one of fear and superstition." The Naskapi were "constantly in dread of imaginary spirits that haunt the wilderness and drive away the game or bring sickness or other disaster.... The conjurer is employed to work his charms to keep off the evil ones...." Wallace found "the marriage relation is held very lightly and continence and chastity are not in their sight virtues" and that "the men are hunters, the women slaves." On top of these social distortions, the Naskapi distorted the truth. "It is safe to say that there is not a truthful Indian in Labrador. In fact, it is considered an accomplishment to lie cheerfully and well.... I verily believe these Indians sometimes lie for the mere pleasure of it when it might be to their advantage to tell the truth." However, Wallace added, they do not steal and they are very hospitable.

For their faults they must not be condemned. They live according to their lights, and their lights are those of the untutored savage who has never heard the gospel of Christianity and knows nothing of civilization of the great world outside. Their life is one of constant struggle for bare existence, and it is truly wonderful how they survive at all in the bleak wastes which they inhabit. (Wallace 1907,215)

Wallace is candid enough to admit that not all of his comments about the Naskapi come from first hand observation. He is quoting opinions of "informants" at Hudson's Bay posts, as well as books in print at the time. Many of his views are found in the writings of other contemporaries. Some, such as Mrs. Leonidas

Hubbard, took the view that the Innut were "noble savages".(5)
 "They had markedly Indian faces and those of the older men showed plainly the battle for life they had been fighting. They were tall, lithe, and active looking, with a certain air of self-possession and dignity which almost all Indians seem to have. The faces were full of interest...." (Hubbard 1908,203)

William Cabot said the Montagnais were part of "this vanishing family" of Algonkians. He found as well that they were "rather improved in sturdiness by the long infiltration of white blood which began with the days of the Coureurs des Bois and the fur trade." (Cabot 1909,184) Cabot wrote about periods of starvation among the Montagnais which came in late winter and were due to the scarcity of game caused by forest fires which had ruined great tracts of land. "The catastrophe, so far as resources for the Indian are concerned, was nearly complete." (Cabot 1909,192) Nevertheless, he said, "the life of these people remains singularly unchanged" and as long as the caribou continue their migrations, "the old-time ways will prevail." (Cabot 1909,210-11)

Cabot's view, while sympathetic, perpetuated a view of the Innut as noble savages living a way of life that was unaltered by

5. Mrs. Hubbard was the wife of Dillon Wallace's partner who died in the Labrador interior. She was determined to complete his journey and preserve his name, and she did so with panache. Her account, A Woman's Way Through Unknown Labrador (1908), contains photographs of a well-dressed woman leaning over a campfire, her head wrapped in a veil to ward off mosquitoes. Mrs. Hubbard thought little of Wallace's attempt to retrace her husband's route and their rivalry in publication was a major story at the time.

Euro-Canadian influences. As long as they remained that way, he argued, they would survive. There was no discussion in his work, or that of Wallace, about the adaptability of Innut culture and how it had managed to withstand outside influence for so long. Part of the reason was distance and lack of sustained contact, but there must have been other reasons--unexplored by these authors--as well.

Rev. P.W. Browne (1909) wrote about the Montagnais of the same period. His interest was that of the church--the creation of a people obedient to the word of God and His Church--and he contradicted much of what Wallace wrote.

They are comparatively cleanly in their habits; and I have visited their encampments without any disastrous results. The Montagnais are strictly honest when left to themselves; and are extremely hospitable: but when they come in contact with southerners they soon acquire the evil ways of the white man. They are of vivacious temperament, alert and intelligent, practically all of them being able to read, in French, as well as in their native dialect. They are all Catholics, and they make regular visits to the missionaries for instruction by the Oblate Fathers, who have been laboring amongst them since 1843.

Immorality is rare among these children of the wild; and even away in the bush they are strict observers of the laws of the Church. (Browne 1909,31)

Browne, like many other missionaries before him, was convinced that native people would be fine if they did not come under the sway of evil outside influences. He also had a few words about the apparently contradictory accounts of the Innut by other writers of his day.

Do not believe all you hear or read concerning the Montagnais or the Naskopis from travellers who pretend to lecture or write on Indians... We find it very difficult now to make people outside understand what

the Indians actually are, or do, owing to gross misrepresentations of Indian life made by incompetent lecturers and unscrupulous adventurers. (Browne 1909,36)

Considerable space has been devoted to the musings of travellers in Labrador during the early years of this century for an important reason. Their attitudes and observations not only informed their generation, but provided the groundwork for much future discussion of the Innut. To varying degrees, the notion that the Innut were a vanishing race of people influenced future ethnographic work in the area, convinced government and missionaries that it was in the people's best interest to settle down and become "civilized", and led to a situation in which the Innut found themselves politically and economically dependent. These influences will be discussed more fully in the next chapter.

20th Century Ethnologists and the Innut

The ethnologist Frank G. Speck studied and wrote about northern Algonkian peoples for nearly 40 years beginning in 1908. He carried out his field work with the Montagnais-Naskapi during the first two decades of this century. Like the travellers and adventurers before him, Speck was a product of his times. He felt he was studying one of the most "primitive" peoples in the world. Another writer has said Speck "viewed 'his' tribes in a romantic light, as exotic and alien survivals of a primitive and--to him--golden age. He once remarked 'that he always preferred the more primitive tribes to study.'" (Harper 1964,109-110) Speck has

been criticized for not taking into account that "these groups were no longer in their pre-European contact situations".

(Tanner 1979,8) Speck, whose bibliography contains some 60 works, has also been criticized because "much of [his] work was done out of hotel rooms, travelling to a reserve during the day for conversations with informants...." (Preston 1975,268)

Despite this criticism, Speck's work provided the foundation for much of the subsequent ethnography of the Innut. He was at least somewhat aware that he was viewing cultures in transition:

"At heart the Indians have lost their independence of life. The white man supplies all their physical needs--food and clothing--while the priest takes care of their spiritual needs. From this state of dependence the native is unable to rise. It is impossible for him to revert to his primitive state of simplicity and it is just as impossible for him to master or catch up with the intricate ways of modern economy. In his natural state he laboured less and had more; now he labours more and has less. The difference flows into the coffers of the (Hudson's Bay) Company." (Harper 1964,50-51)

Despite his sympathies for the Innut's dependent state, Speck's analysis also adopted an ethnocentric standard by which native societies were to be evaluated.

Compared with the agricultural and socially complex native populations everywhere to the south of them, they stand comparable in cultural low-relief with the backward Athapascan of northwest Canada and the northern tribes of California and the Rocky Mountain Plateau area. In general, we may imagine...that progress has stopped because their civilization was completed ages ago, and the urge toward further mastery of conditions of the country and development of its resources has ceased through their accomplishing a state of cultural balance, to which bodies and mental dispositions have achieved an adjustment. (Speck 1935,6)

Speck examined the relation between religious beliefs and productive activities. In his Naskapi (1935), Speck detailed the

relationship between religious practices and hunting, as well as the connection between country or "wild" food and physical and spiritual health. {6}

"Wild game to them is 'pure' and conducive to health, while European food, like alcohol, they believe to be detrimental to their health and vitality." (Speck 1935,18) Speck noted that the Montagnais did not like eating "non-indigenous" foods, like some seafoods, beef, pork, chicken and mutton, and attributed many bodily ills to their consumption. {7} Eating native food--caribou, moose, beaver, partridge, etc.--was "'taking medicine'. Thus, the native game diet is prophylactic to mankind. A deep significance lies beneath this doctrine." (Speck 1935,78-79)

Hunting animals was the key to existence, and game was more than a source of nutrition.

The killing of animals, then entails much responsibility in the spiritual sense. ...failure in the chase, the disappearance of the game from the hunters' districts, with ensuing famine, starvation, weakness, sickness, and death, are all attributed to the hunter's ignorance of some hidden principles of behavior towards animals, or to his willful disregard of them. The former is ignorance. The latter is sin.... (Speck 1935,73)

The caribou occupied the most important place in the Montagnais religious life. Caribou were "a race living under the control of an overlord, having their established social life, executing their migrations, and carrying out other modes of

6 Other researchers have built upon these ideas. See Tanner (1979).

7. This view was echoed repeatedly during the author's fieldwork in Sheshatshiu during the summer of 1987 and will be explored more fully in Chapter VI.

conduct." (Speck 1935,79) Speck's "overlord" is the Innut Papakasiuku, or "caribou master", who controls the supply of caribou to the hunters.

In Speck's ethnography, "the king of the caribou" is a "white man" dressed in black who rules a realm where thousands of caribou dwell. The animals are three times larger than normal and the place is guarded by a wolf of equal proportion. All around is waist high in antlers and the paths taken by the animals are so deep that only their heads and backs show above the ground. Hunters are forbidden to enter here; the penalty for transgression is death. The caribou king rewards with animals hunters who are good and have obeyed the laws (i.e., have not wasted food or desecrated caribou bones). When caribou allow themselves to be killed their spirits return to this place, which is somewhere between Ungava Bay and Hudson Bay. (Speck 1935,80-84) Despite the influences of Christianity such beliefs continue to influence northern Algonkian societies. [Tanner (1969), Sheshatshiu interviews (1987)]

Speck also discussed Innut scapulimancy, a form of divination using scorched animal bones, usually the shoulder blade of a caribou or beaver. The cracks which appeared in the charred bones helped the hunter tell where his game would be. Speck reported that the practice usually worked. Similar practices are reported by Tanner (1969) among the Mistassini Cree and by Henriksen (1973) with the Naskapi Innut of Davis Inlet.

Informants in Sheshatshiu (1987) say the art is rarely performed these days.

Interestingly, Speck observed that divination rarely was reported in the journals of travellers and explorers from the previous generation and was "generally overlooked even by ethnologists among the northern hunting tribes where it assumes prominence." Speck felt the reason was that these ethnologists probably did not understand or speak the Innut language.

(1935,164)

At the time Speck was working, interest was shifting from observing aboriginal economies to learning how they worked. Speck was one of the first to argue that the fur trade had led to a radical change in how land was viewed by the Innut and other northern Algonkian peoples. He claimed that individual hunting territories had existed in pre-contact times. Tanner (1969) says that much of the later debate over Speck's work centred on this point. The opposing view was taken by people like Eleanor Leacock (1954), among others. She held that smaller, individualized territories were a product of a change in the relations of production introduced by the fur trade. Leacock spent some time among the Montagnais during the 1940s and 1950s and observed what she said was a trend towards private ownership of hunting resources. She quoted Tanner (1947) who maintained that the fur trade broke down existing family territories and brought in a new historical phase with less economic freedom for the Montagnais. Nevertheless, she said, "individualized hunting patterns moving

towards private 'ownership' are only beginning to replace co-operative patterns and communal ownership." (Leacock 1954,6)

Tanner and Leacock's assessment of the economic readjustment of Innut society has not proven itself over time. Other factors besides participation in the economy continue to guide Innut hunting patterns. As mentioned earlier, Innut hunters tend to identify themselves with specific parts of Nitassinan, but this relationship is not proprietorial. Individuals do not own the land in a Euro-Canadian legal sense.{8}

Leacock's analysis is based on the assumption that there are two competing and contradictory socio-economic patterns at work among the Innut. One is based on hunting for subsistence, the other is based on trapping fur, a practice introduced by the "dominant society. Historical changes in the region are seen as evidence of the gradual replacement of the first pattern by the second." (Tanner 1979,9) Tanner argues this process leads to the eventual acculturation of the Innut where trappers emulate their white counterparts and leave their families at home in order to more efficiently pursue their hunt along individualized

8. According to informants in Sheshatshiu, hunters identify themselves with the area in which they were born, but this does not mean they confine their hunting activities to these regions. Decisions about where to hunt depend on a number of factors including the presence of game of the last few seasons, the hunt formation, i.e., who is to lead, and other considerations. None of the hunters interviewed in 1987 identified any territory as "my land"; references to ownership were made using terms which implied a communal interest, such as "our land" or "Innut land".

traplines. The trapper uses mainly store bought food rather than relying on subsistence hunting.

While it is clear that the fur trade enterprise, as represented, for example, by the Hudson's Bay Company (H.B.C.), operates on the basis of the second, or capitalist mode of production, it is also clear that in organizing the trapping of raw fur by Indians, the H.B.C. adapted its capitalist methods so as to be able to interact with the Indian system of hunting production which was (and...still is) based on entirely different principles. (Tanner 1979,11)

Opposing Leacock, Tanner argues that production for the fur trade has not "led to private acquisition and accumulation of wealth." Instead, what has developed is a colonial situation in which the "the colonist's sector of the economy dominates over that of the colonized." As well, "each mode of production transforms and shapes the other so that the dominant mode itself is altered and comes to depend upon the subordinate mode, just as the other way around." (Tanner 1979,11) In Chapter I this was referred to as the articulation of different modes of production.

Whether or not the fur trade has "individualized" trapping is of secondary importance here. What Leacock describes could be seen as a form of dual economy where subsistence hunting and trapping came to be dominated by a mercantilist (and later capitalist) mode of production. What is important is the fact that Leacock and Tanner demonstrate the continued existence of the domestic mode of production, whatever its exact configuration. Its survival is further proof of cultural continuity and the adaptability of the Innut way of life, and should lay to rest the "vanishing Indian" argument.

Tanner's is only the most recent objection to the idea that family production units are a recent creation. Other ethnologists in Speck's time accepted the view that the family hunting territory was "very old indeed" and that there were no common hunts among the Innut. (Lips 1947b,2) Citing Hudson's Bay Company journals to substantiate his argument of the aboriginality of family hunting territories, Lips described Montagnais-Naskapi economy in the mid-1930s:

The trapping of game animals principally determines the economic life of these Indians. This form of hunting has the double advantage of providing meat and furs at the same time. The two products are equally important, since the furs are exchanged for vital supplies like flour, fat, tea, clothing, and important articles of equipment all of which serve toward making secure life and livelihood throughout the coming year in the woods. (Lips 1947a,388)

From this passage it is obvious that the Innut had become reliant on the fur trade as a means of acquiring some household goods and tools for the hunt. Part of their "traditional" round was therefore devoted to the fur hunt and travel out of the country to the trading posts of the fur companies. This journey, which many older informants in Sheshatshiu describe as long and difficult, inevitably reduced the time which the Innut could hunt caribou (especially since the prime trapping time and the best time for caribou hunting both occur in the late winter). However, Lips's account also indicates the Innut continued to live a nomadic existence in the 1930s. As well, the beliefs which guided the Innut life and hunt had not been fundamentally altered either by the relations of production introduced by the fur trade or the influence of missionaries in their country.

Nevertheless, Lips questioned whether trapping for the Bay had given the Innut a more secure existence. The replacement of wooden traps by steel reduced animal populations, a situation which continued to place the Innut in danger of starvation because non-native foodstuffs "are merely additions, seasonings, and supplements to the principal meat diet...." (Lips 1947a, 394)

Lips observed that the Innut organized the catching and killing of animals "in such a manner as to safeguard a certain amount of economic security." There were practical and ideological reasons for this: "It seemed to me that the Naskapi hunters regard themselves merely as servants of the chieftains of the game animals whose ceremonial prescriptions at the hunt they have to follow in order to safeguard their own livelihood." (Lips 1947a, 388-389)

By the end of the 1930s, the Innut domestic mode of production, although intact, was coming under increasing pressure. Game was dwindling and the price of fur on the world market was plummeting. In 1942, the HBC closed several of its unprofitable interior trading posts. Henceforth the Innut of Labrador would have to do their trading at either Northwest River or Davis Inlet.

These economic and environmental changes were influenced to a large extent by outside forces. Nevertheless, the Innut way of life adapted and survived, much as it had done since the beginning of contact with Europeans. The main conclusion of this chapter is that, no matter what changes occurred to the domestic

mode of production prior to the introduction of industrialization in their region, Innut culture was able to adapt.

While it is impossible to say exactly what the pre-contact Innut mode of production looked like, it is reasonable to assume that the society was based on a mobile pattern of subsistence hunting, fishing and trapping, and the most important animal was the caribou. The fur trade did not fundamentally change this because the needs of the traders could be adapted to the existing Innut mode of production.

In fact, the fur trade had a minimal impact at first on the Innut lifestyle. It was only with the advent of settlement in Labrador that the Innut first encountered direct pressure and competition in the form of Settler trappers moving into Innut territory. Settlement coincided with the first use of Sheshatshiu as a religious centre.

Once the region had been penetrated by the fur trade and missionaries, other outsiders followed. By the middle of the 19th Century, a new breed of adventurer was entering the previously "unexplored" wilds of Labrador. These adventurers brought out with them reports of the doomed and vanishing Innut. This perspective was common to an age which saw everywhere the relentless expansion of a technological society at the expense of more "backward" and "primitive" parts of the world. Ethnographers

and other observers of the time saw all historical actions of Native peoples as responses to European initiatives. {9}

In Labrador, this led to a debate over whether or not the fur trade had radically changed the Innut mode of production. By reading between the lines it is possible to see that, while they may disagree over detail, these conflicting anthropological perspectives manage at the same time to confirm the continued existence and adaptability of the Innut domestic mode of production.

The following chapter will deal with a major change that affected the Innut in the 1930s: the increase of government involvement in the region and the incorporation of Labrador into the international capitalist sphere of influence.

9. This perspective has also informed the thought of the modernist school of development theory in the latter half of the 20th Century.

Chapter IV

From the Top Down: The State and the Innut

This chapter will examine the rapid growth of the state in the lives of the Innut of Labrador, beginning in the 1930s and continuing to the present. It looks at Innut and Settler life before the Second World War, as well as changes in the regional economy since the construction of the Goose Bay airbase in 1942. It also examines the growth of Sheshatshiu and the official reasons for encouraging the Innut to "settle down" and send their children to school. As well, the chapter covers some of the criticisms of this policy of assimilation, looks at its effects on Innut lifestyle and presents evaluations of regional "development" by two different Newfoundland government commissions.

For two centuries Labrador was a colonial hinterland of Newfoundland and remained outside the view and interest of the government in far away St. John's. Traditionally, "government" in Labrador had been left in the hands of missionaries and traders. During the first decades of this century, the International Grenfell Association (IGA) operated not only as a medical service but provided many of the other social and educational functions that later came to be run by the state. (Zimmerly, 1975) As the economic and political situation of Newfoundland worsened throughout the 1920s, Labrador was the object of little official concern or attention.

Political corruption and financial mismanagement had led the Dominion of Newfoundland to the brink of bankruptcy by 1931. Money was desperately needed for relief. People were dying of beri-beri, tuberculosis, and diseases associated with malnutrition, and massive unemployment and destitution raised fears of civil disobedience. In 1932, to relieve part of its financial burden, the government tried to sell Labrador to Canada for \$100 million. The offer was rejected. (Rowe 1980,389) The negotiations had been carried on without asking the opinion of Labradorians. (Rowe 1980,489)

A Royal Commission was set up in 1933 to examine the future of Newfoundland. It recommended the suspension of the government and the creation of a Commission of Government responsible to the Dominions office of Great Britain. The Commission of Government was established the next year and the British government assumed responsibility for finances, promising to restore responsible government when things improved. However, the commission had little effect on the Newfoundland economy. Between 1934 and 1939, 25 to 30 per cent of the population was on relief, a stipend that amounted to six cents a day or \$1.50 a month (later increased to \$2.00 a month). (Rowe 1980,411-12)

One tangible accomplishment of the Commission of Government was the creation of the Newfoundland Ranger force to uphold the law in Labrador. (Zimmerly 1975,190-91) Like the RCMP in the Canadian Arctic, the Rangers not only acted as a police force, but also discharged a number of government responsibilities,

including distributing relief. Assistance was given to "able-bodied destitute men" and was treated

as a loan that had to be repaid immediately (in contrast to debts at the store) from the returns of the next hunt or catch. After repaying the Ranger for "loan-relief", hunters often had little or nothing left to trade at the store for the purchase of foodstuffs needed by their families. (Brice-Bennett 1986,10-11)

Before the Second World War, the economy of Labrador was based almost entirely on trapping, hunting and fishing. This domestic mode of production supported Innut, Inuit and Settlers alike. The Inuit and Settlers divided their time between trapping and fishing for cod and sealskin. The Innut did not participate in the fishery and thus their entire cash income depended on the acquisition of furs for trade, especially beaver.

This led to a situation in the mid-1930s where Innut activities ran counter to the rules of the Newfoundland government. In 1935, R.D. Fraser, an inspector with the Newfoundland Ranger Force, reported Settler claims "that a very unfair position exists with regard to the catching of beaver on the Labrador. It is argued that the Indians are rather at an advantage in being allowed to catch beaver, presumably for food purposes, while the native {1} and the white man are forbidden by law from doing so." (Fraser 1935a) Fraser wrote that the Indians

1 Many Labradorians use the term "native" to distinguish between those who were born there and outsiders or "CFAs" ("Come From Away"). Native is also used in the literature and government reports on Labrador to refer to white Labradorians, as opposed to Indians and Eskimos, who are referred to by those labels.

were taking beaver "for food" and selling the pelts across the border in Canada.

Following the settlement of the Labrador Boundary Dispute in 1927, the governments of Newfoundland and Canada sought to keep Indians from one jurisdiction from hunting in the other. Fraser reported his concerns about beaver "smuggling". The Innut of the Quebec and Labrador, of course, never recognized the existence of a border in the middle of Nitassinan.

During this period, the government of Newfoundland was beginning to take an interest in "developing" Labrador's resources. However, this interest extended only to coastal communities and peoples. Interest in the Innut of the interior would remain, until Confederation in 1949, practically non-existent.

Around the time of the boundary settlement, the Hudson's Bay Company secured economic dominance when the Moravian Mission in northern Labrador withdrew from the fur trade business which it had engaged in since the late 1700s. Accumulated debt and falling fur prices led the Mission to turn over its trade operation to the HBC for a 21-year term. In turn, the Company signed an agreement with the Newfoundland government accepting responsibility for providing public assistance "when necessary in return for the right to import all wares duty free to the Labrador communities." (Brice-Bennett 1986,6) This new arrangement did not end competition in the Labrador fur trade--

there were still a few smaller, independent traders operating-- but it did reinforce the Company's dominance in the field.

The Moravians supported the Company's intention to help as many trappers as possible pay off their debts and become more self-sufficient. The HBC lowered credit advances "which had the immediate effect of increasing interest in trapping". (Brice-Bennett 1986,7) This affected mainly the Inuit and Settlers who congregated near the trading posts and divided their time between trapping and cod and seal fishing; it did not affect the Innu whose pattern of hunting in the interior where fur-bearers remained plentiful "suited the Company's commercial interests and a policy of advancing credit only to successful trappers served to enforce the lifestyle." (Brice-Bennett 1986,6) Thus the Innu continued to have only limited contact with traders or other Labradorians, but their existence as simple commodity producers was bound firmly to the Company.

[M]uch of their traditional culture was preserved, although it was poorly understood by others. With furs as their only source of income, Innu families faced greater hardship than Inuit or Settlers when fur catches or market prices were low and/or game for food was scarce. (Brice-Bennett 1986,6)

During the 1920s and 1930s the world market price of fur declined relative to other goods. The advent of the Depression saw the price for cod and sealskin drop as well. During this period, Fraser was becoming increasingly concerned with the role of the HBC in the lives of the people of Labrador. "Without a question of a doubt Hudson's Bay Company are a great power in Labrador, a power it is feared which has not and is not making

the best possible return to the producer for his labour." Fraser made his feelings known in a report to his superiors.

It is further understood that the Company seldom, if ever, issue statements to individuals regarding their accounts. Prices charged are out of all proportion to what might be considered a reasonably fair profit. Cases have been reported where an individual often has to take, by pressure brought, the responsibility of debts contracted by members of his family long deceased. There is decided evidence of too much advantage being taken of the ignorance of the average native or settler. They seem to foster extravagance. They seldom, if ever, give cash for furs. In short, it is honestly considered that the power which they show evidence of having, whether it be legal or not, is far too great and is not making for the best possible condition which might exist were they without it. (Fraser 1935b)

Fraser's views are shared by another contemporary observer, Elizabeth Goudie, who was married to a trapper and lived alone in a small cabin in the country when her husband went out onto his trapline. In her autobiography, Goudie describes the circumstances that led to her family's decision to abandon their isolated existence on the north coast and move to Mud Lake, a tiny community near what is now Happy Valley/Goose Bay:

As each year went by we were a little more in debt. The Hudson's Bay Company was getting a bit more impatient with us.

In 1928, when we went to get our food again for the winter, the Hudson's Bay manager told us that if we could not pay off our bills that year, he would have to cut off our credit. Jim (her husband) said we would have to do something. We needed a lot of things when our fourth child was born in 1927. We were living in a house in Davis Inlet with another family that summer because Jim had a job with the Hudson's Bay for a little while.

...When Jim came out of the country the first time, he did very well with fur. We had to have food to eat and he put all he could against his bills. It was not enough.... (Goudie 1973,75)

The picture of Settler life in Labrador taken from individual and government accounts is one of solitariness and economic hardship. But the literature of the time is also replete with stories of how people helped each other and shared what they had. Except for periodic reports of "starving Indians", there are few references to the Innut, who were apparently outside the consciousness of writers and observers of the time. [Goudie (1973), Them Days (1987)]

As we have seen, economic and social circumstances were such that there had been and continued to be little pressure on the Innut to change their way of life. Their hunting and living patterns fit well with the needs of the Hudson's Bay Company, which remained the main link between the Euro-Canadian and Innut cultures. However, the Newfoundland government and other outside agencies looked upon the people of Labrador as poverty-stricken and, although the term was not then in use, "underdeveloped". The literature of the 1930s and 1940s reflects a gradual change in official attitudes towards the region and an increasing realization that there were things to be done there.

Although the terms differ, outside interests in improving the lot of Labradorians used to a large degree the rationalizations that would be applied later by the modernization school of development to the Third World. In the case of Labrador, the perceived backwardness and hardships were to be ameliorated through the introduction of health care, education and small-scale manufacturing. The domestic mode of

production would be ultimately replaced with easier and more efficient means of making a living. It was a classic case of development from the outside, a process which is further accentuated by the increasing role of government in the region. While they say life was hard, accounts by Settlers from the era before the Second World War contain few laments. People accepted the harshness as part of life, and the writings contain overtones of pride in the freedom their lifestyle permitted.

Still, the perception from the outside, aided by fund-raising campaigns for the Grenfell association, portrayed Labrador as a wild land of starvation and endless toil. (Zimmerly 1975) In the 1950s, similar stories of hardship would focus the attention of the state on the Inuit of the eastern Arctic and, in the name of charity, precipitate an influx of southern institutions and ideas.

Early Development Schemes

To understand the reasons for the expansion of the state in the lives of the Inuit, it is necessary to look at the growth of state influence in Labrador generally in the years leading up to the Second World War.

Numerous attempts to "develop" Labrador's people and economy since the turn of the century had met with little success. These included a private lumbering venture in the Hamilton Inlet area and projects sponsored by the International Grenfell Association. The IGA had been set up by Wilfred Grenfell to deliver health

services to isolated Labrador outposts and quickly became a major economic and social force in the region. Besides looking after people's physical (and often spiritual) needs it set up cooperative stores, lumber mills, a mortuary, craft programs, an orphanage, and portable libraries, as well as nursing homes and stations. It even imported a herd of 300 domesticated reindeer from Lapland complete with Lapp herders, but "this venture unfortunately failed due to poaching." (Zimmerly 1975,184)

Wilfred Grenfell was also responsible for starting a fur farm in Cartwright.{2}

In IGA-run boarding schools, Grenfell and his colleague, Dr. Harry Paddon, taught the work ethic. Their students were to be responsible for encouraging and developing Labrador people for the eventual take-over and control of their own future. This, of course, was not possible when all the people shared in a fish and fur 'one-crop' economy. Diversification was necessary and it was towards this end that the different Grenfell schemes were aimed. Cottage industries were encouraged under the Grenfell's "Industrial Division" in which women were taught various crafts they could make for marketing by the Grenfell Association in Canada and the United States. (Zimmerly 1975,189)

The development works of the IGA illustrate the approach taken by outsiders who felt they were working on behalf of Labradorians. Indeed, the IGA and the religious missions were responsible for many good works, improved health care being the

2 Clarence Birdseye began operating the farm in 1913. "Birdseye's venture was short-termed for after spending a few winters in the extreme cold of Cartwright he accidentally discovered the process of quick-freezing of meat and vegetables. Returning to the United States he turned this discovery into the multi-million dollar business that bears his name, Birdseye Frosted Foods." (Zimmerly 1975,186)

most obvious. However, their operations were carried out with a colonial attitude and often an arrogance that assumed the people of Labrador were incapable of looking after themselves. These attitudes appear repeatedly in government reports and other literature documenting the increasing influence of outside authorities, including the church, private charitable operations, and industrial corporations, as well as the state. It is an attitude that continues to inform the way in which these bodies deal with the Innut.

J.D. House (1980) refers to the growth of outside control as "incorporation" and says in Labrador it has had two forms: moral or missionary incorporation, in which churches attempted to "civilize" Labradorians (Settlers, Inuit and Innut alike), and state-sponsored incorporation. "Incorporation is the process whereby the local population is incorporated into, made a part of, the social institutions that characterize the dominant society." (House 1980,100) {3} The combinations of these forms of incorporation led to the development of underdevelopment in Labrador.

The concept of incorporation should be distinguished from acculturation and assimilation "in which native societies become indistinguishable from the dominant society. Although Labrador's Native peoples have become incorporated into dependency upon the master institutions of the larger society, they have successfully

3 While these forms of internal incorporation were proceeding, Labradorians were also being incorporated into world markets through credit extended by fur trading companies.

resisted assimilation and acculturation--and have been made to suffer for that resistance." (House 1980,100)

The process of state-sponsored incorporation began during the Depression. The Commission of Government saw developing land as a way to alleviate the colony's financial and unemployment problems. A promising area would be selected and unemployed fishermen would be transformed into farmers. (Rowe 1980) In Labrador, this desire to develop the region and people led to a number of unique projects.

The Rangers had been surveying the prospects for economic diversification for a number of years. In 1937, the Department of Natural Resources supported an American entrepreneur's plans to set up a reindeer farm. A grazing concession of one million acres was granted to F.S. Lawrence of the Explorers Club of New York to provide a range for 1,000 reindeer to be imported into Labrador beginning in 1938. The herd was to increase by 1,000 animals every year for 15 years to a total of 15,000.

Departmental support was given to the project in order to "permit the development of enterprises within the Colony of Newfoundland and its Dependencies which will utilize its natural resources and lead to the creation of new industry." (Anonymous 1937) The official record is silent concerning the outcome of the project.

A couple of years later, the Newfoundland government was encouraged by Finnish geographer Vaino Tanner to set up colonies in the south of Labrador. In a memo to the government dated September 4, 1939, Tanner wrote that the soil in the south was

favourable to dairy farming and would encourage other development, as well as contribute significantly to government revenues. Dairy farming could be combined with other occupations, such as lumbering, and growing vegetables, potatoes and hay. "It seems to me as though the total area available for colonization is considerable. But the first colonization should be centralized around certain small units (model groups). This is favourable for the development of commercial and co-operative efforts." (Tanner 1939,3) The plan called for the government to provide "instructors and support", but the Commission of Government found the \$30,000 cost prohibitive and suggested the plan be reviewed a year later. (Commission of Government 1939) There is no information in the file to indicate whether or not Tanner's ideas were ever reconsidered. Nevertheless, his rational, scientific solutions for the massive problems of unemployment and underdevelopment of the day presaged the approach that would be taken by government authorities in the region over the next generation.

The depression and the collapse of responsible government in Newfoundland combined to make life in Labrador precarious during the 1930s. For the Innut, who depended on fur to obtain the credit they needed to outfit themselves for another year of trapping, a continual decline in the price of their commodity meant they had to work harder, and cover more territory, in order to earn the same amount of money. On the coast, the declining

market for cod, sealskin and fur combined to reduce many Inuit and Settlers to penury.

In 1940 the Moravian Mission board called on the Newfoundland government to do something about economic conditions of the northern coast, which it described as "nearly approaching the point of desperation." The board wrote:

For a considerable period of years the poverty of the Eskimos has been a regular feature in the reports of the missionaries, who, with so much distress before their eyes, have contributed large sums out of their own pockets to aid the sufferers. They cannot continue such contributions indefinitely. ...[T]he Eskimos are not only increasingly poverty-stricken but are losing the means they require (and formerly possessed) to lift themselves out of their poverty." (Moravian Mission Board, 1940)

There is little official mention of the Innut at this time. However, one account describes how the Indians of the region had become "lazy", were prone to making beer out of molasses, and no longer wore deerskin clothes because it was more lucrative to sell the skins to traders. (Green 1942) The writer concludes with a comment on previous attempts to develop the Innut and Inuit:

The ~~future~~ of the natives of Labrador depends upon the degree of assistance given them in developing the natural resources of their country for their advancement. Not only are many present methods poor, but equipment and suitable markets are also lacking.... (Green 1942, 62)

By 1940, the lifestyle of the Innut who traded at Northwest River had two well-defined components: The people were in the country from September to June and stayed near the post during the summer to trade, visit and rest. Some also came out to the post at Christmas. The average Innut family journey inland was 200 to 250

miles. The head of the family left early in the morning by canoe to find a new camping spot. He cached some of his gear there and returned to his family to eat. The next day the entire group travelled to the new campsite by canoe or komatik (a sledge). The average distance between campsites was about 10 miles. (Mailhot et Michaud 1965,14-15)

From this short description, it is possible to see that the Innut continued to live what observers have called a "traditional" existence, although it has been noted that by this point the old forms of the collective caribou hunt had been replaced and the people travelled in smaller, family units to hunt and trap. (Mailhot et Michaud 1965,29) Still, their lives continued to be guided by the domestic mode of production.

In 1942 the HBC announced plans to close its unprofitable posts in Hopedale, Nain, Nutak, Hebron and Davis Inlet. (Brice-Bennett 1986,12) The first four were Settler-Inuit communities; the latter was where the Naskapi Innut came to trade. When the post closed, the Innut were told by their priest, Fr. O'Brien, to make Northwest River their trading centre because he would not be visiting Davis Inlet the following year. (Foote 1942)

The closings prompted government action. The Commission of Government formed a new division in the Department of Natural Resources called the Northern Labrador Trading Operations (NLTO) "and gave it a mandate to carry on trade at stores along the coast, and to initiate programmes aimed at the economic and social rehabilitation of the region." Within a year the NLTO had

"laid the groundwork for a virtual 'economic revolution' in the Inuit communities along the coast." The changes included setting up a sawmill in Nain, providing equipment for fishing operations, including boats and salting boxes, and increasing the scale of relief. The government was offering people a choice between two ways of earning a living: codfishing or wage-employment at the sawmill. Able-bodied men were denied assistance if work was available. (Brice-Bennett 1986,12-13)

After the HBC closed its Davis Inlet post, the Newfoundland government took over trade and assumed responsibility for the welfare of the population. (Henriksen 1973,14) Thus the Naskapi who traded there were the first Labrador Innut to come into regular, direct contact with government agents. In the early 1940s, Ranger Inspector Walter Rockwood reported that about 140 Innut used the area between Nain and Davis Inlet, and that many arrived to trade "in a starving condition, because of scarcity of deer and other game." (Rockwood 1943,35)

[T]he inland fox hunt was a blank this year, and deer were unobtainable until March or April. The Indians remained on the coast and were employed in cutting firewood and logs, as well as making short hunting trips in land for thirty or forty miles. (Rockwood 1943,36)

Rockwood had some strong opinions about the way relief should be given to the Innut. He objected to it being dispensed by the priest who visited Davis Inlet and then charged back to the Department of Natural Resources.

[I]f the Government must pay for assistance year after year, I can see no reason why the administration of such cannot be left completely in the hands of its

representatives, who are just as sincere in their efforts to help the Indians, that is really help them, as the representative of the church who makes a short visit to them each year, and in addition knows conditions and needs far better. Also if Government is to pay the bill the added prestige of issuing such Assistance should go to its representatives rather than to the representative of any church. The priest visiting the Indians see [sic] them at their best, but the Government Representative sees, living as they do on the coast all year round, both sides of the story. (Rockwood 1943, 37)

Besides his concern for state control over assistance, Rockwood also suggested what could be done about the "Indian problem", which was "more acute and more difficult of solution than that of the Eskimos". As he saw it, the government had a choice: it could "see that the Indians obtain a livelihood [sic] by leading the nomadic life of their forefathers" or "settle them on the coast" where they would learn to fish like Eskimos and Settlers.

To live the "life of their forefathers", Rockwood wrote, would require that the Indians spend most of their time inland hunting and "in no case be permitted to loiter around." However, this government administrator believed that the days of nomadism were numbered. "My opinion is that sentimental, as well as scientific reasons enter in the choice, because such a picture of the Indians recalls 'Wild West' and other Indian tales, read in boyhood days. All evidence points to the fact that the deer herd has so dwindled that such a purely nomadic life is no longer possible." In rejecting "sentimentality", Rockwood chooses assimilation, which would be the preferred option of government for at least the next 30 years.

Rockwood commented on the debate over the merits of settling Indians in coastal communities. He rejected the claim that they "will die off rapidly if forced to remain on the coast.... It is true that they are gradually dying out, but whether the cause is to be found in the fact that too much time is spent on the coast, I cannot say." (Rockwood 1943,37) He also rejected the idea that living in houses would be unhealthy; on the contrary, health would improve. "Such homes would only be for winter use, and tents could be used in summer."

Living in tents, with scanty, unsuitable clothing, no bed clothes or sleeping robes, no clothing to change after getting wet, and wet feet day in and day out for months on an end, must be a tremendous strain on the Indian's endurance, and it is little wonder that they are susceptible to epidemics and affected by tuberculosis. This life would be bearable in summer but in winter with the temperature twenty or thirty degrees below zero, or even colder, it is a different matter. (Rockwood 1943,38)

It is reasonable to assume that Innut had been drying their own feet for thousands of years. Rockwood's impressions, whatever they are based upon, say more about the uncomfortableness of a "civilized" man when confronted with people living on the "frontier" than they do about the Innut. Nevertheless, the attitude that the Innut were doomed as a people and that their only hope for the future was assimilation, or at least a substantial modification to their culture and lifestyle, prevailed in those days. Similar ideas can also be found in the literature produced by development theorists in the early post-war years who believed the only way newly independent countries could "progress" was to "modernize", in effect, "become like us."

Like many government administrators in other parts of the Canadian North, Rockwood's training taught him to believe that assimilation of the Innut as soon as possible was the only solution to the enormous problems he saw everywhere in their society. Likewise, the Newfoundland government looked to its development schemes, as far-fetched as they might now seem, as ways to improve the lives of people in Labrador.

In the years leading up to the Second World War, the Newfoundland government became increasingly desperate to find ways to ameliorate the poverty of most of Labrador's residents and thus staunch the flow of relief money from its own over-extended treasury. As we have seen, it had very limited success in creating an industrial base that would provide a consistent source of wage employment. When it arrived, industrial development came in an unanticipated form--the construction of a large airbase at Goose Bay in 1942.

This project served primarily a military function but it was an economic watershed for Labrador, changing the dominant mode of production from domestic to industrial. Many people were eager to participate in this mode of production because it seemed like a more secure way to make a living. The base became the single most important source of industrial activity in central Labrador and began a series of changes, the effects of which are still being felt. It was a harbinger of a new kind of colonial status which, nearly 50 years later, the Innut are struggling to shed.

The Development of Goose Bay

Central Labrador was incorporated into the strategic planning of both Canada and the United States early in the Second World War. The United States would not be officially at war until December, 1941, but earlier that year it formed the Permanent Joint Board on Defence with Canada. Under that agreement, Canada undertook to build an airbase in Labrador. The United States also signed an agreement with Great Britain which granted it 99-year leases to several bases in Newfoundland. (Neary 1986,39)

In the summer of 1941 both countries sponsored survey missions on the Labrador coast and into Hamilton Inlet looking for a suitable site on which to build an airbase to serve the Atlantic Ferry Command. Both chose the same location: the 12 square mile sandy plateau that is now Goose Bay. (LeBreton 1986,3; Eyre 1981,114) Goose Bay had excellent year-round flying weather and access to the sea. The base would be used to ferry war material produced in the United States to Britain, as well as enhance regional anti-submarine defence and provide support for the Battle of the Atlantic (the Northern Staging Route through Baffin Island, Greenland and Iceland was added later). (Neary 1986,39) Newfoundland gave Canada a 99-year lease on the property.

In his survey report, USAF Capt. Elliot Roosevelt (son of the American president) commented on the people, environment and living conditions in the area:

Psychological: ...The Hudson Bay Company (sic) dominates the whole territory, keeping most of the

population in dire poverty by charging outrageous prices for the bare necessities of living and paying minimum prices for furs and skins.... The people are friendly and cooperative and harbour no ill feeling against (sic) either the United States or Canada.

Economic: Labrador imports the necessities of living with the exception of what can be obtained by hunting and fishing. Farming is non-existent except for a few small garden patches. Food products, textiles, petroleum products, building materials with the exception of wood, (and) steel, iron, and machinery all come from the outside. The Hudson Bay Company (sic) has a virtual monopoly on all trading....

...Health conditions are good amongst the whites and breeds,... A high rate of tuberculosis exists amongst the Indians. The Indians are rapidly dying out.

...Practically speaking very little labor exists. All natives are good carpenters and can be useful as sailors or day laborers. Not a sufficient number of men live in all Labrador to provide enough labor for a single airport's construction. It is believed that little dependence should be placed on available labor in Labrador. (Them Days 1987,16-17)

Construction began in September 1941. Crews worked around the clock and by December a rough runway had been completed and the first plane had landed. (Zimmerly 1975,230) The military complex included an ocean harbour and three 7,000-foot runways. By the following spring the base was operating as an RCAF station. The United States Air Force began construction of additional facilities to support the 8th Air Force in 1942 and the Americans moved in the next year. (LeBreton 1986,4-5)

Zimmerly writes that the settlers were "astonished and bewildered at all the noise in what had been their quiet domain." (1975,231) However, many abandoned trapping for jobs that paid the highest wages they had ever known. Issac Rich was one of them:

We knew that they were goin' to build the Base here and they did want a few men for surveyin' in the beginning so I was one of them that got the job. It was beginning to be a dark outlook for the future if this war was goin' to carry on like it was, and the price of fur was goin' down, so we grabbed the chance and took the job. (Them Days 1987,31)

Over the next couple of years many people began to realize that the base was going to stay after the war and that its presence meant permanent changes to their lifestyle.

"...(I)nstead of gettin' only a canoe or gun, we might get a new home out of it. We might even get a better future out of it and change our way of living that we don't have to go back to the hardships of really livin' off the country any more...." (Them Days 1987,32)

A large number of settlers and Inuit from the north coast migrated to Goose Bay looking for work. A parcel of land outside the military reserve was chosen as the site for a new community. The first incarnation of Happy Valley was as a collection of tents and shacks made out of discarded lumber which eventually took on a more permanent look. As in 1942, the town that exists today relies almost totally upon activity at the airbase for its survival.

At first the settlers worked at the base during the summer and continued to trap during the winter. Fur prices improved after the war, but many who chose to remain working for wages rather than return to trapping. (Zimmerly 1975,237) During the war, the base employed about 100 Labradorians and around 500 outside personnel. (Zimmerly 1975,242)

The settlers adapted well to the wage-labour work conditions although they didn't like "working by the clock." Employment of Naskapi/Montagnais Indians was almost nil. "The contractors tried to hire them to work without much success. They would work a couple of days then drift away." Eskimos were hired too, but

their numbers were always small with a large turnover rate. (Zimmerly 1975,237-38)

Innut informants say no one told them about plans for a massive construction project at Goose Bay. In 1941-42, they simply came out of the country to discover the base was there. One man said they had no idea what was happening. (Sebastien Penunsi, interview, August 4, 1987) At that time, the Innut were much less interested in wage employment than the Settlers.

While the Department of National Defence has no record of how many Innut worked at the base during its construction (Walker 1987), some informants put the number at "around 20". One reported that he and 16 other Innut were employed as labourers building houses on the base. "Indians didn't have jobs, so the government told them to work there. They worked to buy the supplies they needed." (Simeo Penashue, interview, August 11, 1987)

The Innut labourers worked in gangs under white foremen. Language was a problem since few Innut spoke English. However, some of the Settlers in the construction gangs no doubt spoke some Inueimun. One has described relations between the two groups:

All the old Indian fellers used to work with me.... I been not workin' for so long now that I forgets most their names. They was a nice gang, wonderful good gang of men to work with. They didn't find the work hard and they liked it. We ate in the cookhouse and the trucks used to bring the Indians back and forth to North West River when they'd get the gravel. (Them Days 1987,42)

Innut men also worked clearing brush, both at Goose Bay and at another U.S. military installation at Northwest Point, a couple of kilometres from what is now Sheshatshiu. A few women also

worked in the base laundry--"but not many". (Mary Ann Selma, interview, August 4, 1987) Employed women were the exception rather than the rule. Some female informants said they were frightened of the military and did not go near the base.

Zimmerly states that "differences in wage-labor adaptability between the Indians, Eskimos and settlers is easily accounted for by previous exposure to these working conditions...." (1975, 239) This is probably only partly true. Certainly, the Innut had less experience with wage labour than the settlers who often worked odd jobs and part-time for the Hudson's Bay Company or the Grenfell Association, or the Inuit who occasionally worked for the Moravian Mission. Nevertheless, it is clear that some Innut did choose to accept wage employment in a time of poor fur prices as a source of cash which they could use to outfit themselves to return to the country. Wage employment may have been used to augment earnings made as simple commodity producers, but the lives of the Innut still centred on the domestic mode of production.

Carol Brice-Bennett says other cultural factors must be taken into account when discussing aboriginal experiences with wage labour. Besides facing a language barrier, the Innut and Inuit "were bound by their cultures and history to their homelands and to complex kinship relations that put a premium on communalism expressed by food-sharing, cooperative hunting and other practices." By contrast, the Settler culture that had developed in the previous century stressed individuality and self-reliance. The Innut homeland was also in the interior and, although they

travelled out to trade, they had only minimal contact with the Settlers. As well, the Innut and Inuit employed at the base shared a common experience: "they were the majority population in their homelands but a minority, even compared to Settlers, in the new community." (Brice-Bennett 1986,15)

The base became a magnet which drew outsiders to central Labrador and within a year ensured the Innut would become a permanent minority in their own land.

The Royal Canadian Air Force continued to maintain Goose Bay on its own after the war, and the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1948 guaranteed its survival as an important military facility. In 1949, the civilian payroll was just over \$1 million; by 1951 it had risen to \$4 million. (Them Days 1987,188) The local economy experienced a second boom.

In 1951^{*} the USAF began construction of the Melville Long Range Radar site which, along with Saglek Bay and Hopedale, formed the "Pine Tree Line". This meant further opportunities for wage labour. However, Henriksen says the Naskapi Innut of Davis Inlet, which was about a day north by dog sled from Hopedale, "never took advantage of it [wage labour] although they knew about it."

(1973,14) The radar site construction "boom" lasted until 1956 and the effect on the Inuit of the coast was similar to that which other military developments have had on Inuit in parts of the Canadian Arctic. "The construction phase activated the movement of individuals and families looking for a cash income from wage-

paying jobs or for valued material goods available at the sites." (Brice-Bennett 1986,29).

A missionary of the day wrote that wage labour was transforming the Inuit "'from an isolated, independent, self-contained race into a semi-dependent labouring class'". While people were financially better off, a higher cost of living eliminated the gains and tied people to the wage economy. (Brice-Bennett 1986,30) As we shall see, dependence was also increasing for the Inuit even though they were not drawn into the wage economy as far as the Inuit.

In 1952 Canada signed a 20-year contract with the United States that gave the Americans control over one part of the Goose Bay airfield, which it shared with a Canadian airport. The Americans undertook extensive additional construction so that the base eventually supported 12,000 military personnel and dependents. At the same time Happy Valley was growing as a support community which, by 1951 had a population of just over 600 people. Besides the Canadian and American personnel, a detachment from Britain was also stationed at Goose Bay.

Eventually, Goose Bay became an important part of the U.S. Strategic Air Command. Locked in the Cold War conflict, NATO looked to such installations to act as forward staging areas for strategic bombers in the event of war with the Soviet Union. But by the early 1970s, intercontinental ballistic missiles had replaced long-range bombers as the primary nuclear threat and Goose Bay's strategic importance began to wane. The contract with

the United States expired in 1972 and control of all base facilities was turned over to the Canadian government in 1976.

The withdrawal of thousands of Americans was a severe blow to the regional economy. But a recovery of sorts began in 1979 when Canada signed its first bilateral low-level flying agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany. Subsequent agreements with Great Britain and the Netherlands, as well as a proposal to turn Goose Bay into a NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, have renewed local optimism that the economy, tied as it is to military development, will once more rebound.

The Post-War Role of the State

For years, the most powerful institutions in Labrador had been the fur trading houses, especially the Hudson's Bay Company; later, the HBC shared influence over people's lives with the International Grenfell Association. Then, after Confederation in 1949, there was a massive increase in the role of the state in Labrador. Government agencies took over the distribution of social assistance payments, improved health care, transportation and communication, built housing and launched other construction projects.

While this has meant higher material standards of living and security for local people, it has also imposed severe costs upon them. Through community resettlement and compulsory formal education, native Indians, Inuit, and Settlers have had to forego their dispersed, migratory settlement patterns, and this has undermined their old subsistence-commercial economic adaptation.
(House 1980,101)

Government paternalism has also failed to generate development in the region and has led to conditions of under-development. The emergence of state-sponsored incorporation has led to rapid and dramatic change for the Inuit through the construction of a permanent community at Sheshatshiu, the expansion of schooling and health care, and the creation of consumption patterns based on southern models. (House 1980,104)

When Newfoundland became part of Canada, Indians and Inuit were not given "special status", as has been the case in other provinces; rather, they were to be treated by government like other Newfoundlanders. The federal Indian Act did not apply to them and, unlike most other Canadian Indians, they could vote.

The Indian Act was under revision at the time of Confederation, and a revised Act was passed in 1951. No mention was made of its application (or non-application) within the province of Newfoundland; however, because of the enfranchisement of natives that had already occurred, the Act was not enforced. (Budget 1984,39)

Early relations between Ottawa and St. John's were dominated by incessant negotiations over who was to pay for services to Native communities.

The result for Labrador Indians was an administration characterized by "indifference and lethargy," according to one government agent..., but one that aspired to be "a vigorous Health, Education and Welfare program to fit (the Indian) for the Society of the future...." During the period 1949-69 much of the groundwork was laid for the conflicts between the Montagnais-Naskapi and government today. (Budget 1984,38)

House argues that government programs, rather than creating development, do just the opposite.

To promote development, government programmes would have to stimulate local entrepreneurship and capital accumulation in economic sectors which, in the long term, could potentially achieve an internal dynamic of growth, whether through resource exploitation or local manufacturing. But this is exactly what most government programs do not do. On the contrary, they tend to block capital accumulation within the local region and to stifle local entrepreneurship or channel it into nonproductive directions. The role that Labrador Services Division has played is crucially of this type. (House 1980,106)

At Confederation, the province inherited the Northern Labrador Trading Operations (NLTO), which ran trading posts taken over from the HBC in 1942 and dispensed relief in Native communities (several were Inuit and one, Davis Inlet, was Innut). In 1951, NLTO was transferred to the Department of Public Welfare from Natural Resources and its name was changed to the Division of Northern Labrador Affairs (DNLA). "The rationale given was that 'dealing with the [Native] people was not a matter of trading in the first place, but rather it was a matter of welfare.'" (Budgel 1984,41) From this point on the state begins to increasingly dominate the lives of the Innut.

There is a striking parallel here with what was happening to Native people in other parts of the North at approximately the same time. The expansion of the welfare state and government services followed official evaluations of the "Native problem", based on the idea that the domestic mode of production was no longer tenable.{4}

4 "Canadian awareness of the indigenous people in the North developed rapidly during [1939-45] and the government has attempted to draw these people into the overall Canadian society by embarking upon massive programmes of education, housing and

The head of the DNLA summed up the prevailing administrative and, indeed, public attitude towards the future of Native people:

[T]he Eskimos and Indians cannot continue to exist as isolated minorities but must ultimately be integrated into the general body of our Society. A vigorous program in Welfare and Education, particularly the latter, is required to match the health program already underway, and to prepare these minorities for the Society of the future. (DNLA 1956,73)

However, the government of Newfoundland did not feel solely responsible for this work. Since Confederation, the federal government had paid for some of the programs for Native people in the province. In 1954, the governments signed two agreements which resolved the constitutional question of responsibility for Native people. In one agreement, the federal government recognized that it was 90% responsible and agreed to contribute \$200,000 over five years towards two-thirds of the cost for capital expenditures on education and welfare in Inuit communities, and all of the cost for capital expenditures in Innut communities. Under the terms of a second agreement on health, the federal government agreed to cover all medical costs for Inuit and Innut over a ten-year period, as well as launch an intensive campaign against tuberculosis then epidemic in the region. (Brice-Bennett 1986,35)

This Federal-Provincial Agreement covered six Inuit-Settler communities on the north coast as well as the Innut community of Davis Inlet. The Innut of Northwest River did not come under its

health." (Brody 1975,33) [Brody takes the quotation from D.K. Thomas and C.T. Thompson (1972) Eskimo Housing as Planned Social Change.]

terms until 1956. Two years later DNLA opened an office "for the supervision of the Indians there". (Annual Report 1959,113) The Indian Agent who worked out of the Northwest River office administered welfare services and the housing program which gradually emerged once transfer payments began under the Federal-Provincial Agreement.

The state entered the lives of the Innut in the areas of housing, health, education, and economic development. The first three were crucial to the fourth. Without proper housing and the health improvements which, it was presumed, would follow, and without the education that would teach Native people to think like Euro-Canadians, there was little possibility of "rehabilitating" them and making them into "productive" citizens. In short, without all these elements they would not be able to participate in the wage labour economy that was gaining ascendancy in Labrador. It is important to note that while efforts in all of these areas took place simultaneously, there was no master plan for the Innut.

We will now examine the effects that state-sponsored housing, education and economic development have had on the Innut.{5}

i) Housing: During the 1950s, the Newfoundland government launched a program of resettlement and industrialization. Small, isolated coastal communities were consolidated into larger centres

5 The place of health care in the process of incorporation, as well as the question of health and self-determination, will be taken up in Chapter VI.

where, it was argued, it would be easier to provide health, transportation and other services. Larger communities would also provide a labour pool for industry. Similar programs were initiated in Labrador, and the government came to regard the resettlement and sedentarization of the Innuit as a key to their eventual "rehabilitation". Agreements with the federal government provided the province with new sources of capital, and the housing program for the Innuit and Inuit fit into the resettlement program then underway in the province. (Brice-Bennett 1986,35)

In 1956, DNLA tried to get the Naskapi Innuit of Davis Inlet to move south to Northwest River. "The rationale for such a move has been, and is, that it would be easier and cheaper to provide the Naskapi with education and medical attention there. It would also speed up the process of assimilation." The Naskapi were promised jobs if they moved. Seventeen families made the journey but found no wage work in Northwest River and returned to Davis Inlet. (Henriksen 1973,115)

In 1956, an Innu man at Northwest River built the first home in what is now Sheshatshiu. The government became involved the following year when two more houses were built. Another four homes were constructed in 1958, five in 1959, and two in 1961. (Budgel 1984,45) Individuals were required to supply their own labour and were not paid for their work. The government supplied all the building material except for sills and framing. "It should be noted that only those who are prepared to make an effort to help themselves are receiving assistance from the Department." (DNLA

1958,124) Enthusiastic government officials felt living in houses was going to give the Innut an entirely different outlook on life. "The Indians, who until recently lived in tents all the year round, and never dreamed of owning their own homes, are now becoming house conscious." (DNLA 1959,124) The first houses measured 20 feet by 24 feet by eight feet. The government wanted to "awaken a desire on the part of the Indian to own a home, and that once this is acquired he will have a homeowner's pride in it." (DNLA 1959,125)

Housing construction stopped in the early 1960s because of a lack of federal money. In 1965, a new Federal-Provincial Agreement was signed and another 51 houses were built over the next four years. In 1967, only eight Sheshatshiu Innut families were still living in tents year round. (DNLA 1967,235)

In the late 1960s, the provincial government built a new townsite for the Davis Inlet Innut and people began moving into houses. At this time the government still believed firmly in the benefits of housing: "No doubt there will be a vast improvement in health and living conditions." (DNLA 1968,227)

However, doubts began to surface when a 1972 report on Davis Inlet found the new houses to be "'poorly built, not inspected... All houses collect ice in the ceiling and start leaking in the spring. Air vents were not put in [but were] discarded... This winter some people moved back to tents, as the houses were too hard to heat.'" (Budgel 1984,46)

Another continuing health problem was a lack of clean drinking water. Wells were not drilled in Northwest River until 1967. In fact, the combination of bad water and poorly insulated homes continues to be blamed for a high incidence of disease among residents of Sheshatshiu. (Monica Nui, interview, August 6, 1987)

More than half a million dollars was spent in the two Innut communities between 1965 and 1970 for this "improved" housing.

ii) Education: In keeping with the official philosophy of integration and assimilation of Native people in Labrador, once the Innut started to settle in communities, the government began putting their children in the Euro-Canadian education system. "Education is the key, and there is ample evidence, that, given the proper training, Eskimos and Indians can undertake any of the occupations and professions in our present society." (DNLA 1957,79)

Until the late 1950s, the government was content to let the Oblate missionaries handle Innut education. The Oblates began teaching in Northwest River and Davis Inlet in 1953. (Budgel 1984,46) In 1959, a two-room school was completed on the Innut side at Northwest River and, an official reported, education would now begin "in earnest". (DNLA 1959,126) The state had the power to coerce parents who did not like the idea of a foreign education for their children. Many older people in Sheshatshiu recall being

told by their priest that if they did not send their children to school they would lose their family allowance payments.

Education was identified as a means of "developing" the Innut and preparing them for wage employment. Although there was widespread support for the idea of "schooling", some observers worried about the relevance of the foreign curriculum. (McGee 1961) However, the government officials of the day felt their's was a long-term project.

The Indians must be taught the 3 R's, and will also need vocational training, but it would be naive to think that this will automatically solve all the problems overnight. As with the Indians elsewhere there are deeply rooted psychological attitudes to be overcome before the process of integration is complete. (DNLA 1960,116)

Moreover, the Innut could be forgiven if they felt they were getting mixed messages from the authorities since, at the same time the government was encouraging settlement and compulsory education for children, its ideas on economic development included the retention of certain "traditional" aspects of life.

[T]he school year should be adjusted so that the children can accompany their parents in the country during the time of the year when for health and economic reasons such excursions are most beneficial. In this way, too, they will be able to retain their culture and learn traditional skills such as canoeing and hunting. (DNLA 1960,116)

Director Rockwood felt either this solution, or building dormitories for the students while their parents were in the country, was the best way for Innut children to learn. "However by being exposed to two kinds of education, one at school and the other on the land, Innu children would have their lives divided

by two cultures and their future as adults complicated by choices between aspects of the Innu and Euro-Canadian lifestyle." (Brice-Bennett 1986,42) By 1987, the school year had not been officially altered to accommodate families who took their children into the country, although the school administration in Sheshatshiu no longer formally penalized students who are absent during this time--they simply fell behind their contemporaries who remained all year in the village. It was not surprising then that many young people had difficulty deciding which culture they belonged to. (Paul Rich, interview, August 21, 1987)

Innut children went to school on the Settler side of Northwest River until an elementary school was constructed in their village in the late 1960s. Around that time, the head of DNLA was claiming a major educational success when "two Indian boys" entered high school in St. John's. (DNLA 1969,197)

iii) Economic Development: All forms of state-sponsored incorporation can be seen as laying the foundation for the Innut to participate in the capitalist mode of production. It is interesting to note, however, that the availability of military construction work was not seen by the authorities as a permanent boon to the economy, or the people who got work on the various projects. The head of the DNLA was referring to the radar site at Hopedale when he wondered "whether a worse dislocation of the economy will result at its termination and the men [are] forced to return to the fisheries." (DNLA 1953,82) Although the Innut were

not involved in this project, the task, in the eyes of the government administration, was to find something for them to be involved in.

Fur trapping alone could no longer sustain either aboriginal or Euro-Canadian trappers. Pelts that had brought in \$15 to \$30 "in good years" now averaged \$1. (DNLA 1956,71) In 1942-43, the combined value of fur and sealskins taken in Labrador was over \$24,000. Earnings plummeted the following year before rising to \$46,500 in 1945-46. But fur never earned as much again, and by 1958-59 the region's trappers were earning barely \$8,000 a year altogether. (DNLA 1959,130) By 1966 DNLA no longer considered fur to be economically important.

Nevertheless, there was some understanding on the part of government administrators of the importance of hunting and trapping to the Innut way of life. Since trapping could no longer provide the Innut with enough money to purchase supplies to outfit themselves for the country, the government agreed to help. Assistance programs would also help the representatives of the state manage the lives of the Innut. In fact, the Department of Social Services has replaced the Hudson's Bay Company as the main source of credit.

Rockwood believed the Innut were living in "an economic vacuum" (DNLA 1959,126) and that something had to be done. Besides falling fur prices, a sharp decline in the number of caribou and the fear of starvation had kept many families out of the interior for several years. For this reason, many more people than usual

were spending all their time around Davis Inlet and Northwest River, passing the days by consuming "home brew". (Brice-Bennett 1986,39)

Under these circumstances, the DNLA retreated from the notion that to survive the Innut must become wage labourers. New ideas were advanced "aimed at reviving trapping and hunting activities in the interior" and airlifting supplies for the Innut in their camps. (Brice-Bennett 1986,39) The airlift was designed to permit people to remain longer in the country and thus, it was hoped, acquire more fur. In the spring and fall of 1958, supplies for groups of Innut from Davis Inlet were dropped off at Mistastin Lake. "Officials hoped the group would get some furs and more caribou than if they had remained around Davis Inlet but the main purpose of the programme was 'the psychological effect on the Indians, and to remove them from the temptation of brewing.'" The department also airlifted a group of six Sheshatshiu Innut, plus supplies for three months to Marie Lake, about 120 miles inland.

Other DNLA proposals to encourage a revival of trapping included setting up caches at strategic points inland, providing the Innut with portable radios so they could call for help in emergencies, and developing beaver preserves.{6}

[A]ll these programmes were an attempt to rationalize the traditional Innu harvesting economy by introducing technology (aircraft) and organizing resources (food caches, beaver preserves) so that Innu could gain greater benefit from industries that were compatible with their native culture. This approach to Innu

6 A similar plan had been suggested by Ranger R.D. Fraser in 1935. (Fraser 1935a)

'rehabilitation' generally had positive results whereas attempts at influencing Innu to adopt foreign cultural or economic practices on a course of integration rarely succeeded. (Brice-Bennett 1986,40)

Government officials also were beginning to recognize the debilitating effects that a diet without the nutrients found in caribou and other wild meat was having on Innut health.

It is essential for the Indian family to spend part of the time inland not only for the purpose of taking fur-bearing animals but also to obtain natural foods so essential to their well being and not otherwise available to them. Otherwise they must subsist wholly on relief rations which cannot under existing circumstances supply a balanced diet. (DNLA 1960,116)

For the Innut, it was a time of conflicting messages: on the one hand they were being instructed in new ways and encouraged to adapt as quickly as possible to an alien way of life; on the other, the government came to put increasing emphasis on the retention of some aspects of "traditional" life. It can be argued that the traditional elements of life being encouraged did not threaten the overall control of the Innut by the new majority in their homeland. Certainly government had good intentions, but it was still assuming the right to decide how the Innut would live--from when they would be in the community and in the country, to what language their children would speak. Many Innut today refer to these practices as "colonialism."

The process of developing Labrador's economy did not, of course, simply apply to the Innut and their life in the country. The DNLA was also trying to encourage the industrial development of Labrador. In the late 1950s there was official optimism about the chances of a uranium mine near Kaipokok Bay south of Hopedale.

The department hoped the development would speed the integration of the Innut and Inuit into the wage economy and end the coastal dependence on the codfishery. (DNLA 1958,35) However, the development never took place.

In the early 1960s the DNLA supported the development of a codfishery in Davis Inlet. The project met with reasonable success despite the fact that the Naskapi Innut had no tradition of codfishing and considered it much harder work than hunting. (Henriksen 1973) Quite often Euro-Canadian ideas of what the Innut should do, how they should do it, and how much they should be paid did not agree with Innut perceptions of their needs.

The Indian does not consider two or even three dollars fair pay for a hard day's work, even when he is in dire straits and must work. Since he does not like to haggle or to have unpleasant face-to-face encounters he takes what is paid, represses his resentment against the employer, and complains to others... The Indian does not like to offend by refusing to do a job, but he hates to be short-changed. The result is a reluctance to work for what amounts to virtually nothing; if he makes enough to survive by working he will soon lose his "relief money," which in some cases comes to about what he would make by working for \$2.50 a day. Being proud and practical, he is inclined to find some excuse, such as vague aches and pains, in order to save face and avoid working for wages. (McGee 1961,143)

Despite their limited experience with wage labour, the Innut obviously had enough exposure to Euro-Canadian practices to know when they were being cheated. And, like workers everywhere, they found ways to fight it.

Since the Innut of Northwest River lived 100 miles from the nearest codfishing grounds, the DNLA cast around looking for other ways to integrate them into the wage economy. Budgel writes it was

partly on the suggestion of Dr. Tony Paddon that a sawmill was set up near the community in 1965. Paddon supported the sawmill in order that "a start could be made in one way or another on the problem of making the Labrador Indian employable." (Budgel 1984,45) It did not go into operation until the next year. By 1967, the sawmill was employing a majority of the male Innut of Northwest River. (DNLA 1968,222) "Indians are now using chainsaws, driving the tractor and trucks and one of the woods foremen is an Indian." Wages depended on how much wood an individual cut and averaged from \$27 to \$96 a week. During the first season, the Innut lived in tents and fed themselves. Later, a bunkhouse and cookhouse were erected at Caribou River, about 10 miles from Northwest River. Cutters paid for their board and lodging "at a very nominal rate per day" and were taken back to their community on weekends. Besides putting the Innut to work, the project lowered the amount of short-term relief paid out in the community. (DNLA 1968,223)

For a time it was a highly successful operation, and one which the government replicated in Nain, Davis Inlet and Rigolet. Private mills were set up in Postville, Hopedale and Makkovik. The lumber from these operations was used to build local houses, schools, wharves and other facilities. (Brice-Bennett 1986,50)

Several Sheshatshiu Innut said many people worked at the sawmill for short periods of time--just long enough to qualify for unemployment "stamps". The sawmill operated into the 1970s and then went out of business.

Such development projects had a mixed record of success: some worked for a while; others did not work at all. By the early 1970s, non-Native Labradorians were becoming restive about the lack of local control over their economy, and the government responded by setting up a Royal Commission to hear their complaints.

Reassessments of the Role of the State

The Royal Commission on Labrador was set up in 1972 to study the development prospects of Labrador. Its four members looked at all aspects of Labrador society and took two years to produce a six-volume report containing 288 recommendations in 28 areas, ranging from housing and community services to education and industrial development. (Brice-Bennett 1986,59)

In commenting on the education system for the Innu of Northwest River, the report noted an "extremely high" dropout rate "due to language and cultural difficulties, and a lack of parental encouragement and interest. An almost completely academic curriculum is probably the reason." (Royal Commission 1974,136)

The Commission found that it was

[N]ot surprising that education is not given high priority by the local Indians, considering the general living conditions of that segment of the population and curriculum orientation. A few have employment income but most derive a living from social assistance of one sort or another, and other Government funded programs.... Most of the north [Settler] side population, on the other hand, enjoy relatively high income levels through employment in Goose Bay or by the International Grenfell Association. (Royal Commission 1974,136)

Its description of Innut living conditions also identified the failure of government housing policies. The buildings

were poor from the start, cold and flimsy, drafty and unfurnished, raised on small wooden posts, which allowed the wind and snow to whip around beneath uninsulated floors. In the view of the regional health inspector and local medical authorities, the combination of poor quality and design and the abuse of occupants has rendered many of these homes totally unfit.... (Royal Commission 1974,358)

Poor housing was not the only factor contributing to poor health conditions. As of 1974, there was almost no running water in Sheshatshiu. Wells drilled "some years ago" provided poor tasting water, leaving the Innut to get drinking water from a single community well, the priest's house or a nearby pond (which was considered unsafe). None of the Innut homes had toilets and most sewage was removed by bucket. There was no regular garbage collection. By comparison, adequate services were available in adjacent Northwest River. (Royal Commission 1974,359-60)

The Commission also looked at economic development prospects for the Innut and other Labradorians. It noted that the price and quality of fur rose in 1972-73, but only 10 per cent of a total Newfoundland harvest valued at \$120,000 was taken in Labrador. Few people were trapping despite an abundance of fur bearing animals. (Royal Commission 1974,616) The Commission suggested what was needed to make the industry viable: prices had to increase and be stabilized either "naturally" or by the government; trapping could be conducted as "a minor addition" to other economic activities like the "fresh water fishery, caribou husbandry or tourist

development"; capital should be made available for people to set up and expand traplines. (Royal Commission 1974,617)

While its conclusions were not very imaginative, the 1974 Commission was beginning a re-evaluation of three decades of government development policies. It looked for economic activities which would use local resources, labour, and did not require the importation of large amounts of outside capital. It recognized the importance of trapping to the Innut, and recommended a resumption of the airlift program which, by the early 1970s, had ceased to operate.

The Commission's report performed a valuable service by identifying some of the areas of underdevelopment in Labrador. A dozen years later, another Royal Commission once again put the issue of underdevelopment before the government, this time in more direct terms. However, since it was looking at economic development questions for the entire province, the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment had to offer recommendations directed at both Native and non-Native Labradorians.

Nevertheless, perhaps because its chairman was J.D. House, it defined the problem of underdevelopment in Labrador in fairly blunt terms. The Commission's report said government policies of resettlement, education, and economic development for Native people had failed. Instead of improving conditions among the Innut, these policies have led to a situation where practically

the entire community of Sheshatshiu relies on welfare and other transfer payments to survive. (Royal Commission 1986,234)

To reverse this situation, the Commission recommended the Newfoundland government abandon high-spending, paternalistic programs and encourage "self-reliance" in Native communities. It cited the growth of aboriginal political and social organizations as a hopeful sign that Native people were trying to gain more control over their development, however

Government's attitude towards such organizations has been ambivalent: recognition of the problems on the one hand, but reluctance to recognize native claims to special consideration or to relinquish a measure of government control over native peoples' affairs, on the other. The problems are too serious, however, to excuse this reluctance. The Newfoundland government should come to grips with native issues, address the land claims dispute, foster the self-determination of native peoples and encourage them in their quest for greater self-reliance. (Royal Commission 1986,235)

The identification of government failings is one thing; it is another matter entirely to change attitudes that define administrative philosophy. Labrador is an illustration of just how slowly such changes come about. This chapter has examined what led to the state assuming increasing authority over the lives of the once relatively isolated Innuit of Sheshatshiu. This process began with an official desire to "develop" Labrador's people and economy. The first regional development plans were privately sponsored and, although the Rangers provided a limited government presence in Labrador in the 1930s, it was not until the construction of an airbase at Goose Bay in 1942 that the state's role began to expand dramatically. Growth of government services

led to the creation of dependency and underdevelopment, especially among the Innut who were vigorously encouraged to abandon their domestic mode of production and their nomadic lifestyle. As the Innut were settled in houses in Sheshatshiu, and their children were sent to school, the old pattern of family hunting was broken up. Education was seen by government agents as a tool of assimilation, the desired outcome of the process of sedentarization.

This chapter has also shown that the government began, slowly, to question these policies in the early 1960s when an emphasis was placed on encouraging "traditional" Innut activities. Aircraft were hired to take some of the Innut into the country to encourage increased trapping. Nevertheless, the idea that survival meant adoption of the values of the majority culture, including participation in the wage economy, was not abandoned. Recent interviews in Sheshatshiu affirm that the Innut were well aware of this contradiction.

Finally, two Royal Commissions have questioned the government's development-from-above philosophy, and the notion that assimilation is the only option open to the Innut and other Native people.

The next chapter continues the examination of the theme of assimilation by looking at the destructive effects industrial and military development has had on the Innut.

Chapter V

Industrial and Military Development in Labrador

They left their homes in the towns, settlements and out-ports of Newfoundland to come to "Labrador". We have no homes to go back to. Ntesinan is our home. We are under no illusions: The kind of vision articulated by some people in business and government, for our country, as a bustling area of heavy industry, is not compatible for our continued existence as a people. The bitter lessons have been learnt in Alaska and areas of Northern Canada where industrialization has been imposed on the indigenous people.

(NMIA 1980,7)

...in December 1966, Churchill Falls was still virtually a wilderness.

(Cote 1971,vi)

The second half of this century has witnessed the spread of industrial capitalist relations throughout the Canadian North. With it has come the increasing marginalization and, in many cases, destruction of Native societies. Industrial expansion in the North has taken many forms: the construction of the Alaska Highway through the Yukon in 1942-43; oil and gas development in Norman Wells and the Beaufort Sea in the Northwest Territories; the massive hydro-electric complexes at James Bay and Churchill Falls in Labrador. While this is by no means a comprehensive list, a common element can be found in all of these projects-- their deleterious effects upon aboriginal peoples.

The construction of the airbase at Goose Bay, as well as plans to expand the facility into a low-level jet fighter training centre for NATO, can also be included in the list of northern industrial developments which have had an impact on

Native societies. In an underdeveloped [1] region such as Labrador, the construction of Goose Bay--and the current proposal to expand it--have consequences similar to those associated with other megaprojects in the Canadian North. Besides economic changes, such projects have enormous social effects on societies whose livelihood depends on the land which is used for industrial development. [Berger (1977), Dacks (1981), Cruikshank (1982)]

This chapter will examine the effects of industrialization and military expansion upon the Innut of Sheshatshiu. To begin, we will examine the Innut claim to the region and describe some of the differences between the Innut concept of land tenure and Euro-Canadian ideas of ownership and development. Following this will be a short description of development projects that have either been planned or carried out in the Innut homeland since the Second World War. The latest military development proposal and its probable effects on the regional economy will then be examined.

Colonial Control: Who "Owns" the Land? Who Benefits?

As we have seen, underdevelopment is not a natural condition; rather it is the effect upon a population or region of actions and decisions taken by economically more powerful forces. There is ample evidence to support the assertion that the people who inhabit Labrador--Innut, Inuit and Euro-Canadians--are aware

1 For a definition of underdevelopment, see Chapter I.

of their dependent economic position and desire more control over their own destinies.{2} This consciousness has led to the formation of numerous Native and non-native political and economic organizations to fight for a voice in development. In Labrador, as in other parts of the North, the process of underdevelopment is inextricably linked with the question of who owns the land on which industrial development is being carried out, as well as who has the power to make decisions about the disposition of that land. House has described the relationship between industrial capitalism and the powerlessness of the peoples of Labrador. "Since the advent of state-sponsored incorporation in coastal Labrador, economic underdevelopment has become integrally tied to political subordination." (House 1980,108) The political subordination to which House refers is the relationship between St. John's (the "metropolis") and Labrador (its "hinterland"). The relationship between the dominant metropolis and its exploited hinterland is well documented in literature on the Canadian North. [Innis (1956), Bergér (1977), Watkins (1977), Usher (1982)]

Earlier, we discussed how the growth of state-sponsored incorporation helped create the climate necessary for the introduction of industrial relations of production in Labrador.

2 This statement is based on a survey of comments made to government commissions, at public fora, and in personal communications. See Royal Commission on Labrador (1974), Labrador Resources Advisory Council Annual Report 1976-77, and the Building on Our Strengths: Final Report of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment (1986).

The Newfoundland government had long wanted to encourage development in the region and, seen through the Euro-Canadian legal prism, it had the right to do so through its exercise of territorial and political sovereignty. In 1927, the British Privy Council awarded Labrador to Newfoundland, a relationship that was unaltered by Confederation with Canada a generation later.

Social control in Labrador has been exercised by outside forces since the advent of state-sponsored incorporation, among which have been the RCMP, Labrador Services Division store managers, social service workers, and other bureaucrats.

The notion that one people has the right to control another is as foreign to the Innut as the Euro-Canadian concept of how land ownership is acquired. The idea of "property" dominates the Euro-Canadian worldview, but there is no equivalent term in the Innut language. (Vincent and Mailhot 1983)

The Montagnais clearly claim historical, economic, cultural and emotional links to their territory. These links, which they affirm to have never renounced, give them title and confer upon them the rights to continue to exert the type of control and mastery which their culture has taught them to conceive of as the natural relationship every man has with the land. In short, the Montagnais reckon that by law they would be the ones who have complete control over their territories.... This includes making decisions, such as were made in the past, as to who can traverse it and under what conditions. (Vincent and Mailhot 1983,23)

Thus the Innut maintain they, and not the alien governments of Newfoundland or Canada, exercise sovereignty over their country. Their interest is not merely proprietary. "Too often land claims are looked upon simply as a claim on the land. The

natives are in fact mapping their future for structured and controlled development." (Atlantic Planners Institute 1981,25)

In the Innut view, there is no "claim". They possess rights to the land and the power to control their own lives because they have never surrendered these rights to any foreign government. This control also extends over the air above the land, although it does not imply the automatic exclusion of all other interests. Certainly, there might be circumstances where the Innut choose to allow certain activities in their territory--but it would be the Innut who would make that decision, not an outside government or agency. (This is a key point in the current struggle of the Innut against low-level flying over their country, and it will be encountered repeatedly in this chapter and the next.)

If Anglophones and Francophones presently occupy portions of Indian land, it is because the first occupants have either ceded them to the newcomers, or temporarily allowed use of them or because the immigrants have usurped the land outright, ignoring native Amerindian principles of law. As realistic as they are concerning their present situation, the Montagnais, like other Amerindian groups, nonetheless continue to affirm their title to that section of Quebec [and Labrador] over which they have inherited control. (Vincent and Mailhot 1983,23)

The Sheshatshiu Innut are unequivocal: There is no confusion over whose land is being used for industrial and military development. And where lands are being used by newcomers, the Innut feel they are entitled to compensation.

What the white man is doing now is managing the Innut land. He seems like a visitor. He provided a lot of inducements to change [the Innut] lifestyle--he offered jobs, school. If someone was trying to ruin your life,

wouldn't you fight back?... In the country a lot of the rivers are closed and flooded. Good land has been flooded. The government is getting a lot of profit out of Innut land. Why shouldn't we have that money? It's our land. We should get some benefit. (Simon Michel, interview, August 20, 1987)

In 1977, several representatives of the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association (NMIA) appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs. The committee was considering Bill C-9 which would extinguish aboriginal title to the area covered by the James Bay Agreement. Joseph Nuna spoke about the meaning of an aboriginal "claim" to the land:

"The Indians know the country themselves. They are the hunters of the land and it should not be the decision of the government to make decisions which affect Indian people because the government does not know anything about their hunting life and their way of living.... Just recently the game wardens came and took over our hunting rights and told us that we cannot hunt and told us that we have to buy licenses in order to hunt and support ourselves. ...The Indian people should make their own hunting and game laws because the white people do not know anything about the hunting way of life--all they know is office life...." (Indian and Inuit Support Group 1979,3)

Thus, the Innut are fighting two battles. First, they demand the recognition of their aboriginal right to choose their way of life. This recognition must come from outside agencies and the Euro-Canadian newcomers, whether Settlers or others, who now occupy their homeland.

The second battle is similar to that of non-native Labradorians. They demand the right to have a say in their own economic and political development and desire to shed the unwelcome status of an administrative colony and exploited industrial hinterland. With this context in mind, we will now

turn to the expansion of capitalist relations of production and the "development of underdevelopment" in Labrador.

Industrial Development

In most areas of the North the fur trade economy was "pre-industrial". The relations between Native people and merchants were not those of labour and capital. Mel Watkins described aspects of the fur trade economy to the Berger Commission:

"The prosecution of the fur trade depended, at least initially in each region into which the trade expanded, on the Indian as fur-gatherer. As such the Indian was a commodity producer, not a wage-earner, and thus the fur trade was literally a trade, or a commercial activity, not an industrial activity. The Indian became dependent to the extent that he became vulnerable to the exigencies of the trade, but he did not have to make two critical and traumatic adjustments.... Firstly, he did not have to become a wage-earner, and secondly, which is really the opposite side of the coin, he did not have to yield up his ownership of the land. To put the matter differently, neither his labour-time nor his land had to become themselves marketable commodities." (Berger 1977,117)

When trapping was replaced by wage labour at the Goose Bay airbase, the Lake Melville region continued to possess a "single-crop" economy. A service sector grew up in Happy Valley which relied entirely on military activity for its survival. For the Goose Bay area, economic well-being always has been associated with the military. Within the space of a few years, an economy based on independent commodity production in the form of trapping had been replaced by one that depended heavily on wage employment at the base.

This situation illuminated the basic problem of a one-industry economy; if the industry were to fail, or

simply leave as was the case with the Americans, economic collapse would likely follow, with all those leaving who could or had roots elsewhere and those who could not or would not, forced to accept the role of welfare recipients. While wage-labor work provided a type of security and regular pay checks that trapping never could, the nature of Goose Bay's wage-labor economy forced dependence on the Americans and their desire to maintain Goose Air Base, a situation easily changeable overnight through the political machinations of changing American presidents. The situation was further compounded by the American's [sic] twenty-year lease at Goose Bay which was scheduled to expire in 1972. (Zimmerly 1975,246)

The demographics of the region also changed. The base brought to Labrador large numbers of military men from a different culture. Subsequent industrial development further increased the numbers of outsiders and reduced the Innut to a minority in their own land.

When American military activity began to decline in the 1970s, some other source of wage employment had to be found for the area. The Smallwood government had promised a chipboard mill but the \$120-million project went to Stephenville to replace an American base being phased out there.

In 1969, Melville Pulp and Paper Ltd., a subsidiary of Canadian Javelin, was set up in Happy Valley. A pulp industry was conceived of for the region to supply Stephenville's Labrador Linerboard mill with black spruce. One million dollars worth of equipment was shipped to Happy Valley that year, but "it was all mobile" and could just as easily be shipped out again. Permanent construction consisted merely of garages and storage sheds. The company predicted it would ship out 300,000 cords of wood that year but only met 10 per cent of that amount. There was a lot of

work and several hundred men from Quebec and the Maritimes had to be hired because not enough labour could be found in Labrador.

(Zimmerly 1975,245-46)

While they were happy to have a source of employment, some Labradorians became concerned about the wood cutting operations.

Their logging was carried out in a manner similar to what is known as "highgrading" in the mining industry; activity was concentrated on the richest and most accessible timber stands and the marginal or more difficult areas were neglected. (Labrador Resources Advisory Council 1977,18)

There was much concern about this exploitative approach to renewable resource "harvesting" before Labrador Linerboard shut down in 1976 due to high production costs.

The linerboard venture was a classic example of what Harold Innis (1962) described as a hinterland economy producing raw materials for its more powerful metropolis. Social and political relationships also tend to be influenced by the creation of a staples-based economy and a colonial link is formed between the hinterland and the metropolis. "The essence of this relationship is that factors outside the colonial economy determine the economic viability of the staple." (Dacks 1981,13-14)

Innis's staple thesis was part of a liberal economic analysis. It was reworked into a Marxist perspective during the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry by Mel Watkins. (Page 1986,226)

It is this reinterpretation that fits the contemporary economic situation in Labrador. What Watkins (1977) said about the Northwest Territories and the Dene in the mid-1970s applies equally to Labrador and the Innut in the late 1980s.

The North was a typical resource hinterland exporting raw resources while importing capital and manufactured goods.

Watkins argued that this outward draining of economic surplus locked the North into a "staples trap." It had neither the capital nor the political power to control its own destiny. A few seasonal construction jobs would do nothing to change this cycle of dependency; native people would lack the skills, the capital and the opportunity to reach the promised land.... They would be a permanent proletariat divorced from the means of production.... The boom/bust cycles of non-renewable resources meant that the uncertainties were ever present for all except government employees. (Page 1986,226-27)

The boom-bust cycle is a part of life in Labrador and has not only affected the Innut by casting them in the role of occasional wage labourers who depend on government assistance or welfare when there is no other source of income, but it has also made precarious the existence of Euro-Canadian business. In the central Labrador region, the focal point of this cycle remains the air base. [Canadian Public Health Association (1987), LeBreton (1986)]

The introduction of wage labour in Labrador in the 1940s meant the end of hunting and trapping (which by that time had become a difficult way to make a living) for many Settlers and some Innut. A dependence on wage income soon developed. Similar patterns have been documented among the Yukon Indians during the construction of the Alaska Highway during the Second World War.

Initially, some Yukon Indians benefitted from opportunities for wage employment brought by the Highway construction. A few men got jobs doing slashing, general construction work and guiding....

Indian women earned money sewing mukluks, jackets and mitts to sell to construction workers, taking in laundry and cleaning at maintenance camps. (Cruikshank 1982,17)

Most of these jobs were short-term. Once the building boom ended in 1943, so did wage work for most Natives. As Yukon Indians were drawn into the Euro-Canadian wage economy over the next couple of decades, they relied increasingly on government subsidies to support their families. (Cruikshank 1982,20)

The Alaska Highway construction was a military project. Military development outside Canada, such as the Thule air base in Greenland, has also caused the severe dislocation of aboriginal populations. (Brosted and Faegteborg 1985) Despite its very different purposes, military development operates much the same way as industrial development in the North. It is development from the outside which produces forms of underdevelopment because it does little to provide local, sustained economic growth. Subject to changing political and strategic demands, it creates its own boom-bust cycle which dominates the economic lives of people who rely on military-generated wage labour.

The construction of Goose Bay airbase and the Alaska Highway launched the era of industrial development in their respective regions, causing the local economies to become oriented towards large developments financed from "outside". Plans to expand Goose Bay into a NATO training centre is simply the latest illustration of this process at work in Labrador.{3}

3 Col. John David, the commander of the Goose Bay facilities, has referred to DND's activities in Labrador as "military industry." (Interview, Jan. 14, 1987)

However, military development has not been solely responsible for creating conditions of underdevelopment in Labrador. Shortly after becoming premier of Newfoundland in 1949, Joey Smallwood flew over the 246-foot Grand Falls on the Hamilton River. His biographer wrote that he was "obsessed by it and saw Labrador as 'the one lucky break that nature gave to Newfoundlanders, a compensation for their climate, isolation, and sparse natural resources.'" (Zimmerly 1975,244) Smallwood inherited the old dream of developing Labrador, and he eventually got financial backers and government officials in Canada, the United States and Britain to support the creation of industry in the interior. This resulted in the birth of the mining towns of Wabush and Labrador City. The Grand Falls was renamed and eventually disappeared beneath the seven-million horsepower Churchill Falls hydro complex.

The benefits of the iron mines and hydro harnessing to the people of Labrador were almost nil while the effects...were felt on the political scene. A few, almost negligible number of Labradorians were employed during the construction phases of these projects, but most lacked enough technical skills to remain when only maintenance jobs were available. (Zimmerly 1975,245)

Despite the paucity of local benefits, Churchill Falls has been praised as a magnificent example of how technology and capital can transform wilderness into a productive commodity. (Cote 1971) While political control was exercised from St. John's (or London during the Commission of Government period), real economic control remained beyond the reach of Newfoundland

politicians who depended on international capital to finance any major industrial undertaking.{4}

At this point, it would be useful to point out other economic development projects which have had a direct effect on the Innut lifestyle. Foremost among these is the construction of the Churchill Falls hydro complex which flooded Lake Michikamau and inundated important Innut hunting areas. Begun in the late 1960s, it was the largest construction project undertaken in Canada up to that time. The creation of the 2,200-square-mile Smallwood Reservoir had an immediate and irreversible effect on the Innut:

"We are deeply affected by the Churchill Falls project because Lake Michikamau is flooded. The hunting grounds that we had at lake Michikamau are under water. We trapped there, we hunted there and some of our relatives are buried there. The graves are all under water... The government did not consult with us or negotiate with us. They just went ahead without our people knowing that they were planning to flood the land." (Indian and Inuit Supporter 1979,8)

Another Innu man was more succinct:

The government is stealing the land from the Innut. They built Churchill Falls. Outfitters set up camps. These people get a lot of money from using the land. Why don't the Innut get a cent? (Sylvester Andrew, interview, August 14,1987)

By not informing the Innut or asking how they felt about the plans, industrial developers followed a pattern established by

4 This process is well illustrated by Harold Horwood (1986) Corner Brook: A Social History of a Paper Town. Horwood documents the cooperation between government and foreign business interests that transformed a fishing village into an industrial town in the 1920s.

the builders of the military base and government officials who felt it was their right to decide what was best for the Innut.

[Governments] have shown little understanding of native peoples, and their policies have too often been guided by a mistaken and unrealistic view of development possibilities. With a few notable exceptions, until very recently government policies have been geared towards incorporating native people into an urban-industrial way of life. (Royal Commission 1986,232)

There have been several other hydroelectric schemes discussed for the region, including more dams on the Churchill River. Other industrial development proposals for Innut land have included an uranium mine near Makkovik, which would have included a road south to Northwest River. Uranium exploration began in the 1950s but it was eventually decided that the mine would be too costly to develop. There has also been discussion of building an aluminum smelter at North West Point, a couple of kilometres from Sheshatshiu. This development would bring an estimated 7,000 people to the region and generate \$250 million in wages. (Hill 1983,11) Although it has not gone ahead, the Innut opposed the project on the grounds it would destroy their traditional livelihood. Other industrial development schemes for the region include the production of offshore oil reserves, a Trans-Labrador highway to link the region with the outside, and expanding tourist facilities, including fishing and hunting camps in the interior.

Such proposals--whether they come about or not--play a key role in perpetuating the underdevelopment of Innut society because there is no aboriginal participation in the processes of

decision-making. The Innut are not against development as such; what they oppose is having development imposed upon them--and they feel there will be deleterious consequences for all people in the region.

...[I]f you proceed with plans to force industrialization and hydroelectric projects upon us, you can be confident that not only will our small nation be unable to survive and develop as a people, but the rural people of this area will be reduced to the residents of a rural slum on the fringes of industrial boom areas controlled and worked in by outsiders. (NMIA 1980,7-8)

The question of who benefits from industrial enterprises in Native homelands is central to this discussion, and it does not only apply to the Innut. It was eloquently articulated by the Dene of the Northwest Territories in the late 1960s when plans were announced to build a pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley. The pipeline was to be the engine of progress for the North and its proponents felt it would benefit the Dene by transforming them into wage-earners. Change, some argued, was inevitable. However, the Dene--and their supporters--disagreed with this vision of historical necessity.

To cast the Dene simply as wage-earners, as the applicants do, is then not only to cast them in a role they may not want, but to deny them their role as the land-owners who should be entitled to appropriate the rents from projects which they choose to let proceed on their land. That denial is critical, for it means that the once-and-for-all rents generated within the region, from non-renewable resources that are in due course depleted, are ultimately re-invested at the behest of the corporation outside the region, rather than being re-invested within the region, by the people themselves, in activities based on renewable resources that could survive after the non-renewable resources are exhausted. (Watkins 1977,90)

Not only was control over the land being wrested from the Dene, they, like the Innu, were to be denied the economic benefits of industrial development. The rents earned from the pipeline project would leave the territory. According to Jellis (1977), "The economic rent associated with a natural resources project may be defined as the revenue accruing to the project after the deduction of all costs of production, including adequate return to invested capital." It was a classic underdevelopment scenario.

In a study carried out for the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, Hugh Grant (1981) examined the draining of rents from Nitassinan from 1975-1980, and extrapolated to estimate the losses up to 1990. The study looked at financial returns attributable to mining, forestry and hydro-electric developments in the Innu homeland.

Grant estimated the amount of rents taken out of Nitassinan between 1975-1980 at \$4.4 billion. "This figure is dominated by the rents attributable to Churchill Falls (\$4.1 billion), although substantial rents are also to be found associated with mineral extraction (\$257 million)." Just over half of these rents went to hydro consumers in the form of low rates for hydro-electric power; 13.6 per cent went to governments as royalties and corporate income taxes; and 37.3 per cent of rents "were captured by operating companies in the form of excess profits." (Grant 1980 Vol.II,224)

The value of future rents from the region was "in excess of \$14 billion as of December 31, 1980." (Grant 1980 Vol.II,225)

The largest portion of this would come from hydro. Grant advised the figures for future rents should be interpreted with caution because, obviously, exact amounts would depend on increases in costs, taxes, and other factors. However, even as a rough estimate, Grant's study usefully illustrates a major effect of under-development in the Innut homeland--the massive draining away of wealth the Innut feel rightly belongs to them.

Large-scale development is antithetical to fundamental Innut values. Innut society is based upon self-reliance, personal competence, patience, the acceptance of hardship, and a multiplicity of interpersonal relationships. Industrial society values interdependence, authority, and a rigid work schedule. (Hill 1983,13) These conflicts lead to misunderstandings and conflict between individuals as well as societies. For example, the Innut see a strong link between industrial development and the restrictions placed on their activity by Newfoundland and Quebec game laws. (NMIA 1980)

Each new intrusion into their territory, whether by direct industrial development, or through government regulations, is seen by the Innut as merely one more threat to their existence as a people. This situation has led some leaders and observers to argue that the Innut now face "cultural genocide". (Hill 1983,14, David Nuke, interview, Jan. 12, 1987)

Military Development

In Labrador, the military represents the latest and, it can be argued, most important case of industrial development. The effects of such development covered in this chapter--control of land and resources, loss of rents, and the threat to the Innut culture--apply to the military with special force. Military development in Labrador has had, and continues to have, a dramatic effect on the Innut mode of production.

The transformation of the central Labrador economy from dependence on a single commodity--fur--to dependence on the military for wage labour has been discussed. At first, the base had only a limited effect on the lifestyle of the Innut. Some men and women found temporary wage work with the military or other organizations, but their society remained oriented towards the domestic mode of production. However, construction of the base was a harbinger of change. The increasing influence of the state in the lives of the Innut, combined with the movement of other forms of industry into Labrador, signaled the beginning of a period of rapid change. Foremost among these was a decline in the number of people going into the country to hunt and trap. Many families stayed in the community in order to send their children to school. Hunting became a part-time occupation.

In the early 1970s, the federal government began helping Innut families return to the country through its Outpost Program. Government slowly began to comprehend the link between health and hunting and trapping, something the Innut had always

understood. [Northern Innu Health Council (1986), MacEachern (1984)] Under the Outpost program, the Innut and their equipment are transported into the country by airplane.

However, the Innut now see the continued use of their land to be jeopardized by low-level jet fighter training conducted out of Goose Bay. In 1967, the Royal Air Force began sporadic low-level flight training exercises with Vulcan bombers. In 1979, the Canadian government signed an agreement with West Germany that allowed its air force to conduct similar training flights. By 1986, there were about 5,000 military flights out of Goose Bay per year. (Colonel John David, Interview, Jan 20, 1987) Low-level flying is carried out at great speeds as low as 30 metres from the ground. In 1987, another bilateral agreement was signed with The Netherlands. There is also an American Air Force contingent stationed at Goose Bay, but it does not carry out low-level flying exercises. The Canadian government sees this flying as a way of demonstrating its commitment to the NATO alliance.

In 1980, NATO began searching for a site to build a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre (TFWTC) for use by all allied air forces. (Department of National Defence n.d.,1) For years there have been protests about the number of training flights carried out over the densely populated areas of central Europe. Thus NATO began looking for a suitable location. "The Canadian government noted that it has such a place in CFS Goose Bay, where the air forces of Britain, Germany and the United States are already taking advantage of the wide open spaces to conduct low-level

fighter training." (Department of National Defence n.d.,2) Canada is competing with Konya, Turkey, for the base and the Department of National Defence has put together a slide-tape show extolling the virtues of flying in "empty" Labrador. The decision is being sold locally as a way of creating hundreds of new jobs and shoring up the area's poor economy. The TFWTC would cost about \$630 million to build and would see 200 jets stationed permanently at Goose Bay. (Armitage and Kennedy 1987,7) The expanded base would train pilots in air-to-air intercepts and combat manoeuvres involving large numbers of aircraft. According to the base commander, a TFWTC would handle approximately 50,000 military training flights a year. (Col. John David, interview, Jan.. 20, 1987) Besides these two jet fighter training scenarios, a North Warning System radar installation is also being built near Goose Bay.

The Innut are opposed to low-level flying in Nitassinan for much the same reason they are opposed to other industrial development that is carried out without their consent. They fear the massive increase in military activity will make life in the country intolerable because of the noise, and impossible due to the destruction or dispersal of the game on which they depend. It is important to understand that the Innut are not arguing for a return to "the old days" (although many people compare favourably the quality of life when they were more or less nomadic to how they live now). What the Innut demand--and what

aboriginal people across the North are demanding--is the right to develop themselves.

At this point it is useful to recall that Watkins says underdevelopment creates a situation where local economic and social needs are suppressed.

The primary mechanism by which local development is suppressed is by the outward drain of economic surplus from the region. The most significant loss from the failure to retain surplus is the destruction of local self-determination. (Watkins 1977,91)

Military development in Labrador perpetuates conditions of underdevelopment in a number of ways: (1) The growth of facilities at Goose Bay has nothing to do with local economic or social needs. (2) The development's "sustainability" depends entirely on the exigencies of strategic planning, and once technology or war-fighting strategies change, there may be no reason to maintain a high level of operations at Goose Bay. (3) This development will perpetuate a boom-bust cycle by further tying the local economy to activity on the base. (4) The decision to expand was not made locally, thus eroding the ability of the Innut (and others) to be self-determining. (5) For the Innut, military activity represents future rents that will be drained from their country--or at least their community--since much of the money NATO will pay to build and use the base facilities will leave Labrador. As well, there are no federal or provincial programs designed to ensure "spin-off" benefits for Native people. (McGrath, letter, October 6, 1987)

Nevertheless, the local business community in Happy Valley/Goose Bay favours increased low-level flying, whether through bilateral agreements or a NATO training centre, as a solution to the area's underdevelopment. The town council of Happy Valley-Goose Bay has expressed "unanimous" support for continued military expansion. However, Mayor Hank Shouse has also been quoted saying the town does not favour development "at any price." (Evening Telegram, Feb. 10, 1986) The military has gone out of its way to reinforce the importance of its activities to the region and allay any fears that its activities will be socially disruptive.

A Department of National Defence economist has produced a study called The Socio-Economic Impact of Present and Future Military Activities in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Region in which he describes the current economic situation in the area as "not very bright." (1986,7) [5] Citing an unemployment rate of 22 per cent during the summer of 1985, LeBreton's report describes the number of jobs that would be created, and the amount of money that would be injected into the local economy, by increased military activity.

According to the study the Department of National Defence is the largest single employer in the region with 411 people, or 8.2 per cent of the workforce. (LeBreton 1986,12) Military

5 No attempt has been made to analyze the merit of the economic models or assumptions in this study. The DND-generated study is used for the purpose of illustrating arguments about colonial relations in Labrador. Detailed critical analysis of the author's economic arguments must be left to others.

activities accounted for net after-tax wages of \$25.26 million in the region in 1986. Governments collect \$7.47 million in taxes generated by the regional economy, and business gets \$4.92 million in profits and depreciations allowances. In total, the military generates \$37.65 million in economic activity in Happy Valley/Goose Bay. (LeBreton 1986,63) The study also states that increased military activity will lead to an increase in local employment, and this will lead to an increase in net regional income. (LeBreton 1986,73)

LeBreton maintains a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre would have a much greater impact on the local (and provincial) economy with the construction phase requiring 15,000 person-years of employment. About one-third of this work would go to the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. However, given the size of the labour force, "a significant number of positions in the construction industry could be filled by workers from outside the region." Local business would also benefit. (LeBreton 1986,82)

The total income earned during construction would be \$702.83 million, of which Labrador would get \$208.51 million. However, these revenues would last only as long as the construction continued. The total annual budget of the TFWTC would be \$293.8 million. (LeBreton 1986,86)

LeBreton is convinced that military development holds the key to the future well-being of Labrador.

The military activities then could be, by 1995, the driving force behind the Labrador economy. With

close to 30 percent of employment and work income for households, the military sector could be by a significant margin the most important economic factor in the region. The result would be a much reduced regional and local unemployment rate, a more dynamic local housing market and overall a stronger regional and local economy which would rely on the strong economic base represented by the military activities at Goose Bay. (1986,100)

Not everyone shares LeBreton's unabashed enthusiasm for military development. In casual conversations, this researcher heard a number of non-Native local people express cautious optimism that the base will help the economy. Others are less enthusiastic, citing the massive economic dislocation that occurred when the Americans left in the 1970s. Those Euro-Canadians who do have misgivings maintain an almost complete public silence for fear of losing their chance to work should the opportunity appear, especially since the business community is solidly behind expansion. "Business people themselves feel there is no viable alternative to military activities in the area and that alternate proposals do not have similarly positive regional prospects." (LeBreton 1986,39)

LeBreton outlines the amount of local support the military has and quotes a statement by the Mokami Project Group--"a local group concerned with airport activities and development"--describing deep resentment towards outside critics of military development.

It is significant to note that LeBreton devotes only two paragraphs in his entire work to Innuit "complaints" about the military projects.

Another serious issue concerns the noise made by the military aircraft. Such noise pollution is seen as disturbing to some local people even though they realize that aircraft which takeoff are always noisy. However the problem has been accommodated by most people who see military activities as a low pollution industry. Noise pollution is after all the cleanest form of pollution since it leaves no residue to be carried by water or winds. The noise of aircraft taking off is one thing, while the noise of low flying aircraft is another. The Innu have been complaining for some time about noise pollution, saying that it disturbs their way of life and scares the wildlife away from their hunting grounds. The real issue here seems to be the pursuit of self determination and land claims. Natives oppose all activities which take place on, or over, what they perceive as their own legitimate land. (1986,41)

LeBreton implies Innu complaints are not to be taken seriously because they do not realize that noise is "clean" pollution, and their complaints amount to political grandstanding over land claims. The latter argument is commonly used by the pro-development lobby in Happy Valley to discredit the Innu position. LeBreton also points out how the military gets little co-operation from the Innu or Inuit when it asks for camp locations in order to avoid overflights.

DND and the federal government in general are fully aware of the concerns expressed by the native people toward noise pollution arising from low level flying activities. Efforts are being made to solve the problem to the satisfaction of both parties. DND has taken the stance that it is possible to continue low level flying out of Goose Bay while letting the native people continue their traditional hunting and fishing activities in Labrador. (1986,41) [emphasis added]

It is useful to point out the similarities between this point of view and those taken by administrators and other agents of outside authority outlined in Chapter IV. What LeBreton is defining here is the essence of the colonial relationship between

the Innut and outside authorities. It is a relationship in which "one individual is forced to relate to another on terms unilaterally defined by the other. The relationship is not negotiated...." (Puxley 1977,108) DND and the Government of Canada have decided, for strategic, political and economic reasons, that low-level flying should take place in Labrador, through bilateral arrangements and, if possible, through the development of a large NATO training centre.

[T]he Department of National Defence is committed, with the approval of the federal government, to continue to support expanded military activity at Goose Bay. The Goose Bay facilities are now considered as an important part of Canada's commitment to the defence of the Alliance. (LeBreton 1986,103) [original emphasis]

That decision having been made, there appears to be little room for negotiation.

When LeBreton says the Innut "perceive as their own legitimate land" the area over which the military flies, he is, according to the above quotation, at the very least ignoring the legitimacy of the "claim". It is a classic colonialist position.

The attitude of the colonialist to the colonized can best be appreciated as the attitude of a property owner to his property. Such colonial assumptions prevent the colonialist from accepting any move toward real autonomy on the part of the colonized. Any such move is either ignored, defined as unacceptable, or reprimanded.... (Puxley 1977,108)

LeBreton's remarks merely reflect DND's colonial attitudes towards the Innut. The Canadian Forces commander at Goose Bay has said he feels "assimilation"--participation in the majority culture and economy--is the only option the Innut have since there is no future in living on the land "and not many people

want to do it" anyway. (Col. John David, interview, Jan. 14, 1987)

This chapter has looked at the two facets of underdevelopment: the economic effects of the importation of capitalist relations of production to the North, and the social impact of those relations on the indigenous population. The latter is referred to as colonialism--a process which encompasses not only economic dominance, but also forms of subjective control. The Innut, and many other residents of Labrador, are well aware of the extent to which their lives are controlled by outside forces, and they recognize that the state-sponsored incorporation that aided the expansion of the capitalist mode of production has led to the increasing powerlessness of their community.

The Innut are fighting on two fronts. Not only do they share the collective Labradorian dilemma of trying to gain some control over their own economic development, but they are also fighting for the recognition of their claim to their land. This claim, like those of other Native groups, is based on the concept of aboriginal rights discussed in Chapter II, rather than a Euro-Canadian definition of property rights. For the Innut, ownership is not equivalent to individual possession. This fundamental difference in cultural perception separates the indigenous people of Labrador from all those who came later, and it means the Innut do not share the dominant culture's view of how the land should be "used" or "developed".

This divergent viewpoint also means the Innut do not recognize the right of the Canadian military to conduct low-level flight training in their territory, nor are they willing to allow it to take place simply for the economic benefits that might be derived. To the Innut, military development is not a question of jobs and money, but the latest manifestation of colonial control and a foreign mode of production in their region. It is another industrial development which threatens their way of life and decreases the likelihood that they will be able to gain a measure of control over their own development in the near future.

This chapter argued that there are strong reasons why military development in Labrador can be analyzed as part of the capitalist mode of production. Industrial developments such as the Churchill Falls hydroelectric complex have resulted in a massive draining away of potential rents from Nitassinan--revenues that might have gone into the local economy. This has meant a loss to the Innut of potentially billions of dollars. Further, military development is likely to accelerate this process.

While a DND-sponsored study indicates that military spending will be the driving force behind the Labrador economy by 1995, local interests and needs--Native and non-Native, economic and social--are likely to take second place to development decisions made from the outside.

Finally, the military facilities at Goose Bay have produced a boom-bust cycle in the Labrador economy resembling that found

in other one-industry Northern (or southern) communities. When mines shut down in single-industry Northern towns, businesses fail, schools close, and people move away; when the American Air Force pulled out in the early 1970s for strategic and political reasons, the Labrador economy declined. No matter what military development finally takes place, Labrador's economic health will rest precariously with decisions made in DND's Ottawa headquarters or NATO's military council.

The next chapter will examine the Innut response to the latest military-industrial incursion into their territory and look at how they are working to change their colonial status and develop themselves.

Chapter VI

Reaction and Resistance: The Innut Fight for Self-Determination

All peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic and social development.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The right of cultural survival is a human right, and all these things, all these aboriginal rights that we are talking about, you know, should not be seen as extraordinary rights or anything like that. They are there because we were there first, we had certain customs and traditions and the way we did things before the Europeans came, and we have a right to continue to practice and retain these things. It is a human right, it is not anything special that is given to us by anyone.

John Amagoalik
Inuit Committee on National Issues

It is not much to ask when we say that we want to control our lives again. We too have the right to exist as a distinctive culture, to make our own decisions about the future of our children and our land. Our happiness and survival as a people depends on our being able to regain this control once again.

Peter Penashue
"Civilization' and Destruction: A
Foreign Program for the Innut"

This chapter will look at what the Innut of Sheshatshiu have done and are doing to regain a measure of control over their lives and "develop themselves". This struggle is seen in the context of a reaction to government and other institutional forms of social control, as well as resistance to military development. The chapter begins with a brief explanation of aboriginal rights. It goes on to examine ways in which the Innut have resisted the

denigration of their values and have struggled for cultural survival, including attempts to make education more relevant to the young and protests against hunting regulations, to name just two. The chapter also looks at the elements of the fight against military development--protest campaigns, defense of the environment and human rights. Reference is made to the views of non-Native Labradorians concerning Innu't actions, and the chapter concludes with some observations on the racial elements of the confrontation.

To understand why the Innu't are so vehement in their protests against low-level flying and other "unauthorized" uses of their homeland, it is necessary to locate what is happening in Labrador in the larger context of the struggle for the recognition of aboriginal rights in Canada. The Innu't are not just opposed to military activities, although they do have strong moral objections to their land being used to train pilots in war-fighting strategies. Current opposition to low-level flying has as its seed a long unredressed grievance--the usurpation by a foreign government of what the Innu't see as their right to control their own lives. The use of the term foreign is not accidental, for that is how many Innu't refer to both the Canadian and Newfoundland governments. In short, what the Innu't demand is self-government with all the rights that entails.

Most Canadians take for granted their right to self-government, that is to be citizens of a state in which they participate in the decision-making process through elected

representatives. In turn, these representatives make decisions on behalf of their constituents involving all aspects of life: the exploitation and disposition of resources, economic development, law enforcement, citizenship, language, culture, fiscal relations, education, health and a host of other powers are included on the list. However, the aboriginal people of Canada feel that this system has been forced on them and that they are being governed without their consent. Their opposition to this governance has taken many forms, and most recently it found expression in a series of First Ministers' conferences on Native self-government ordained by the Constitution Act, 1982. The powers sought by the First Nations were just those listed above to describe the self-government powers possessed by other Canadians.

The constitutional process ended in failure in March 1987; however, that has done nothing to temper aboriginal societies' demands for self-government. Not the least among these have been calls by the Innuit for recognition of their aboriginal rights in Nitassinan.

Much has been written about the concept of self-government and aboriginal rights. [Boldt (1985), Hawkes (1985), Asch (1984), Daniels (1977)] Section 35 of the Constitution Act recognizes but does not define the "existing aboriginal and treaty rights" of Native people. A series of First Ministers' Conferences was set up to work out a definition but in the end the governments of

Canada and the representatives of Native peoples could not reach an agreement.

Asch (1984) says since there is no consensus on the exact meaning of aboriginal rights, definitions are illusive. He says there are two types of rights to which the constitution could refer:

The first refers to rights of self-government and self-determination, such as the "power to participate directly in government" normally associated with the existence of a viable political society. These kinds of rights are often referred to as "constitutional" rights, and are sometimes seen as an aspect of human rights. (Asch 1984,6)

For the Dene, he says, these rights have been taken to mean "significant, internationally recognized political or human rights, including the right to enjoyment of culture and the right to survival and self-determination."

The second constitutional possibility refers to a property right in land and/or a right to hunt, fish and trap. Asch quotes Cumming and Mickenberg (1972): "'Aboriginal rights are those property rights which inure to Native peoples by virtue of their occupation of certain lands from time immemorial.'" (Asch 1984,6)

This conception of "property rights" does not fit comfortably with Euro-Canadian definitions. However, there is no reason to assume that it should.

"This is not the land that can be speculated, bought, sold, mortgaged, claimed by one state, surrendered or counter-claimed by another. These are things that men do only on the land claimed by a king who rules by the grace of God, and through whose grace and favour men must make their fortunes on this earth." (Morse 1985,49)

We have already examined some of the bonds which tie the Innut to Nitassinan. The Innut are unanimous in their assertion that the land is theirs because they have occupied it since "time immemorial" and they wish to assert their aboriginal right to the land. Among these aboriginal rights is the right to be self-governing. Self-government is seen by all Native people as the main weapon in the fight against assimilation. Inuit leader Zebedee Nungak was speaking for his people when he described self-government, but the definition is universal:

"Self-government is the exercise of effective control by a people over matters directly affecting their lives. As a distinct people within Canada, Inuit can only continue to develop and to avoid assimilation by exercising powers of self-government." (Gaffney 1984,63)

A previous chapter of this paper examined the efforts that have been made to assimilate the Innut into Euro-Canadian society. At this point, it is important to understand something of the reaction to assimilation, and how it reinforces the desire for self-government.

Assimilation and Cultural Survival

Innut society is under siege, but it has not disappeared. In fact, one measure of the resilience of the Innut is the very fact that their culture has survived, if not intact from pre-contact times, then in a slightly modified form. This has been the case with many aboriginal societies.

In most cases, after initial disruption, peoples reorganized their economic lives in connection with trade and/or seasonal or temporary labour, accepted a

modicum of formal leadership to deal with the outside, incorporated a measure of Christian belief and ritual into their traditional religious practices, and reinterpreted their definitions of male-female roles and relations as they welded past and present in an ongoing way of life. They evolved new cultural forms, which, although much changed from aboriginal times, continued to be distinctly theirs. In the name of "modernization" and "development" these cultures are now being threatened as capitalist relations are fully imposed even in the most remote hinterlands of the world. (Leacock 1982,168)

For the Innut, who had limited contact with Euro-Canadian culture until this century, change happened quickly. As we have seen, the forces of assimilation--religion, education, government, and industry--began pressing on them almost simultaneously in a sustained way beginning in the 1940s and 1950s.

Demands by the dominant society to surrender the heritage Leacock refers to above began with the church. Religion, the Innut believe, laid the groundwork for future government demands. The following is part of a conversation between two hunters, 44-year-old Shinipest Antane of Sheshatshiu and 75-year-old Pien Kanikuen of Schefferville.

Shinipest: In the days before the priests arrived, the Innut were always in the country. When the priests arrived they went straight into the country to see the Innu people to try and convince them to become Christians. The Innut were finally convinced and some were married in the country....

What are the reasons why we started to lose our way of life? Why did the government make us stay permanently in this settlement?

Pien: Why? Because they said we had to send our children to school all the time.

Shinipest: That's one reason.... But the priests played an important role as well. The priest was a white person too. I don't say I am against them, and I'm not against the religion either, but the assimilation of

the Innut started back when the priests came to us in the country.

...before long they had us at their mercy. We really believed in them when they told us about the spiritual things. We really believed in them, you see. We thought we knew the wrong things. (Antane and Kanikuen 1984,25)

The arrival of Christianity presaged many changes. Later, the provincial government created the village of Sheshatshiu, and built houses and schools. Children no longer went with their families into the country because they had to go to school, and because someone had to look after the children, most hunters left their families behind in the community.

Shinipest: ...That's where they really tied the rope on us you know. They taught the kids all the time and we couldn't take them into the country with us. After a while we started to forget about our way of living because the government ran so many things. Finally, they made us start to not want to go into the country.

...So that we would abandon our land. (Antane and Kanikuen 1984,25-26)

Antane argues the reason for this was simple: the government wanted the land to exploit. Once the Innut were no longer in the way, geologists--called "the searchers of rocks" by the Innut--scoured the land. They were not just looking for rocks, but for sites for hydro development, oil exploration possibilities, and other things. Soon mining towns like Labrador City, Wabush, and Schefferville sprang up, and the gigantic hydroelectric complex at Churchill Falls was built. The government drew lines on maps and drafted hunting regulations, Antane says, and the Innut were displaced. Since they spoke no English, and were not informed of the development plans anyway, there was little the Innut could do to protest. The assault on Innut culture which began with

religious and state incorporation, increased when the economic potential of their land was discovered. (Penashue 1984, 23)

Shinipest: ...All the land that has been divided up is land that has been stolen from us. And if the government had told us in advance of their plans, of the things they wanted to do, we could have stopped them little by little. If we remain unable to stop them, they will completely finish up on our land.

Pien: And then we will be completely changed--we will be like French and English people. (Antane and Kanikuen 1984, 27)

The process of assimilation is not being accepted willingly and many Innut see their's as an anti-colonial struggle similar to those fought by the former colonies of Britain, France and other European powers. The basis of this argument is that the Innut, like aboriginal peoples across the North, see themselves as a distinct people with their own cultural, political and religious institutions who have been invaded by an outside culture and economic system. In Labrador, as in the rest of the North, the domestic mode of production, which is key to Innut culture, has become dominated by the capitalist mode of production. The Innut see this process accelerating through military development, the eventual outcome of which will be the elimination of their way of life.

Opponents of the Innut, especially those with an economic stake in future military or industrial development in the region, prefer to cast them as a disaffected minority. The Innut view of self-determination is challenged by many non-Natives who see development, primarily through the military, as the key to the region's economic future. Many of these people feel the campaign

against the military is using unfair tactics and arguments. In 1986, the Mokami Project Group (MPG) was set up to counter "adverse publicity", "half-truths" and "misinformation" put out by outside opponents of military development. In May that year, then Justice Minister John Crosbie announced a \$180,000 federal/provincial grant to the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce, the Mokami Regional Development Association, and the Happy Valley town council to set up the group. Its spokespersons maintain it is not just a pro-military lobby; rather, it espouses the need for "balanced development" in the region, including a highway link to the "outside" and more tourism. (Clariss Rudkowski, interview, Jan. 17, 1987) A spokesman for the group has compared the economic benefits of military development to the Hibernia offshore oil drilling megaproject. (The Evening Telegram, Jan. 26, 1988)

The Mokami group feels the Labrador plateau should be "utilized more effectively...both militarily and commercially" and it supports both low-level flying and plans for a NATO training centre. It wants to see the regional airport used for international stopovers, something which could lead to the development of "a duty-free industrial park." (Mokami Project Group, n.d., 2)

These views illustrate the desire for a local say in economic development, although the plans, if they came about, would unlikely be subject to local control. The MPG has identified Settlers as a "disadvantaged group" which needs the

benefits--improved schooling, health services--"which only steady economic development will bring and maintain." (MPG n.d.,3) The group's members see the Innut as obstacles to the development they say all Labradorians will benefit from. They argue the Sheshatshiu community has been "poorly advised and led," and raise the spectre of "outside interference." A recurrent MPG theme is that the Innut want to "go back" to the way things were, a proposition which is both absurd and impossible. Assimilation, the group argues, has happened everywhere and the Innut must accept its inevitability.

The Innut see the MPG as a leading local force in the assault on their right to choose their way of life and feel the group is motivated by racism and the economic advantages its members stand to gain from expanded military development. They argue such attitudes serve only to perpetuate conditions of underdevelopment.

[W]hat makes us angry is that even though you don't understand our world you and your government want to change it. You talk about the fact as you put it, that "you can't go back in time," that there is "no place in the present for a hunting culture," that we have to "progress". (NMIA 1986,34)

The fact that the MPG is employing a lot of the same arguments heard from the mouths of government administrators only reinforces Innut resistance. In many ways, the proponents of "progress" in Labrador appear to be caught in the past. As we have seen, the notion that development equals progress (i.e., the transformation of aboriginal hunter-trappers into a proletariat) was prevalent throughout the North in the 1950s, but it has been

abandoned almost everywhere. The fact that it is still so popular in Labrador speaks eloquently of the state of relations between its aboriginal and non-aboriginal societies.{1}

An important element in this effort to silence Innu opposition is the denigration of their work and skills, and the concomitant argument that life in the country is a useless occupation, or that what the Innu are doing no longer counts as a "traditional" lifestyle.

When they're talking a traditional way of life it's not necessarily traditional in the traditional sense that they're talking about, because traditionally the Innu walked wherever they wanted to go in the hinterland or went by canoe and they lived off the land and all those other things. What they're calling a traditional way of life now has no similarity whatever. They have funding through their Outpost Program whereby they are flown into where they want to go for their camps, they shop at the Co-op or other grocery stores and take their groceries with them--including their meat for a large part--and we feel very much that they can afford to have... a glorified holiday that the rest of us can't afford. And there's just none of this traditional way of life anymore. (Claris Rudkowski, interview, Jan. 17, 1987)

The argument goes that the Innu should accept reality, stop their opposition to low-level flying and other developments, learn skills and get jobs. The Innu deeply resent being classified as "unemployed" (NMIA 1986); rather, they see themselves as a skilled people.

Most non-Innu are ignorant about and do not have these skills. Our work, our skills are related to country life--to living from the land. Our culture is a hunting culture. We don't hunt caribou to put money in the bank. (NMIA 1986,34)

1 The racial elements of this controversy will be considered later in this chapter.

Despite the relentless pressure to conform, the Innut have no illusions that the loss of their way of life and a complete surrender of their right to make decisions that govern their lives would consign them forever to the role of regional subproletariat.

And what for--to do your work, but always to be at the bottom of your system in which people are valued for the work they do and how much money they earn. The more money you earn the more power you have, the better person you are. Innu would be on the bottom of your system just as aboriginal people across Canada are on the bottom of the heap. This has absolutely nothing to do with our intelligence. We are as smart as anyone but if we try to succeed in your world we have to give up being who we are and become totally a part of your culture. (NMIA 1986,35)

It should be apparent by now that the Innut reject this option. As a distinct people, they argue they have the right to decide how to run their own lives, and that means they have the right to control what happens in their territory. In short, they have the right to self-determination which has never been surrendered. In this they share a philosophical position with other Native groups.

Although our numbers are small, a little over ten thousand scattered across Ntesinan, we are nevertheless a distinct People with a single language, a single indivisible national homeland, a single culture and national identity. We are all one People, one nation, whether Canada rules us through her provincial government in Quebec, or through her government in Newfoundland. How then have we been brought to our present position of being made to feel ourselves virtually foreigners in our own land? In this age when the rights of Peoples have been elaborated and strongly affirmed alongside, and in mutual interdependence with the human rights of individuals, how is it possible that an alien culture, a foreign intrusive power can so flagrantly trample on these rights? (Michel 1987,2)

The Innut say that although Canada has signed numerous international conventions guaranteeing the right of self-determination and is legally bound to uphold them, the spirit of these conventions is not made to apply to aboriginal peoples. To support this view, they point to the wording of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other agreements. By signing these agreements, they argue Canada has reaffirmed the "equal rights of nations large and small." (Michel 1987,8)

The entire Innut struggle--demands of self-determination and control over their land, opposition to low-level flying and military expansion, calls for changes in hunting laws, demands for improvements in health, education and social services--is based on the contention that their human rights are being abused. As we shall see, opposition to this abuse has taken many forms. The Innut are trying to regain control over all facets of their existence. They are proud of their culture's ability to survive nearly 500 years of contact with Euro-Canadian society, but they are also keenly aware that now, more than ever before, their culture is under assault. Their collective survival as a People hangs in the balance.

The rest of this chapter will be devoted to ways in which the Innut are resisting assimilation and attempting to reassert control over their lives.

Health and Self-Determination

One of the benefits to Native people of the industrial mode of production and state-incorporation in Labrador and other parts of the North was to be an improvement in health. While many of the diseases suffered by the Innut in the 1950s have been brought under control, the morbidity rate of the community still far exceeds that of adjacent Northwest River. The Innut say a major contributing factor for the poor state of health of many people in their community is the lack of control they have over their lives. Before exploring the connection between health and self-determination, it is important to know something of government involvement in health care in Labrador.

The federal government began contributing to health care in northern Labrador in 1949, but a high incidence of tuberculosis among Native people (12.5 per cent among Inuit; 9.6 per cent among Indians) led the province to push for increased funding in 1951. Under the Federal-Provincial Agreement, Ottawa agreed to spend \$1.5 million over 10 years on a general health program "including 'a vigorous anti-tuberculosis campaign [and] also full Federal responsibility for the transportation, rehabilitation and treatment of Indians and Eskimos...regardless of the nature of the illness.'" (Budget 1984, 43)

Ranger Walter Rockwood had earlier expressed the opinion that living in tents and on the land made the Innut susceptible to disease. Settling in houses, he wrote, would improve their

1

overall health. However, just the opposite appears to have occurred.

It does seem likely that there was no shortage of natives needing hospitalization or treatment: increasing numbers of people in the villages of Davis Inlet and North West River, living a sedentary existence for the first time--without the services or know-how for such a lifestyle--probably aggravated health conditions. (Budgel 1984,43)

Health conditions in the village were poor. Infant mortality in 1962 was 20 per cent. In 1966, the head of the IGA's health services, Dr. Tony Paddon, wrote to the provincial Ministry of Health describing the conditions in Northwest River. Nine years after the first homes were built there, people still suffered from gastroenteritis, impetigo and related infections. Paddon said the village was "'filthy', 'perfectly horrible,' and 'an unsanitary mess' and... 'four hundred Indians are sufficient problem under the best of circumstances.'" (Budgel 1984,43) Paddon's remarks are revealing and perhaps shed some light on contemporary Inuit complaints about the kind of care they receive in Northwest River. (There is no health facility in Sheshatshiu.)

The government, however, appeared to be in no hurry to resolve the problem it had helped to create by installing the nomadic Inuit in houses. In 1970 there were plans to build sewer lines in Sheshatshiu "at the earliest opportunity." (DNLA 1970,222). In 1987 there was still no sewer system.

Food represented another problem for the Inuit who were not used to living in a village and shopping in a store. The Inuit hold there is a strong connection between their ability to live

and hunt in the country and the general health of the population. The key element in this relationship is food, something that was commented upon by anthropologists half a century ago. (Speck 1935) Many people in Sheshatshiu, especially elders, say they do not like store-bought food and feel it is not as good for them as wild meat, such as caribou.

People are better off in the country than in the community. They aren't suited to buying groceries in the store. They are used to eating wildlife.

The village water is not good. That may be why we are getting sick. Living conditions are bad here. This house has no running water. That is why the old people are getting sick. (Monica Nui, interview, Aug. 6, 1987)

According to a census made in the community in 1987, there are 99 houses in Sheshatshiu, of which 10 were built the previous winter.[2] An average of seven people live in each house, but only 30 households have running water and a sewage system. The others, like that of 64-year-old Monica Nui quoted above, must haul water from communal wells which are often a long way from their homes, and they must dispose of sewage in whatever way they can.

The Innu communities of Sheshatshiu and Davis Inlet rely on funding from the federal government which is administered by the province. In the summer of 1987, another in a series of federal-provincial five-year agreements was signed. Under this agreement, the federal government will give the two communities \$12 million over five years for capital programs. Another \$1.5 million is to

2 Statistics were compiled by Lyla Andrew for a study of the Sheshatshiu group home.

come from the province in the form of services. This works out to a little over \$1 million per community per year. However, a sewer system for Sheshatshiu would cost an estimated \$8.4 million, and existing funding arrangements make construction unlikely. (Daniel Ashini, interview, Aug. 18, 1987)

As we have seen, in the 1960s medical officials with the Grenfell association blamed unsanitary conditions in Sheshatshiu for a number of ailments. While a systematic study has not been done in the community, a doctor and a nurse who worked in Davis Inlet have linked high morbidity with a lack of self-determination. Medical practitioners have argued that the standard Euro-Canadian medical model is inappropriate for the community because it "ignores precisely those economic and political conditions that are the major determinants of health in any community...." (Scott and Conn 1987,1648) Health care is one more outside agency exercising control over the lives of the Innu, and has displaced indigenous forms of health care. (Brice-Bennett 1986,95; Scott and Conn 1987,1650)

Medical facilities in Davis Inlet are good and people are immunized, tested for tuberculosis, and taught about nutrition, yet "by any definition, the health of Innu living in Davis Inlet is appalling."

In 1977, for example, a morbidity survey showed that 86% of the population had head lice; 17% had scabies, parasitic skin infestation; and 27 had impetigo, a bacterial skin infection; 53% of the adults were considered to have alcohol problems; 29% had been hospitalized within the previous 12 months.

Children made an average of six visits per year to the clinic. Between 1981 and 1984 there were 20 cases of tuberculosis in Davis Inlet out of a population of 240. This represents an incidence of 1,667 per 100,000, or more than one thousand times the national or Newfoundland rate. The rate for Sheshatshiu during the same period was 280 per 100,000. (Canadian Public Health Association 1987,34) Violent death rates, including suicide, are also high, and in 1982-83 accounted for 50 per cent of mortality. (Scott and Conn 1987,1650-51) The authors see poor living conditions, lack of running water and sanitation facilities as part of the cause.

This pattern of morbidity "is shared by oppressed peoples around the world, groups which have in common economic, political, social, and cultural alienation." The authors identify "self-determination, cultural, economic and political considerations" as "truly central" to health care.

Andrew and Sarsfield (1983, 1984) have discussed the connection between health and powerlessness among the Innut. The level of available funding for local health care makes no difference in the overall health of the people. Nevertheless, no errors are admitted by those who administer the system, nor is there a recognition that in health care, too, the Innut are in a condition of dependency. Although this dependence is recognized, the Innut "cannot be enthusiastic over the offer of control of a few health programs when control over the areas that matter so much to Innut people, such as land, resources, education, and immigration, remain out of Innut control." (Andrew and Sarsfield

1984,429) The authors argue that even total control over the health care system would not alleviate the situation because health is linked to other social and political considerations.

The appalling health conditions in Native communities has placed governments in a bind. They cannot accept the situation, but at the same time will not recognize the need to change policy in order to do something about it. As a result, aboriginal communities are given advisory committees and boards, and told they will be able to "consult", although their opinions are rarely solicited. The government argues that Natives are "not yet ready" to administer their own affairs. (Andrew and Sarsfield 1983,6)

However, there is one way in which the Innut can and do attempt to take control over their own health care--by going to the country, or nutshimit.

The change in the health of Innu families when living away from the environment of the government villages is remarkable. Alcohol abuse suddenly stops. A combination of improved diet, a rigorous lifestyle, and the stable emotional and social environment offered by a functioning Innu society, make for a startling contrast to life in the villages. It is initiatives such as this which represent the health-care system on which Innu energies and attentions are focused today. (Andrew and Sarsfield 1984,429)

The source of physical health when in nutshimit is obvious--the consumption of country food. But more than that, people say they feel freer and able to live the way they want once away from the community. Rather than being crowded in houses, they are in tents out in the open, living next to and with whom they choose rather than where they have been assigned. (MacEachern 1984,4)

In the country the way the Innut feel about themselves is totally different. Social pathologies present in the village do not exist.

"[I]f you're separated from--say parcels of land that mean a lot to you, or you're separated from ways of life that mean a lot to you, or you're separated from ways of earning a living that mean a lot to you--part of your humanity is taken away from you when that happens."
(MacEachern 1984,9)

It is not only the Innut who recognize the important link between mental and physical health and living in nutshimit. Doctors and nurses who have periodically visited Innut hunting camps have commented on the people's state of health while away from Sheshatshiu. (Sarsfield, letter, 1982; Stevenson, letter, 1981; Wotton, letter, 1981)

There has been discussion about setting up a medical clinic in the community since the Innut must cross the bridge to Northwest River for their medical care, and many people feel they are not well treated by the staff at the Grenfell association hospital there. A community clinic would "belong" to the Innut, especially if the people themselves organized its set up. To date, however, there are no firm plans to do this.

Considerable space has been devoted to the relationship between Innut dependency or underdevelopment and health in order to understand the implications of increased low-level flying in the region. The Innut fear that jet fighter training will drive wildlife from the country and make life in the camps intolerable. If this happens, they could lose a major source of individual and collective health.

Hunting Regulations

Hunting regulations began to impinge on the activities of the Innut in the 1920s when the Newfoundland-Quebec boundary was fixed through negotiations between Canada and Great Britain. Innut hunters say the boundary makes no sense to them and they resent the imposition of hunting laws by the two provinces. They say people have always hunted in the interior and, regardless of provincial government games laws, should be able to continue to do so. The fact that the line was drawn by people in a distant country who had never seen Nitassinan, and knew or cared little about its inhabitants, remains a source of irritation to the Innut.

Provincial game laws are also a source of irritation. Before the provinces claimed their respective territories and jurisdictions, the Innut were not afraid to hunt wherever they wished. Hunting is an aboriginal right, but now they say they are harassed by game wardens. (Antane and Kanikuen 1984; Matthew Penashue, interview, Aug. 11, 1987)

Hunting is for the Innut "the staff of life." (Michel 1987) But in order to hunt they, like other Labradorians, must get a permit from the provincial government. Few bother and consequently it is not uncommon for a hunter to find himself before the court for exercising what he considers to be his ancestral right. Besides, there are only a certain number of hunting licenses available, and most of them go to non-Native

hunters. The same applies to fishing licenses--non-Innut fishermen commandeer the best of what the Innut feel are their traditional fishing spots--and wood cutting.

The problems such regulations cause aboriginal people in Labrador are not new--and the Innut are not the only ones affected. The Inuit have also long complained of restrictive provincial regulations. (Ford 1975) Nor is it only big game which requires a licence. During the summer of 1987 Matthew Penashue was charged with possessing an "illegal" rifle. He had been hunting partridge without a licence and a wildlife officer took away his gun and charged him. "It's pretty hard to be a hunter without a gun," he explained.

The Innut feel the rules are pernicious and arbitrary. "These regulations have ostensibly been enforced against the Innu on the grounds of wildlife conservation but in fact have served mainly as a pretext for the gratuitous exercise of an officious colonial authority." (Michel 1987,15)

The Innut identify themselves with particular herds of caribou, one of which lives in the Mealy Mountain area southeast of Sheshatshiu. The herd has been closed to hunting since 1975 when its population dropped to 200 to 300 animals. It has now increased to around 2,000. (Stu Luttich, interview, Aug. 21, 1987) In the early spring of 1987, a couple of hundred people from Sheshatshiu moved into the Mealy Mountains and hunted the caribou to protest the game laws. The hunt began with a half-dozen elders and the community priest, a non-Innut. It grew

quickly as word spread. About 30 animals were taken and people lived in tents and moved back and forth between the camps and Sheshatshiu by snowmobile. An RCMP helicopter hovered overhead but no arrests were made until outraged non-Innut hunters in Happy Valley forced the authorities to take action. The hunters charged discrimination and threatened to go in and slaughter the herd themselves if something was not done about the Innut.

While several Innut and the community's priest were charged by the RCMP, they refused to participate in the court proceedings, arguing that they were not bound by provincial law. (Michel 1987) The defendants were eventually convicted and sentenced to a month in jail. In Sheshatshiu, the hunt and subsequent trial galvanized community opinion as people became aware that they could take action to defend their rights.

This winter we did a protest in the Mealy Mountains area because the government lied to us about 10 years ago and said caribou would be closed [to hunting] for five years.... That's why elders were the main people who pushed for the illegal hunt, even if they had to go to court or were taken to jail.... We wanted to show our frustration...we didn't care anything about any laws or regulations but we were trying to continue the Innut way of life by killing caribou and different kinds of wildlife. (Matthew Penashue, interview, Aug. 11, 1987)

Many Innut say they will continue to hunt caribou and other animals, regardless of government prohibitions. The dispute over hunting laws brings them into direct conflict with hunters and outfitters from Happy Valley. The latter are especially resented because they are given government permission to set up their fishing or hunting camps on prime Innut hunting territory. Besides

the usurpation of their right to hunt, the Innut feel they are being deprived of a source of livelihood. The government and non-Natives make money off the land but the Innut get nothing.

For its part, the Newfoundland government takes the position that the Innut are free to challenge the game laws in courts if they wish, but until such a time that they are overturned, the laws will remain unchanged. (McGrath, letter, October 6, 1987)

Education

Antane and Kanikuen (1984) have discussed the process of assimilation which began with the coming of Christianity and the importing of a foreign education system and values into the Innut homeland. What the Innut are taught in the community's government-run school is that "the ways of their older brothers and sisters and parents and grandparents are wrong and that they must choose some 'career' in order to get ahead." (NMIA 1986,35) Many children drop out of school by grade five, disillusioned with an official curriculum that ignores Native peoples and their indigenous knowledge.

You hear a lot about explorers but they only got around by following the long-established routes of Native people.... [I]t should be possible to teach children the skills they will need in the country outside school. I don't advocate closing down the school but there should be a lot of work outside the classroom. (Ben Andrew, interview, Aug. 18, 1987)

Even the few students who work hard and become teachers are only allowed to teach "in the way your culture has decided teachers should work." (NMIA 1986) The assumption is made that the

teachers, who have the knowledge, will fill the empty receptacles, the Innut students.

Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as a process of inquiry. The teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence. (Freire 1970, 58-59)

There has been some discussion in Sheshatshiu about the band taking over the school and setting up a curriculum that is more relevant to the Innut. However, one community leader says people do not yet have the self-confidence needed to take control of education.

Nevertheless, there are things being done to make sure school children learn about their culture. During the summer of 1987, the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association and the Sheshatshiu Band Council provided funding to produce a book on the Innut language and culture. Sylvester Andrew, a 47-year-old hunter, was in charge of the project. Andrew said he fears the Innut language could be lost in 20 to 30 years time. He said he thought it would be possible to introduce an Innut program in the school but there was no money to fund it.

The government doesn't care about the Innut language--just English. The government wants the Innut to lose their language and culture. Perhaps the government won't recognize the Innut as Indian people in the future or recognize land claims. The government encourages children to go to school in English but doesn't care about our language. (Sylvester Andrew, interview, Aug. 14, 1987)

While it is good for young Innut to learn both Inueimun and English, he said having an education does little for them in the

long run. Since the Innut lack the money and advantage of other groups in society, it is very rare that children succeed in school. Andrew said the only answer is to make the education system more responsive to Innut needs, and more relevant to the culture.

Social Services

The Innut have been the victims of what Freire calls "cultural invasion". In this phenomenon, the invaders impose their view of the world on another group and inhibit the latter's ability to express itself. "The invaders mold; those they invade are molded. The invaders choose; those they invade follow that choice--or are expected to follow it." (Freire 1970,150) Invasion is an act of violence, even when the invader assumes the role of helper or friend.

In the last analysis, invasion is a form of economic and cultural domination. Invasion may be practiced by a metropolitan society upon a dependent society, or it may be implicit in the domination of one class over another within the same society.

Cultural conquest leads to the cultural inauthenticity of those who are invaded; they begin to respond to the values, the standards, and the goals of the invaders. (Freire 1970,150)

The attempt force the Innut to adopt Euro-Canadian ideas concerning the value of "work" has been discussed previously. A primary agent in the process of assimilation is the Newfoundland Department of Social Services. No other agency--not even the band council--has as much influence or control over the Innut and how they live. [Brice-Bennett (1986), Andrew, L. (1984)]

The department touches nearly every aspect of Innut life. It is the major source of cash income for families which depend on social assistance; it allocates temporary job placements for people looking for enough weeks to qualify for unemployment insurance; it funds people who want to spend part of the year in the country; it runs the local group home. Many Innut hunters resent the department's control over their ability to outfit themselves for longer than three months in the country (Joseph Abraham, interview, Aug. 6, 1987), but others say things have improved because of social assistance. Pien Selma said formerly when credit ran out with the Bay, people often starved; with social assistance, this no longer happens. (Interview, Aug. 11)

However, the Innut have no say in the development of social services policy (Andrew, L. 1984). Until 1980, the department did not have an office in the community and there was no recognition that the Innut constituted an unique culture. Now, however, the Sheshatshiu office attempts to be flexible in order to meet local needs. Still, the social services district manager says despite her best efforts, policy continues to emanate from St. John's where no distinction is made between the provincial capital and Sheshatshiu. (Mullins, interview, Aug. 10, 1987)

At any one time, about 30 per cent of the community is on social assistance, and the percentage is higher when the number of people doing short-term work to qualify for unemployment insurance is considered. (Such work includes housing repairs, cleaning up the community, clearing a local playing field and

making snowshoes.) The department dispenses between \$7,000 and \$8,000 per week in the community.

At the moment, the director says, there is too much dependence on government agencies in the community, and the band council has not yet recognized that this dependency is a problem. When this happens, she says, it will be possible to create "meaningful" work.

A former social worker challenges this view of the department as a benign institution. (Andrew, L. 1984) She says although some department personnel recognize the problems particular to Innut communities, "no sincere attempt is being made by those in control of policy to involve Innut in making policies directed at developing programs consistent with Innut culture...." (Andrew, L. 1984, 36) Andrew and three other social workers were fired in 1984 when they attempted to make social services policy consistent with community needs. Andrew says the department did not want to have its authority challenged.

By not making a serious effort to involve the Innut in policy making, the department merely advances the process of assimilation. And because the Innut are not there to defend their cultural values, those values are denigrated or denied. For instance, Andrew says social service policy advances the nuclear family as the model to emulate, and programs are predicated on it. On the other hand, the Innut live in large, extended families, both because of inadequate housing and by preference. However, social services policy requires the reduction of a person's

assistance payments if anyone in the household has another source of income, such as unemployment insurance or a pension. This is often the case with the Innut, and the reduction in welfare causes hardship for many families. (Andrew, L. 1984,34) Thus the efforts of local administrators, when the attempt to identify local needs, are thwarted by the bureaucratic demands of policy.

Nevertheless, the Innut refuse to give up living in large families, despite being penalized for not adopting the nuclear "model". Although it may appear a small thing, and may be carried out passively rather than actively, the people's refusal to adopt different living arrangements is a form of resistance. While few Innut would use the language of decolonization indigenous to Third World liberation struggles, they have no difficulty identifying what they are up against. As one 88-year-old woman from Schefferville explained:

The government thinks the Innut can't manage their own land but they always did before. People from all over did--all the Innut. A child will agree to do anything if you give him a lollipop. This is how the government is treating the Innut. (Adeline Ashini, interview, Aug. 20, 1987)

The Anti-Military Campaign

While the Innut have sporadically resisted efforts at assimilation and colonization in areas of education, hunting and welfare, it is in the anti-military campaign that community outrage has come into sharp focus. Since the early 1980s, the Innut have managed to mobilize a sizeable body of public opinion behind them and have squared off against local and national

interests which want to see Goose Bay become a major NATO base. On the side of the Innut are environmental and peace organizations, church groups and several national Native political organizations. Supporting the development are local business interests, politicians, and many people who feel they may benefit by any jobs the project might create, as well as the province and the federal government through the Department of National Defence.

Many on the pro-development side argue that the Innut are simply using low-level flying as a lever to settle their outstanding land claims. There is indeed an outstanding claim by the Innut over Nitassinan. Research was halted in the early 1980s when the federal government stopped funding the NMIA, the Labrador Innut land claims organization, because it had become a leading voice in the anti-military fight. Many Innut leaders also say the research stopped because they felt they did not need to "claim" land that was already theirs.

The Mokami Project Group feels the Innut should stop protesting and get to work on their land claim. Once it is settled, they should set up small businesses--hunting and fishing camps and crafts--and benefit from the project "like the rest of us." It has told the federal Environmental Assessment Review Panel, which has been set up to hold hearings on environmental effects of low-level flying, that although the Innut protest represents only an "extreme minority position, they do have serious concerns which must be addressed...." Land claims must be settled, the group says, and the panel was asked to "convey to

both levels of government" that message. (Mokami Project Group 1986,1016)

However, this view of an Innut claim to territory is restricted and does not include veto power over development. Settlers say they have legitimate claims to the land as well, and most of them support the military. Happy Valley/Goose Bay Mayor Hank Shouse was quoted in The Globe and Mail referring to the Innut claim:

"We've heard all the arguments, all the innuendos, all the lies. They talk, they brag that it's their land, that they were here first....I'd like to think if I were here for thousands of years at least I could be self-supporting." (Armitage and Kennedy 1987,19)

More will be said later about this rhetorical war between the pro-militarists and the Innut.

For the Innut there is a strong link between ownership of the land and the aboriginal right to control what happens there and their anti-military stance. In their eyes the military is the merely the latest manifestation of outside control by a foreign power which refuses to recognize their aboriginal rights. The focus of the current struggle happens to be the military, but it might just as easily be another representative of industrial capitalist society--a major mining operation or hydroelectric project. This is not to say the Innut have not developed an analysis of the situation which includes a firm disarmament position--they have that as well. But in Labrador today the military represents the forces of capitalist development which, as

we have seen, perpetuate conditions of underdevelopment in the region.

The Innut see this as a life and death struggle in the literal sense: if they lose and they are unable to continue their way of life in the country, their culture will be doomed. The tone of the debate on both sides is often emotional and the Innut arguments are frequently met by counter attacks employing racist stereotypes. (Armitage and Kennedy 1987)

The last chapter described the two military projects--low-level flying carried out under the aegis of bilateral arrangements between Canada and specific NATO countries, and a proposal for development of the Tactical Weapons Fighter Training Centre (TWFTC) at Goose Bay. The Innut are not alone in their concerns about these plans. Some local non-Innut groups have questioned the wisdom of counting on a military megaproject, with its complete lack of local control, to provide "development" for the region. One group commented that it has heard estimates of 500 to 2,000 jobs, but there is no indication of just what those jobs will be.

Those who say that military creates employment indirectly appear to forget that it is a completely artificial economy, maintained by the state and that it produces nothing in itself. In fact, it takes money and resources away from the rest of society.

Yet the Newfoundland and Canadian governments are promoting the militarization of Labrador and Quebec as a giant, job creation scheme, which, void of any utilization of natural resources and production of wealth for society, is exactly what it is, assuming of course that some jobs will be created. (Unemployment Action Committee 1986,1022)

The committee argues military development will simply reinforce Labrador's boom-bust economic cycle. "The militarization of the region will do nothing to break the cycle of dependency, it will only add to it."

Increased use of the Goose Bay airport by the military is supported by the government of Newfoundland, which is concerned about maintaining employment in the region. Most of this concern, however, centres on the non-aboriginal population of Happy Valley/Goose Bay. The provincial minister of intergovernmental affairs has said he does not want a federal environmental panel that will study the effects of low-level flying to look at land claims. As well, "ethnic origin should not be an issue"; instead of talking about "native" people, the review should concentrate on the benefits of the project for all Labradorians. The provincial government is especially concerned that the panel emphasize the "positive social and economic benefits brought to the region through increased employment". Where the panel guidelines refer to "the aspirations of native and non-native residents" (implying the two groups have different perspectives), changes should be made to refer to "aspirations of Labrador residents".

(Ottenheimer 1986, 1286) This seems to indicate that the official Newfoundland government position has changed little from the 1950s when there was no recognition of the existence of aboriginal peoples in the province.

The above is a brief illustration of the climate in which the debate over the future of central Labrador is being waged.

The problems these flights cause for the Innut can be divided into four broad categories: (1) the impact of air combat training on people when they hunt in the interior; (2) the effect of these activities upon wildlife; (3) the "socio-economic and socio-medical impacts of the expanding military presence at Goose Bay on the community of Sheshatshiu; and (4) the "serious prejudice to our rights and land claims posed by the military expansion." (Ashini 1986,779)

How the Protest Developed (1981-1987)

The first low-level training flights over the Quebec-Labrador peninsula were conducted in 1967 by the British Royal Air Force using huge Vulcan bombers. The flights were infrequent and the current round of jet fighter training did not begin until the Canadian government began signing bilateral agreements with individual NATO air forces. West Germany began its flights in 1980 and the number of sorties has increased each year. Canada now has low-level flying agreements with Great Britain and the Netherlands.

Two vast training zones totalling 100,000 square kilometres were designated in 1981, one to the north of Sheshatshiu, the other close to Quebec north shore. These flying zones are over Innut land. Pilot training involves flying as low as 30 metres from the ground at speeds of several hundred kilometres per hour. Each zone also contains a practice bombing range on which dummy

ammunition is used (although plans for a TWFTC include the use of live ammunition bombing ranges).

In 1981, the Department of National Defence submitted a report to the Government of Newfoundland on the effects of low-level flying in Labrador. The report concluded that neither the Innut nor the environment were likely to be harmed by such activity. (Landry 1981)

Innut protests over the flying initially took the form of letters written to the federal ministers of Indian Affairs, the environment and defence. The response was perfunctory: the government was looking after things and making sure there was no environmental damage.{3}

A more organized campaign began in 1983 when a delegation of Innut from Sheshatshiu and Sept-Iles/Maliotenam toured West Germany. The trip was widely covered in the media and the Innut received the support of the Green Party and Survival International.

Protests by the Quebec Innut increased that year when low-level flights were carried out over their hunting territories. "Official" protests by the Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais (CAM), which represents the Quebec Innut, to the federal government achieved nothing, and the band councils of La Romaine, St. Augustin and Mingan joined the Innut of Sheshatshiu in a national protest campaign. In 1984 two Innut each from Sheshatshiu and La

3 The following chronology is largely taken from Armitage and Kennedy (1987).

Romaine went to Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal and St. John's. The tour was the subject of relatively short-lived media interest.

The Newfoundland government responded to the Innut campaign by saying there was no evidence that low-level flying damaged the environment, frightened animals away, or threatened human health. Nevertheless, while remaining committed to military development as a way to revitalize the local economy, the government announced it would conduct a two-year, \$350,000 study of the effects of low-level flying on caribou.

By 1984, Great Britain was also conducting regular low-level flights out of Goose Bay. As the flying increased, so did Innut protests. Innut from Sheshatshiu and three communities on the Gulf coast launched a national campaign to stop the militarization of their territory. The campaign was expanded to include several European countries where the Innut stated unequivocally that their hunting and trapping way of life was being threatened by the flying.

By 1985, the Innut were getting support from Project North, a church group, and an increasing number of human rights and peace groups. Their cause was also embraced by Greenpeace and other international organizations. The Innut have also taken their case to a number of international human rights fora.

In May 1985, the Sheshatshiu Innut hosted an assembly at a campsite near their community, attended by representatives of all Innut communities, members of support groups and the media. Meetings took place in a large communal tent and a makushan or

ritual feast was held. At the same time a NORAD combat exercise called "Amalgam Brave" was carried out from Goose Bay. The contrast between the "traditional" Innut and warfare training was a media coup for the Innut.

In May 1986, an Innu leader from Sheshatshiu and a family from La Romaine toured Great Britain, Italy, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and West Germany, meeting with a number of senior government officials, including the deputy Prime Minister of Italy. By this point, the issue had been well covered in the media.{4}

Throughout their campaign, the Innut have endeavored to maximize media coverage of their protests. Through their use of the media, the Innut have been trying to change how they are perceived in the eyes of both Newfoundlanders and Canadians. To do this they have had to create images of an embattled people that can be transmitted by an event-oriented media, whether radio, television or print. The difficulty with this approach, and it is one faced by any group attempting to publicize its cause, is that the newsgathering agencies will tire of Innut "events" and cease to cover them.

Innut concerns about the potential of low-level flying to destroy the environment have been clearly enunciated through this protest campaign. However, these arguments are also being made in another "official" forum--the federal Environmental Assessment

4 See Bradbury (1985), Hobson (1986), Poole and Oakes (1986).

Review Panel that has been set up to examine military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec.

Low-level Flying and Environmental Concerns

As of the end of 1987, two government-sponsored environmental studies were being carried out in Labrador. The first was the caribou study referred to above. The second was being carried out by the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office (FEARO), an arm of the Ministry of the Environment.

Under federal regulations "proposals initiated or funded by the federal government or that will be located on federal lands, and which are likely to have significant adverse environmental effects, [must] be submitted to a public review." (Environmental Assessment Panel 1986,3) The public review is conducted by members of an Environmental Assessment Panel appointed by the Minister of the Environment.

Although the Department of National Defence had commissioned its own environmental study (Landry 1981), increasing protests and concern about the effects of low-level flying caused it to request a public review under the Environmental Assessment and Review Process in February 1986. A panel was appointed to conduct the multi-stage review, which includes: (i) discussions with leaders and members of Labrador and Quebec communities leading to the production of a set of draft guidelines; (ii) public meetings held to review the guidelines (Sept.-Nov. 1986); (iii) final guidelines (Jan. 1987); (iv) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

produced by the Department of National Defence; (v) public and panel review of the EIS; (vi) a request for additional information or, if none is needed, the process moves to (vii) public hearings; (viii) the panel makes a final report to the ministers of the environment and national defence and the findings are made public.

Obviously this is a long, protracted process and critics have charged it is meaningless since low-level flying will continue throughout the period of the hearings. At first the panel interpreted its mandate to include recommending that low-level flying be halted or phased out if it was shown to seriously threaten the environment. However, since there was some confusion over this matter, it asked the federal environment minister, Tom McMillan, to clarify its mandate. (FEARO 1987)

Citing Canada's commitment to its allies, the minister responded by saying the panel could not recommend that the flying should stop and must limit its recommendations to "mitigative" measures only. All it is allowed to do would be to suggest ways to limit any damage that might be occur to the environment or the people in it. The decision was criticized by the Innuit and other opponents of the development, but was received with enthusiasm by those who want the projects to proceed.

In March 1988, McMillan attempted to counter criticism that he had destroyed the independence of the panel. Writing to the panel chairman, David Barnes, he said he respected the body's independence:

[N]othing I have said should be construed as restricting its obligation to follow its collective conscience.

Stated more bluntly, what you write in your report is for you to decide. I hope, however, that the limitations I have described will be taken fully into account when the Panel decides on the wording of its recommendations. (McMillan, letter, March 21, 1988)

To the Innut of Sheshatshiu, the pressure on the panel by McMillan is another sign that the government is not serious when it says it is concerned with potential damage from low-level flying. Nevertheless, the band council decided not to opt out of the process, and it has urged its counterparts on the Quebec north shore to continue to participate. Sheshatshiu Chief Daniel Ashini says the council feels the EARP is a "publicity tool" and will not have a major effect on the situation. "But there is no point in just sitting back and letting the report go ahead without our participation. At least we can say we were against it." (Ashini, interview, Aug. 18, 1987) The Innut learned to be suspicious of the process when their opinions and recommendations were ignored in the EARP report that came out before the construction of Churchill Falls. (Michel 1986,93)

The Innut made several submissions to the panel during the review of the draft guidelines. Much of what was said about the effects on the environment and people comes from hunters who have spent time in the country while the jets have been flying.

One hunter from St. Augustin on the Gulf coast described what happens when the jets come over:

When they reach a large lake, the planes fly extremely low, almost touching the water. They fly so low over the lakes in fact, that the exhaust ripples the water. These planes also fly very low over the camps of the Innut, and the exhaust ripples the canvas on our tents.

There is some kind of pollution in the exhaust of

these planes from the north. The sand on the beaches of the lakes is poisoned; the animals and fish are dying. Shortly after some of these planes flew over, we went out on a short trip in the canoe. I saw a lot of fish that were dead and also dead animals. It's the the powerful smoke from those planes that must have killed the animals and the fish. (Antane 1984,16-17)

Some people say the military flying is destroying the quality of life in the country. It is no longer a peaceful place where they can carry out their way of life in a manner of their own choosing. Where they can go is now dictated by where the jets may fly. For some, life in the country is no longer enjoyable.

People say the jets terrify the children and older people. "Children faint because of the noise. The wind from these airplanes sweeps tents away. Children are scared so much it is hard for them to breathe." (Monica Nui, interview, Aug. 6, 1987)

Innut hunters say they have noticed many changes in the country since the advent of the jet flights. There are stories of caribou of being malnourished and losing their unborn calves and eggs cracking and falling from their nests.

These days you have to walk a long way just to see any wildlife--not like when I was young. Low-level flying is scaring off the animals.

We'd like to see it back to the good old days, but that's hard because the military is here.... It would be better if the military found another place to do their exercises. People are afraid of the exercises because they don't want to be caught out in a canoe when the planes come over. (Matthew Penashue, interview, Aug. 11, 1987)

There used to be animals around the community. Now they are gone. There is a reason animals are now getting smaller--it's because of low-level flying. In the old days animals used to be large and healthy. Now they are not healthy because of low-level flying--maybe it's because of the smoke from the jets. (Pien Selma, interview, Aug. 10, 1987)

The hunters say there is no way over-hunting could be responsible for the radical changes they have observed in caribou behavior. At one time the animals used to migrate through a region that now lies in the northern flying zone. Now they do not, and they only stopped when low-level flying began.

I've been in the country for a long time. I've never seen wildlife declining when there was no low-level flying. Since low-level flying started the population [of animals] is declining. I don't blame it on over-hunting or disease. There used to be a lot of caribou in the north but they seem to be disappearing and heading to James Bay. (Sylvester Andrew, interview, Aug. 14, 1987)

The hunters' views tend to be denigrated by proponents of military expansion for being "unscientific" and politically motivated. For instance, the commander of Goose Bay dismissed charges that the kerosene-based fuel the jets use causes air pollution. Nor does it hurt people, despite Innut complaints of burning eyes following overflights. (David, interview, Jan. 20, 1987)

In his review of environmental literature, Landry minimized the effects low-level flying might have by saying there was little data on caribou which could be applied to the situation in Labrador-Quebec (1981,14) In 1983, Newfoundland government biologist Stu Luttich wrote to the NMIA. He said although there was no systematic research at the time to monitor the effects of low-level flying on the George River caribou herd, "incidental reports and observations from professional and non-professional field observers could suggest" that the beginning of increased low-level flying coincided with a change in caribou migration

patterns. At the time the flying began the George River herd "began to migrate less extensively south into central Labrador during July-September and began inhabiting the central-northern Labrador summer range for an increasingly shorter period of time. However, there is no proof for cause and effect." Luttich continued to say he would prefer that the George River herd be protected from overflights until a full study of effects is done. "I personally doubt increasing acoustical disturbances will be directly beneficial to the Herd's present ecological status." (Luttich 1983) [Original emphasis]

Four years later, Luttich was in the second-year of the province's study of the 750,000-member George River herd. He remained cautious about cause and effect. However, he did say that 10 to 20 per cent of the herd's summer range has been abandoned. This region corresponds with one section of the northern flying zone. "There are correlations to be made [with low-level flying] but whether there is cause and effect, we don't know." He said there is also evidence of caribou dying from malnutrition, but that could be because the herd has reached its maximum density and numbers are beginning to decline naturally. (Luttich, interview, Aug. 21, 1987)

The fate of the caribou remains central to the Innut. During the period leading up to the public EARP hearings more "scientific" work will be done to measure the effects of low-level flying on the animals. The Innut hunters, who have spent their lives tracking the caribou and learning their ways, remain

convinced that there is indeed a connection between the overflights and changes they have observed. They resent not having their views taken seriously. They are also certain that changes in caribou behavior and migration patterns will have a profound impact on their ability to continue their way of life in the country.

Caribou are not the only animals the Innut are concerned with. Their representatives urged the environmental panel to carefully examine the effects of low-level flying on all the animals of Nitassinan. (Ashini 1986)

In fact, many Innut see the training as a plot by the "government" to drive them out of their country and destroy their culture. They see the military as simply the latest in a series of assimilationist forces. Many Innut vow "we'll keep going back to the country despite the low-level flying." (Anne Marie Penashue, interview, Aug. 11, 1987) Only by continuing to use the country do the Innut feel they will be able to defend their aboriginal and human rights.

Human Rights

Many Innut feel that by promoting low-level flying and military expansion, the Canadian government is guilty of "cultural genocide" in Nitassinan. By this they mean the destruction of their land-based culture.

Under the United Nations' 1948 Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, genocide is given a

fairly strict definition. Article II states that genocide is acts "committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group..." Such acts include killing, causing bodily or mental harm, imposing measures that would bring about a reduction in the number of births in the group, and "deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part..." (Commission on Human Rights 1978,45)

This definition of genocide has been criticized for being severely limited. (Leblanc 1984) For instance, Article II does not define "national, ethnical, racial and religious" groups. Presumably that is left up to individual countries. Leblanc also points out a difficulty with "intent to destroy" a group or groups. (1984,25-26) There is also no mention of "cultural genocide, i.e., efforts to destroy groups over time by attacking specific aspects of their culture, not their physical existence." (Leblanc 1984,4)

In the case of the Innut, we must look first at the applicability of the narrower definition of genocide. The Innut certainly constitute a separate "ethnical" group, however, it would be difficult if not impossible to prove the Canadian government has a deliberate "intent to destroy" as required under Article II of the Convention. Nor is there any attempt to stop births, transfer children or physically destroy the group.

However, substitute the term "ethnocide" for "genocide" and the Innut might have an easier time making a case. The Working

Group on Indigenous Peoples has stated that ethnocide is "...the violation of the right of an ethnic group to develop its own culture." (Davies 1985, 755) It is a wide interpretation which would cover both the active and unintended destruction of an indigenous culture. The term cultural genocide, as the Innut use it, or ethnocide, as the working group defines it, does not necessarily imply the active destruction of a people or a culture. Certainly Canadian government actions in Labrador are not motivated by the willful desire to destroy the Innut. However, the importance of the idea of ethnocide is in the fact that the government does not have to actively pursue this end; rather, it is enough for it to happen by accident, or to be threatened. The crime is in the violation of the Innut's collective right to develop their own culture. The other side, of course, is proving that this situation is actually occurring.

According to the Innut, the militarization of their homeland and the "systematic and total denial" of their right "to have any control over the disposition of their homeland and its resources" is contributing to "social collapse". Building a NATO base and increasing the military use of the region "will represent a major move in this process of ethnocide which is at origin an outgrowth of the denial of the collective human rights of the Innu...." (Michel 1986, 93)

It was in this climate the Innut invited the International Federation of Human Rights (IFHR) to visit Labrador. The federation was founded in 1922 "to serve and propagate the ideal

of Human Rights, to struggle against their violation and to demand their respect." It was involved in the fight against Naziism and, since 1948, has worked to ensure adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (IFHR Report 1986,I) Its role in Labrador was to "investigate the validity of human rights violation allegation by the Innu of Labrador/Quebec." The five-member commission was also to determine whether or not "such violations occur as a result of low-altitude, military jet overflights of the Innu."

The commission conducted a 10-day field investigation in May, 1986. Its primary conclusions were that "certain internationally recognized natural and legal human rights of the Innu...are being violated" by military activities. Low-level flights in the two training areas "generate conditions that are harmful to the physical, mental and cultural well-being of at least a segment of the Innu population." The commission also recognized a number of associated problems, including reliance of the non-aboriginal population of Happy Valley/Goose Bay on the economic spin-offs generated by military activity, the existence of racial tension between the native and "white" communities, threats to the environment, and aboriginal rights and land claims.

The report is unequivocal in its conclusions. Low-level flying constitutes and infringement of the Innut's individual and collective human rights. The latter are their aboriginal rights. It states that "the low-altitude flights have created a feeling of harassment, of permanent pressure amongst the Innu and a state

of psychological insecurity concerning their status as Innu persons and as an indigenous population." The flying also infringes upon the collective rights of the Innu to their traditional livelihood and makes this right difficult to pursue. (IFHR Report 1986,42) While it does not use terms like genocide or ethnocide, the report's conclusions leave little doubt that the investigators believed that military activity in Labrador creates conditions that threaten the right of the Innu to develop their culture.

Reaction and Racism

The IFHR report generated a lot of controversy in Labrador. The Innu were pleased with its findings, arguing it supported their case and constituted a major embarrassment for Canada's reputation as a defender of international human rights. Supporters of military development attacked the report for being shallow, poorly researched and "biased".

One outcome of the report was to contribute to an escalation in racial tension in the region. This rise in antipathy on the part of some (but certainly not all) non-Innu, has been noted by other observers. The Canadian Public Health Association (1987) said the chances for violent confrontation will increase as tensions in the community rise.

Two academics from Memorial University in St. John's have examined what they call the "ethnopolitical strategies and rhetoric" used by the two sides in the military development

debate. (Armitage and Kennedy 1987) Racism and "redbaiting"--the accusation that the Innu are being used by "outside" forces with "hidden agendas"--have been used in this campaign by proponents of military development.

Racism enters into this equation when military expansionists make carte blanche statements about Innu behaviors [sic] and motivation which denigrate them as a people and deny the validity and continuing validity of their culture....

...In Labrador, the military itself, as well as its advocates, attempt to argue that peace groups and "professional agitators" are behind the scenes encouraging the Innu to oppose the air combat training....

Some military expansionists have taken the "hidden agenda" and "outsider" theme a step further by suggesting that communist agents are behind the scenes attempting to destroy NATO, democracy and for that matter Christianity. The archetypal threat to western democracy, Christianity, individualism and free enterprise is advanced in the form of the "communist conspiracy" as the true dark hand guiding the actions of the Innu and their supporters. (Armitage and Kennedy 1987,22-23)

The authors offer a couple of examples to illustrate their points. The letter below was written in April 1987 by a member of the Mokami Project Group to The Sunday Express in St. John's:

"We've heard that beavers have left their houses; that ducks are dying within the egg; that we're all going to be sterile because of the radiation of these low-level aircraft. All false, false, false, false information. This is propaganda which is fed to the Innu people by Marxists, Leninists, socialists, communists." (Armitage and Kennedy 1987,23)

The purpose of this line of attack "is to shift the axis of opposition away from Innu versus military to outsiders (communists) versus military." (Armitage and Kennedy 1987,24)

The effect racist ranting has on the general population is questionable at best. However, it does manage to confuse the

issue and divert attention from the questions the Innut are raising concerning their aboriginal rights and the dispensation of justice.

To conclude, this chapter has been about the right of the Innut to self-determination, and their resistance to the forces which, intentionally or otherwise, are denying them this right. Like other aboriginal groups in the North, the Innut maintain they should make the decisions about how to live, how their community should be governed, and what form of economic activity to pursue. This aboriginal right is based on the concept of original occupancy, the idea that the Innut lived in Nitassinan and governed themselves long before Europeans came to the country. While the newcomers with their mercantilist and then capitalist mode of production came to dominate the Innut domestic mode, the latter have surrendered neither their land nor the right to make decisions about what should be done on it. The fact that Euro-Canadian jurisprudence does not supply a precise definition of an aboriginal right is not--to the Innut and other Native peoples--the problem.

This chapter also looked at how the Innut have resisted the forces of incorporation: the association of life in the country, and not medical services, with improved health; the writing of a book on Innut history so children will speak their own language and learn something of their culture; the defiance of hunting regulations that directly impinge on the domestic mode of production; and the ignoring of penalties imposed by an inflexible

bureaucracy on people who live in large, extended families.

Resistance often begins as a reaction to a particular set of circumstances; at the outset it is sporadic and unco-ordinated. Historically, the resistance of Native people to incorporation and underdevelopment has become concentrated when there is a particular issue to focus upon. In the 1970s, plans to build a gas pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley gave the Dene a chance to articulate their grievances to a national audience. In Labrador, a similar opportunity has been afforded the Innut in the form of military developments at Goose Bay. The Innut-led protest against low-level flying is not just a campaign against militarization, although it certainly has those elements. It is a fight for recognition of aboriginal rights and a demand for justice.

When the Innut say they do not want more military flying in their homeland, they are not simply resisting the "inevitable" coming of technology and change. The capitalist mode of production, of which military development is a manifestation, is already the dominant economic force in Labrador. What the Innut are demanding is a say in the development of their land, and to have that say, they must have political and economic power. In arguing for these powers, they are defending the environment of which they are an ancient part. But they wish to go forward, not backwards; they wish to control the future because they have not been permitted to control the past.

These demands bring them into a face-to-face conflict with their non-Native neighbours whose livelihoods now depend almost

exclusively on the wage labour provided by military development. This chapter touched very briefly on examples of a racist reaction to the Innut struggle. This particular response is difficult to quantify, but it is significant enough for the Canadian Public Health Association to issue a warning about increasing racial hostility and the prospect for violence in Labrador.

Obviously, the Innut represent a threat, both to local interests which want to expand the rôle of the military in Labrador, and the federal government itself. Theirs is a struggle for authentic development, for the right to decide their own future. This requires a recognition of their inherent aboriginal rights, something that governments are loathe to grant to any of this country's Native peoples. Many Innut express deep admiration for the Dene of the Northwest Territories and their two-decade long fight for justice. They see many parallels between the two nations, both in aboriginal lifestyles and contemporary political struggles. Like the Dene, the Innut of Sheshatshiu do not know how long it will take to win recognition of their rights, but they are prepared to fight as long as it takes.

Summary and Conclusions

This thesis has argued that Labrador is an underdeveloped region in which two inter-related modes of production, the industrial and domestic, exist in a relationship where the former dominates the latter. This situation has come about because of the expansion of capitalist relations of production in the region since the Second World War. Underdevelopment has been defined as a condition where the economic benefits of development accrue to outside capital rather than to the local economy. All Labradorians are affected by this relationship.

The central Labrador region resembles many areas of the Canadian North in that it relies on a single industry, the military, for its livelihood. Like other regions, this single-industry economy is subject to periodic periods of expansion and decline--a cycle of boom-bust.

The Innuit, whose culture is based upon the domestic mode of production, find themselves at the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchy instituted by the industrial mode of production. Their society is in a transitional phase which began with the introduction of fur trade relations in the region in the 1700s, and has continued through the expansion of state-sponsored incorporation and industrialization in the second half of this century.

Only when the changes began to come in rapid succession, as the products of a state-directed development philosophy, did the

Innut ways become threatened in a way they had not been previously. Soon after "discovering" the Innut, European powers sent missionaries to try to "civilize" them. The Innut accepted Christianity, but not necessarily in the manner the priests had hoped, and combined it with forms of indigenous belief. Thus, like the fur trade, religion was also partly adapted to Native ways and requirements.

However, about 50 years ago the role of the missionaries as the main force of assimilation was taken over by the government of Newfoundland. As we have seen, state incorporation, as opposed to religious incorporation, was more systematic and far-reaching and had a greater effect on the Innut way of life. The biggest change was that families settled in communities so that Innut children could go to school. Certainly, the agents of the state had other motives--they were convinced the Innut would die out if they continued their old ways--and many of the changes forced on the people were done for benevolent reasons. This pattern has been observed in relations between the federal government and the Inuit of the Eastern Arctic, as well as with other Native peoples in the North.

The effect of these changes was to increase the pressure on the domestic mode of production at a time when the industrial mode had already gained ascendancy in Labrador. Living in one place, becoming educated and healthy, it was thought, would turn the Innut into an industrial labour force. However, no such thing happened and the result of this rapid change was the creation of

a generation of Innut who were neither able to function in the country nor acquire the skills needed to compete in the labour marketplace.

Despite predictions that they were doomed to extinction unless they became "like us", the Innut have neither vanished nor been assimilated. In fact, they continue to possess a powerful attachment to the land and the domestic mode of production. Since the early 1970s, the Innut have returned in increasing numbers to the country for at least part of the year to regain a sense of collective self-esteem that is not provided by life in Sheshatshiu. As well, the elders are teaching the younger generation how to live and hunt in the country, knowledge that is vital to the continuation of their culture.

The elders feel it is important that the youngest generation--their grandchildren--learn about the country as well as be able to function in the majority culture. They point to many of their children, now in their 20s and 30s, who missed the chance to learn country skills because they were required to go to school. While Innut children must still attend classes, the importance "traditional" skills is now more widely accepted by non-Innut.

Interestingly, it is the elders who have also adapted the best to wage labour and the industrial mode of production. Since the construction of Goose Bay in 1942, many hunters have used seasonal employment (much of which is now funded through the provincial Department of Social Services) to get the cash they

need to outfit themselves for the country. Like their ancestors who used the fur trade to provide them with implements, to make their lives easier, these hunters have been able to take advantage of certain aspects of a foreign mode of production.

On the other hand, their children went to school because the priests and government officials had convinced their parents of the merit of learning English and being able to compete for jobs. However, nearly all have found the promises to be hollow: at the end of the education process, which for many often came before high school, they found little work and no prospects for self-betterment, at least under the terms set by the majority culture. At the same time, they had not learned many of the skills necessary to function in the country. This lack has been devastating for many people's self-esteem and has created a generation which spends much of its time idle in the village.

When the elders of Sheshatshiu were young, the industrial mode of production was making its first appearance in Labrador. At that time, it did not represent a major threat to the Innut who were able to continue their nomadic lives much as they had under the mercantilist relations established by the fur trade. However, pressure on the Innut way of life increased substantially when the majority culture decided it was more interested in the land itself than the products that land produced. Over the last 30 years, this has meant increasing mineral exploration, the flooding of Innut land for the Churchill Falls hydroelectric complex, and other projects. This has

accelerated the process of underdevelopment by draining resources and revenues from the local economy. This means local needs have not been satisfied. It is a process common to industrial development throughout the Canadian North. Throughout this process, the Innut have not been consulted about what development, if any, should take place in their country.

For nearly a decade the military has been using the "empty" space of Labrador for low-level test flying, but it is really in the last five years that the dramatic increase in the number of sorties has come to be viewed by the Innut as a threat to their way of life.

This paper has argued that military development operates much like other forms of industrial development in the creation of underdevelopment in the region. The military of the 1980s holds views which echo those of government agents 50 years ago-- Labrador is here to be used. It is felt that one purpose to which this vast land could be the construction of a NATO Tactical, Fighter Weapons Training Centre. However, the Innut argue the government has no right to invite NATO to their country, and maintain the jets will destroy the environment, change animal behaviour and migration patterns, and drive their people out of the country. If this happens, the Innut say they will lose the most important element of their culture, and the Canada will be guilty of cultural genocide.

This conflict is really about who owns or controls the land the Innut call Nitassinan and others call Labrador. The Innut do

not recognize any title to the land but their own, and say their "ownership" is based on the right of aboriginal occupancy. This view is challenged by those who feel the land belongs to "all Labradorians". The battle is over who will have a say in development, and what sort of development--if any--should occur.

It is a battle in which the Innut find themselves outnumbered and outgunned. The federal government and the supporters of military development have almost limitless financial resources to use to sell the NATO training centre to the region and the country. Although the Innut do not have a lot of money, they have managed to bring their case to the attention of a national and international audience. For the most part, they have been quite adept at using the media to get their message out. For example, it is quite likely that if the Innut had not protested long and loud {1} there would be no environmental assessment of the effects of low-level flying taking place. Despite skepticism about the value of the Environmental Assessment Review process, and the fact that low-level flying will continue despite what the panel rules, the public hearings that are scheduled to take place in 1989 will provide the Innut with an "official" forum in which to air their views.

It has been suggested in this thesis that the clash of cultures in Labrador can be seen as having produced, or being in the process of producing, one of several outcomes. Briefly, these

1 The loudest protest probably occurred on Parliament Hill in 1985 when a couple of Innut locked themselves in a van and blasted out the sound of low-flying jets over a loud speaker.

are (i) the destruction of one group by the other, i.e., genocide; (ii) the stronger of the two subordinates the weaker and comes to completely dominate it; (iii) one of the forms is assimilated; (iv) the two forms live in peaceful coexistence; or (v) some form of integration is arrived at which does not require the complete assimilation of the weaker group.

From the preceding analysis it should be clear that the first example is totally abhorrent to anyone who has even the remotest sense of justice and humanity. So far it has not occurred and it must not be allowed to occur. Innut warnings that cultural genocide could be their fate if military development continues in their homeland should be enough to emphasize the importance of arriving at some acceptable resolution of the current conflict.

The second outcome can also be rejected in the case of the Innut. Gundar Frank argued that capitalism first subordinated and then totally dominated other modes of production, and that this had been going on since the 1500s. Plainly, this has not been the case with the Innut; if it had, there would be no need to discuss the contemporary workings of the domestic mode of production and its importance to Innut culture because this mode would have ceased to exist.

Likewise, the third option--assimilation--was used by Marx to argue that the inevitable outcome of capitalist development was the alteration and assimilation of all previously existing economic forms. However, as we have seen, Marx paid too little

attention to non-economic factors that contribute in perhaps unmeasurable ways to the production process. The problem of explaining the development of underdevelopment in many parts of the world has led some writers to argue that there can be an "articulation" of different modes of production, that it is possible for them to exist simultaneously. However, bowing to Marx, these neo-Marxists hold that the capitalist mode of production will dominate the domestic mode, but this domination is not absolute.

In examining the relationships between Northern Native peoples and the dominant Canadian cultural formation, this idea has led to the development of a dual-economy thesis based on the existence of two inter-related modes of production. As we have seen in the case of the Innut, some Native people are able to use earnings from wage labour to purchase supplies they need to carry on activities in the domestic mode of production. As well, the domestic mode is used by the Innut as a source of spiritual and physical regeneration. The self-esteem and feeling of productivity gained from life in the country is not found in the village where the industrial mode of production (in the form of marginal employment and idleness) dominates.

It is important to recognize that these two modes of production do not live in a situation of peaceful coexistence. Capitalism is by nature aggressive and expansionist; it pushes all other modes to the margins and, in many cases, has completely obliterated them. This is the situation the Innut now face.

Increasing industrial use of their homeland, in the form of low-level jet fighter training, and in other existing and proposed forms of development, is threatening their way of life. Many argue that if the flying continues they will be driven from the country, and once that happens, they will no longer retain the skills needed to carry out activities in the domestic mode of production.

However, this does not rule out the final option, integration, which is also a form of coexistence. The existence of a dual economy implies a form of integration has developed over the last century. It is only with the rapid expansion of industry in the region that this coexistence has been threatened. The process began with the construction of Goose Bay, accelerated with the building of the Churchill Falls hydroelectric complex, and is approaching a point of maximum stress with plans to use the Labrador interior as a NATO training centre.

That said, it is not too late to find a solution which will accommodate both the needs of the Innut and the governments. A land claims settlement, while an imperfect solution, would be a tolerable form of integration if it contained for the Innut guarantees of self-government and self-determination in the areas of health care, education, and economic development. The Innut must become partners in any development scheme in central Labrador, and the age-old process of development from the outside must stop. To ameliorate conditions of underdevelopment, the

Innut must have the chance to control their own lives and development.

For this process to work, a number of conditions would have to be met; these are not prescriptions, but possible options:

1) There would have to be a recognition by government that the Innut have a right to determine their own future. This implies that both governments, but especially the province, embrace the concept of aboriginal rights. Arguments about just what these rights are could go on for years, but in the case of the Innut it might be a sufficient starting point for the governments involved to show good faith by agreeing that the Innut have these rights and should be treated as equal partners in settling the future of the region.

2) The Innut would have to collectively decide that it was worth taking a risk and negotiating a claim (a decision that would be a lot easier to do if their aboriginal rights were recognized and affirmed). This would imply the abandonment of the "nationalist" position that the Innut are a sovereign people and need not negotiate for their own land. While this position is the most emotionally acceptable for the Innut and their supporters, it discourages governments (and many non-Innut who worry about their place in a future, redefined Labrador) from taking any steps towards accommodation. This implies a compromise that will be hard for many Innut to make, and whether or not it should be made is rightly the decision of the community itself.

3) For this process to work, all industrial development activities must be suspended until a land claims settlement is reached. The status quo, of increasing marginalization of the Innut through the expansion of the industrial mode of production, is unacceptable and its continuation will do nothing to encourage the Innut to negotiate because they will see that there is really nothing to negotiate for.

This means that no further bilateral low-level flying agreements should be signed, and no low-level flying should take place until land claims negotiators determine its future. This position has been taken by both the International Federation of Human Rights and the Canadian Public Health Association on their reports on the effects of low-level flying.

This position does not deal with military training as a strategic issue and does not answer the question of whether or not Canada should be taking part in activities which, it can be argued, are not defensive, but offensive. Instead, it takes military development as another form of industrial development and, having examined its effect upon Innut culture, holds that it should be suspended until other development questions are answered.

4) The alternatives mentioned above imply a role for the non-Native inhabitants of Labrador who have been pushing for about 15 years to have a say in their own development. This paper has pointed out many similarities between the Innut and non-Native Labradorian situations, especially with respect to their

subordinate roles in an economy dominated by the industrial mode of production. Both are demanding the right to make their own decisions, to participate in a development process that works from the bottom up, instead of the top down.

While the business elite of Happy Valley-Goose Bay is loud in its support of military development, others question locking the local economy into a situation where it would be even more reliant upon the military for its welfare. Many look with some trepidation to predictions that with the development of the NATO TFWTC, the military will be the main economic force in Labrador within a few years. They see this to mean even more outside control and less local decision-making ability. This portion of the population is uncountable since most decline to express their misgivings in public for fear of losing an opportunity to work should it materialize. While some might criticize this position as hypocrisy, it is an understandable one considering the fact that Happy Valley-Goose Bay is, in effect, a single-industry town.

A gradual awakening of an understanding of where Innut and non-Innut interests meet would go a long way to silencing the racial overtones of the discussion. Not all Labradorians are racists, but the silence of the majority ensures that the reactions of a vocal minority are taken to represent the entire population. In turn, this makes it more unlikely that the Innut are going to be willing to talk seriously with a group they perceive holds them and their way of life in contempt.

What sort of future will be created by new relationships between the aboriginal people of Nitassinan and the Settlers and other newcomers is, of course, an open question. There are a few historical precedents in Canada where Native peoples and governments have negotiated new arrangements, and the degree of success has been mixed.

The fact that the Innut have been able to resist assimilation means they are not likely to surrender their land now. For the several hundred years during which they had sporadic contact with Europeans, and the half-century in which that contact has been sustained, they have retained their identity as a distinct people sharing a common culture, language, history and world view based on the domestic mode of production. They have not vanished, as predicted by travellers in the last century.

It is impossible to say what would have happened to the Innut had history been different. What is clear is that the Innut are still here and a major portion of their existence is still governed by the exigencies of the domestic mode of production. The Innut of Sheshatshiu drive trucks, listen to stereos or watch television; they drink Pepsi and wear blue jeans or other non-traditional clothing; and many now go to the country by airplane rather than by canoe or on foot. But does this make them any less Innut? Surely these trappings of Euro-Canadian culture are the products of choice, as was the initial decision several hundred years ago to trade beaver and other furs for axes of steel and other implements.

Cultures evolve. To be static is to risk extinction. When the Innut chose to adopt foreign-made tools to make their work a little easier, they did not automatically change the purpose for which the tool was adopted. Rather, they incorporated it into their lives. Certainly, a modification process was initiated with the first cross-cultural contact, but that exchange of goods or knowledge was, for many years, reciprocal.

But now things have changed, and the Innut are aware there are no quick solutions for underdevelopment, but they are not content merely to sit back and wait to confront a future which they have not had a hand in designing. They are finding strength in their resistance to the forces that have created and maintained the underdevelopment of their community, and feel that strength will sustain them in the future. But they have no illusions about what they are up against and realize their future also depends on the actions of others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Interviews

- Abraham, Joseph. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 6, 1987.
- Andrew, Ben. Sheshatshiu Band Council. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 18, 1987.
- Andrew, Charlie. Co-ordinator, Outpost Program. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 18, 1987.
- Andrew, Sylvester. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 14, 1987.
- Ashini, Adeline. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 20, 1987.
- Ashini, Daniel. Chief, Sheshatshiu Band Council. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 18, 1987.
- David, Col. John F. Commanding Officer, Canadian Forces Station, Goose Bay, Labrador. Jan. 14 and 20, 1987.
- Luttich, Stu. Wildlife biologist, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Goose Bay, Labrador. Aug. 21, 1987.
- Mullins, Gillian. District Manager, Department of Social Services, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 10, 1987.
- Nui, Luke. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 6, 1987.
- Nui, Monica. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 6, 1987.
- Nuke, David. Naskapi Montagnais Innu Association. Happy Valley, Labrador. Jan. 12, 1987.
- Penashue, Anne-Marie. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 11, 1987.
- Penashue, Matthew. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 11, 1987.
- Penashue, Pien. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 3, 1987.
- Penashue, Simeo. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 11, 1987.
- Penunsi, Sebastien. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 4, 1987.
- Rich, Paul. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 21, 1987.

Rudkowski, Claris. Mokami Project Group; Happy Valley, Labrador.
Jan. 17, 1987.

Selma, Mary Ann. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 4, 1987.

Selma, Pien. Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Aug. 12, 1987.

Primary Sources

[Note: In references PANL stands for Public
Archives of Newfoundland and Labrador]

Anonymous 1937. Introduction of Reindeer into Labrador. File NR
53-37, PANL.

Foote, Capt. W.H. 1942. Labrador (Reports by Miss Green 1942 and
Capt. W.H. Foote 1942). File [GN 31/3C], PANL.

Fraser, R.D. 1935a. "Report on the Beaver on the Labrador" from
an unnumbered file in Labrador: Economic Developments;
Effects on the Eskimos 3/11/35. File C11/4 27323, PANL.

----- 1935b. "Bad Effects of the Hudson [sic] Bay
Company's Powerful Monopoly" from Labrador: Economic
Developments; Effects on the Eskimos 7/11/35. File C11/4
27323, PANL.

Green, Miss [?] 1942. "Report on the Conditions in Northern
Labrador, November 1942" in Labrador (Reports by Miss Green
1942 and Capt. W.H. Foote 1942). File [GN 31/3C], PANL.

Luttich Stu. Regional Biologist, Wildlife Division, Department of
Culture, Recreation and Youth, Government of Newfoundland
and Labrador. Copy of letter to Greg Andrew, Naskapi-
Montagnais Innu Association. Nov. 23, 1983.

McGrath, John. Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Rural,
Agricultural and Northern Development, Government of
Newfoundland and Labrador. Letter to author, Oct. 6, 1987.

McMillan, Tom. Minister of the Environment, Government of Canada.
Letter to David H. Barnes, Chairman, Environmental
Assessment Panel Reviewing Military Flying Activities in
Labrador and Quebec, March 21, 1988.

Mokami Project Group. Letter to Members of Parliament,
Oct. 16, 1986.

- Moravian Mission Board 1940. "Memorandum on the Eskimos of Northern Labrador, Presented by the Moravian Mission Board to the Commission of Government, Feb. 1940" in Labrador: Economic Development Effects on the Eskimos. Unnumbered file, PANL.
- Newfoundland and Labrador, Commission of Government 1939. Untitled memo (16-10-39) in Colonization in Newfoundland and Labrador. File P.U. 70-'39 [R347], PANL.
- Rockwood, Walter 1943. NL/RI General Report, Northern Labrador Administration, (15-6-43), report of Inspector Walter Rockwood. PANL.
- Sarsfield, Dr. Peter. Director of Community Medicine, Grenfell Regional Health Services. Copy of letter to Francis Penashue, June 17, 1982.
- Stevenson, Mary. Nurse with Grenfell Regional Health Services. Copy of letter to Dr. Peter Sarsfield, November 8, 1981.
- Tanner, Vaino 1939. Memo in Colonization in Newfoundland and Labrador. File P.U. 70-'39 [R347], PANL.
- Walker, Capt. M.P. Canadian Forces Station Goose Bay. Letter to author, Sept. 11, 1987.
- Wotton, Dr. K.A. Copy of letter to Dr. Peter Sarsfield, Oct. 28, 1981.

Secondary Sources

- Abele, Frances and Daiva Stasiulis. "Canada as a 'White Settler Colony': What About Natives and Immigrants?" in The New Canadian Political Economy (W. Clement and J. Williams, eds.). McGill-Queen's (forthcoming).
- Andrew, Ben and Peter Sarsfield 1984. "Innu Health: The Role of Self-Determination." Circumpolar Health 84 pp. 428-430.
- Andrew, (Ben) Penote and Peter Sarsfield 1983. "Local Health Care Amongst Indigenous Peoples." Paper presented at the 74th Annual Conference of the Canadian Public Health Association, June 1983.
- Andrew (MacEachern), Lyla 1984. "The Administration of Social Injustice in Ntesinan." Native Issues IV:1 (October) pp. 34-37.

- Antane, Anikashan (trans.) 1984. "Innu Hunters Speak Out on Low-Level Flights." Native Issues IV:1 (October) pp.16-20.
- Antane, Shinipest and Pien Kanikuen 1984. "Assimilation of the Innu" (Anikashan Antane, trans.). Native Issues IV:1 (October) pp. 25-33.
- Armitage, Peter and John Kennedy 1987. "Redbaiting and Racism on our Frontier: Military Expansion in Labrador and Quebec." Unpublished study: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Armitage, Peter 1984. "The Religious Significance of Animals in Innu Culture." Native Issues IV:1 pp. 50-56.
- Asch, Michael 1984. Home and Native Land: Aboriginal Rights and the Canadian Constitution. Methuen Publications.
- 1977. "The Dene Economy" in Dene Nation: The Colony Within (Mel Watkins, ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ashini, Daniel. "Presentation by the Sheshatshit Innu Band Council and N.M.I.A. to the BEARO Hearing, October 1986" in Compendium of Submissions Received on Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement During Public Meetings Vol. II, December 1986.
- Atlantic Planners' Institute, Newfoundland & Labrador Branch 1981. Planning for Northern Communities: A Conference in Labrador.
- Bailey, A.G. 1937. The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures 1504-1700. St. John: Publications of the University of New Brunswick Museum.
- Barone, Charles A. 1985. Marxist Thought on Imperialism: Survey and Critique. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe Inc.
- Berger, Thomas R. 1977. Northern Frontier, Northern Homeland: The Report of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry (Vol. I). Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Blomstrom, Magnus and Bjorn Hettne 1984. Development Theory in Transition: The Dependency Debate and Beyond: Third World Responses. London: Zed Books, Ltd.
- Boas, Franz 1905. "Physical Types of the Indians of Canada" in Ethnology of Canada and Newfoundland. Toronto: Ontario Archeological Report No. 12.
- Boldt, Menno J., et al. (eds) 1985. The Quest for Justice:

- Aboriginal Peoples and Aboriginal Rights. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bourgeault, Ron 1983. "The Development of Capitalism and the Subjugation of Native Women in Northern Canada." Alternate Routes 6, pp. 110-140.
- Bradbury, Patricia 1985. "Luftwaffe over Labrador." This Magazine XIX:3 (Aug.) pp. 9-11.
- Brewer, Anthony 1980. Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey. London, Boston and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Brice-Bennett, Carol 1986. Renewable Resource Use and Wage Employment in the Economy of Northern Labrador. Background Report for the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment, Newfoundland and Labrador.
- Browne, Rev. P.W. 1909. Where the Fishers Go: The Story of Labrador. Toronto: The Musson Book Company Limited.
- Brody, Hugh 1981. Maps and Dreams: Indians and the British Columbia Frontier. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre Ltd.
- 1975. The People's Land: Whites and the Eastern Arctic. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Brosted, Jens and Mads Faegteborg 1982. "Expulsion of the Great People When U.S. Air Force Came to Thule: An Analysis of Colonial Myth and Actual Incidents" in Native Power (Jen Brosted et al., eds.). Universitetsforlaget: Bergen.
- Budgel, Richard 1984. "Canada, Newfoundland, and the Labrador Indians 1949-69." Native Issues IV:1 (October) pp. 38-49.
- Cabot, William B. 1909. "The Indians" in Labrador: The Country and the People (Wilfred T. Grenfell, ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Canadian Public Health Association 1987. CPHA Task Force on the Health Effects of Increased Flying Activity in the Labrador Area, Final Report.
- Cartwright, George 1911. Captain Cartwright and His Labrador Journal (Charles W. Townsend, ed.). Boston: Dana Estes & Company.
- Clement, Wallace 1981. Property and Proletarianization: Transformation of simple commodity production in Canadian Farming and Fishing. Departmental Working Paper 81-3. Ottawa: Carleton University.

- Cole, Leslie 1988. The Southernization of Food Habits on Baffin Island, 1955-1985. unpublished M.A. thesis: University of Ottawa.
- Commission on Human Rights, Sub-commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities 1985. Review of Further Developments in Fields with which the Sub-commission has been Concerned. Revised and Updated Report on the Question of the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, prepared by B. Whitaker.
- Côté, Langevin 1971. Heritage of Power: The Churchill Falls Development from Concept to Reality. Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation Limited (Brinco).
- Cruikshank, Julie 1982. "The Gravel Magnet: Some Social Impacts of the Alaska Highway on Yukon Indians." Paper presented at the Alaska Highway Conference. Fort St. John, June 18-20, 1982.
- Dacks, Gurston 1981. A Choice of Futures: Politics in the Canadian North. Toronto: Methuen.
- Daniels, Harry W. 1977. The Forgotten People: Metis and Non-Status Indian Claims. Ottawa: Native Council of Canada.
- Davies, Maureen 1985. "Aboriginal Rights in International Law: Human Rights." Aboriginal Peoples and the Law: Indian, Metis and Inuit Rights in Canada (Bradford Morse, ed.) Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Department of National Defence (n.d.). Background: NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre Project. Ottawa: Department of National Defence.
- Department of Northern Labrador Affairs 1952-1970. Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare. Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.
- Engels, Frederick 1972. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (Eleanor Burke Leacock, ed.). New York: International Publishers.
- Environmental Assessment Panel 1986. Guidelines for the Preparation of: An Environmental Impact Statement on Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec.
- Eyre, Kenneth Charles 1981. Custos Borealis: The Military in the Canadian North. unpublished D.Phil. thesis: University of London.

Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office (FEARO). "Reply from the Minister of the Environment Concerning Clarification of the Mandate of the Panel." Aug. 3, 1987.

Federation Internationale des Droits de L'Homme 1986. Report of the Mission on Low-Altitude Jet Overflights of Labrador and North-Eastern Quebec (Canada).

Fisher, Robin 1977. Contact and Conflict: Indian-European Relations in British Columbia, 1774-1890. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Fitzhugh, William W. 1977. "Indian and Eskimo/Inuit Settlement History in Labrador: An Archaeological View" in Our Footprints Are Everywhere: Inuit Land Use and Occupancy in Labrador (Carol Brice-Bennett, ed.). Nain: Labrador Inuit Association.

----- 1972. Environmental Archeology and Cultural Systems in Hamilton Inlet, Labrador: A Survey of the Central Labrador Coast from 3000 B.C. to the Present. Washington: Smithsonian Institute Press.

Ford, George 1975. Quoted in Inuit Today IV:5 (May) pp. 60-61.

Foster-Carter, Aidan 1978. "The Modes of Production Controversy." New Left Review 107 (Jan.-Feb.) pp. 47-78.

----- 1976. "From Rostow to Gundar Frank: Conflicting Paradigms in the Analysis of Underdevelopment." World Development IV:3 pp. 167-180.

Frank, Andre Gundar 1970: "The Development of Underdevelopment" in Imperialism and Underdevelopment: a reader (Robert I. Rhodes, ed.). New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

----- 1969. Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

Freire, Paulo 1970. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Gaffney, R.E., et al. 1984. Broken Promises: The Aboriginal Constitutional Conferences. New Brunswick Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians.

Gosling, W.G. 1910. Labrador: Its Discovery, Exploration and Development. London: Alston Rivers, Ltd.

Goudie, Elizabeth 1973. Woman of Labrador. Agincourt: The Book Society of Canada Limited.

- Grant, Hugh 1980. The Exploitation of Natural Resources in Ntesinan: A Summary of Past and Future Rent Estimates 1975-1990 (2 Vol.) Prepared for the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, Sheshatshiu, Labrador.
- Harper, Francis 1964. Friendly Montagnais and Their Neighbours in the Ungava Peninsula. Laurence: The University of Kansas.
- Hawkes, David C. 1985. Aboriginal Self-Government: What Does it Mean? Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations.
- Heimbecker, Connie 1984. The Lullaby and Family Among the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu of Labrador. unpublished M.A. thesis: Carleton University.
- Henriksen, Georg 1973. Hunters in the Barrens: The Naskapi on the Edge of the White Man's World. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Hill, Robin 1983. "An Aluminum Smelter for Labrador?" The Indian and Inuit Supporter III:1 (April) pp. 11-15.
- Hind, Henry Youle 1863. Explorations in the Interior of the Labrador Peninsula: The Country of the Montagnais and Nasquapee Indians (2 vol.). London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green.
- Hobson, Sharon 1986. "Will NATO choose Goose Bay or Konyia for NTFWTC base?" Jane's Defence Weekly. November 22, 1986, pp. 1244-46.
- Horwood, Harold 1986. Corner Brook: A Social History of a Paper Town. St. John's: Breakwater Books.
- House, J.D. 1980. "Coastal Labrador: Incorporation, Exploitation and Underdevelopment." Journal of Canadian Studies XV:2 pp. 98-113.
- . "Coastal Labrador II: Resisting 'Development' and the Emergence of a Regional Identity." Department of Sociology, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Hubbard, Jr., Mrs. Leonidas 1908. A Woman's Way Through Unknown Labrador. Toronto: William Briggs.
- Indian and Inuit Support Group of Newfoundland and Labrador 1979. "The Naskapi Montagnais Innu Association and Land Claims."
- Indian and Inuit Supporter 1979. "The Impact of Development on Native People." The Indian and Inuit Supporter 1:1, May 1979 pp. 6-10.

- Innis, Harold 1962. The Fur Trade in Canada: An Introduction to Canadian Economic History., University of Toronto Press.
- Jellis, Arvin D. 1977 "The Loss of Economic Rents" in Dene Nation: The Colony Within (Mel Watkins, ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jennings, Francis 1975. The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Jones, Gwyn 1986. The Norse Atlantic Saga: Being the Norse Voyages of Discovery and Settlement to Iceland, Greenland, and North America. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Labrador Resources Advisory Council 1977. Annual Report 1976-77.
- Landry, Major G. 1981. An Initial Environmental Evaluation on a Proposal to Conduct Low-Level Flying Training from Goose Bay, Labrador. Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of Air Plans.
- Leacock, Eleanor Burke 1982. "Relations of Production in Band Society" in Politics and History in Band Societies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'homme.
- Leblanc, Lawrence J. 1984. "Genocide and Political Groups." Presentation to the 25th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Atlanta, Georgia, March 27-31, 1984.
- LeBreton, Marcel 1986. The Socio-Economic Impact of Present and Future Military Activities in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Region. Directorate of Social and Economic Analysis, Operational Research and Analysis Establishment, Department of National Defence, Ottawa.
- Lips, Julius E. 1947a. Naskapi Law: Law and Order in a Hunting Society. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- 1947b. "Notes on the Montagnais-Naskapi Economy." Ethnos XII pp. 1-78.
- Lithman, Ingve Georg 1982. The Practice of Underdevelopment and the Theory of Development: The Canadian Indian Case. Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology, University of Stockholm.

MacEachern, Lyla 1984. Unpublished report on Kakushpinanut (the Outpost Program) prepared for the Sheshatshiu Innu Council.

MacKenzie, Marguerite and Sandra Clarke 1983. "The Sheshatshiu Sociolinguistic Variability Project: A Preliminary Report" in Actes du Quatorzieme Congres des Algonquinistes (William Cowan, ed.). Carleton University.

Mailhot, José and Andrée Michaud 1965. Northwest River: Etude Ethnographique. Quebec: Institut de géographie, Université Laval.

Marx, Karl 1973. Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy. New York: Vintage Books.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels 1978. The German Ideology, Part One (C.J. Arthur, ed.), New York: International Publishers.

----- 1977. Selected Works In One Volume, New York: International Publishers.

----- 1972. The Marx-Engels Reader. (Robert C. Tucker, ed.) New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

McGee, John T. 1961. Cultural Stability and Change Among the Montagnais Indians of the Lake Melville Region of Labrador. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Michel, Penote Ben 1987. Statement read to the Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador, Happy Valley, March 1987.

----- 1986. "Canadian Government Arguments and Statements in Justification of the Imposition of Low level Flight Training on the Territory of the Colonized Innu People and the Offer by Canada of the Innu Territory of Ntesinan to NATO as the Site of a New NATO Tactical Fighter and Weapons Training Centre and Range Complex, and Innu Responses to these Arguments" in Compendium of Submissions Received on Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement During Public Meetings Vol. I, December 1986.

Mokami Project Group. "Presented to Environmental Assessment Review Panel on Low Level Flying Activity in Labrador and Quebec Discussion of Draft Guidelines, October 27, 1986" in Compendium of Submissions Received on Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement During Public Meetings Vol. III, December 1986.

----- n.d. Untitled background sheet on development in Labrador.

- Morse, Bradford W. 1985. Aboriginal Peoples and the Law: Indian, Metis and Inuit Rights in Canada. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association 1986. "We Are a Distinct People." Native Issues VI:1 (September) pp. 33-36.
- Neary, Peter 1986. "The Diplomatic Background to the Canada-Newfoundland Goose Bay Agreement of October 10, 1944." Newfoundland Studies II:1 pp. 39-61.
- Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Public Welfare Annual Reports 1952-1970, St. John's.
- Newfoundland and Labrador. Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment 1986. Building on Our Strengths: Final Report of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment. St. John's: Queen's Printer.
- Newfoundland and Labrador. Royal Commission on Labrador 1974. Report of the Royal Commission on Labrador (6 Vol.). St. John's.
- Northern Innu Health Council 1986. "Kakuspinanut Study Project Proposal."
- Ottenheimer, Gerald R. Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs, Newfoundland and Labrador. Letter to Carol Martin, Executive Secretary, Environmental Assessment Panel on Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec, October 27, 1986 in Compendium of Submissions Received on Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement During Public Meetings, Vol. 3. December 1986. pp. 1285-86.
- Page, Robert 1986. Northern Development: The Canadian Dilemma. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Paine, Robert, ed. 1977. The White Arctic: Anthropological Essays on Tutelage and Ethnicity. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Parkman, Francis 1887. The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Penashue, Peter 1984. "'Civilization' and Destruction: A Foreign Program for the Innut." Native Issues IV:1 (October) pp. 21-24.
- Poole, Erik and Jim Oakes 1986. "Canada campaigns to put NATO base in Labrador wilds." The Globe and Mail. Thursday, May 22, 1986.

- Preston, Richard J. 1975. "A Survey of Ethnographic Approaches to the Eastern Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi." The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology IX:3 (Aug.) pp. 267-277.
- Puxley, Peter 1977. "The Colonial Experience" in Dene Nation: The Colony Within (Mel Watkins, ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Richardson, R. Alan (n.d.). Acculturation Among the Seven-Island Montagnais. unpublished M.A. thesis: McGill University.
- Robinson, Joan 1979. Aspects of Development and Underdevelopment. Cambridge University Press.
- Rostow, W.W. 1960. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto. Cambridge at the University Press.
- Rowe, Frederick W. 1980. A History of Newfoundland and Labrador. Toronto: McGraw-Hill-Ryerson Ltd.
- Ruccio, David F. and Lawrence H. Simon 1986. "Methodological Aspects of a Marxian Approach to Development: An Analysis of the Mode of Production School." World Development XIV:2 pp. 211-222.
- Sahlins, Marshall 1972. Stone Age Economics. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
- Scott, Richard T. and Selina Conn 1987. "The Failure of Scientific Medicine: Davis Inlet as an Example of Sociopolitical Morbidity." Canadian Family Physician 33 (July) pp. 1648-53.
- Speck, F.G. 1935. Naskapi. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- 1925. "Montagnais and Naskapi Tribes." Journal of American Folklore 38 pp. 1-32.
- Speck, Frank G. and Loren Eiseley 1942. "Montagnais-Naskapi Bands and Family Hunting Districts of the Central and Southeastern Labrador Peninsula." American Philosophical Society Proceedings 85 pp. 215-242.
- Speck, Frank G. and George G. Heye 1921. Hunting Charms of the Montagnais and the Mistassini. New York: Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation.
- Tait, R.H. 1939. Newfoundland: A Summary of the History and Development of Britain's Oldest Colony from 1497-1939. The Harrington Press.

Tanner, Adrian 1979. Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the Mistassini Cree Hunters. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

----- 1977. Indian Land Use and Tenure in Southern Labrador. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Tanner, Vaino 1947. Outline of the Geography, Life and Customs of Newfoundland-Labrador (The Eastern Part of the Labrador Peninsula) (2 vol.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Evening Telegram. St. John's Newfoundland. Jan. 26, 1988.

----- Feb. 10, 1986.

Them Days 1987. "'On the Goose': The Story of Goose Bay" (Judy McGrath, ed.) Them Days: Stories of Early Labrador XII:4 (July). Happy Valley-Goose Bay: Labrador Heritage Society.

Thistle Paul C. 1986. Indian-European Trade Relations in the Lower Saskatchewan River Region to 1840. The University of Manitoba Press.

Tuck, James A. 1976. Newfoundland and Labrador Prehistory. National Museum of Man. Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold Ltd.

Trigger, Bruce G. 1985. Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

----- 1976. Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660 (2 vol.). Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Turner, Lucien M. 1979 [1894]. Ethnology of the Ungava District, Hudson Bay Territory: Indians and Eskimos in the Quebec-Labrador Peninsula Quebec: Presses Comeditex.

Unemployment Action Committee. "Submission to the Environmental Assessment Panel on Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec, October 27, 1986." in Compendium of Submissions Received on Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement During Public Meetings Vol III. December 1986.

Usher, Peter J. 1982. "The North: Metropolitan Frontier, Native Homeland?" in Heartland and Hinterland: A Geography of Canada (L.D. McCann, ed.). Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.

- Vincent, Sylvie and José Mailhot 1983. "Montagnais Land Tenure." (Mary Stark and Marguerite Mackenzie, trans.) The Indian and Inuit Supporter III:1 (April) pp. 16-27.
- Wallace, Dillon 1907. The Long Labrador Trail. Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company.
- Watkins, Mel, ed. 1977. Dene Nation: The Colony Within. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins 1981. "The Separation of the Economic and the Political in Capitalism." New Left Review 127 (May-June) pp. 66-95.
- Worsley, Peter 1984. The Three Worlds: Culture and World Development. University of Chicago Press.
- Zimmerly, David 1975. Cain's Land Revisited: Culture Change in Central Labrador, 1775-1972. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

END

07-07-89

FIN