INDIAN-ESKIMO RELATIONS*

INTRODUCTION

This volume marks a stage in the evolution of anthropological reporting and analysis by focusing on a major boundary rather than on a particular community, tribal group or cultural area. Although it parallels some of the many recent studies of "ethnicity" by concerning itself with intergroup relationships, identities and cultural diacritics, it is not the study of one complex, plural society, but of a large number of societies inhabiting a vast region, 4000 miles from end to end. Furthermore this region is only a unit from the analytical or present point of view, for few of the native societies described knew about more than the few ethnic groups adjacent to them, and no one, native or European, was cognizant of the whole panorama of boundary relationships until after the great era of exploration which, for certain regions here described, did not end until well within the twentieth century. As many of the papers are at pains to point out, the very concepts of "Eskimo" and "Indian" are artificial labels derived from external knowledge and classification, and often misinformation. Among the Eskimos few, until recently, would have recognized their supposed unit if confronted with it.

*Nelson Graburn is Professor of Anthropology and Curator of North American Ethnology at the University of California, Berkeley. He has done fieldwork amongst the Inuit of the Eastern Canadian Arctic since 1959, and in the Central Canadian Arctic in 1976. He has been particularly concerned with Indian-Eskimo boundary relationships since involvement in the Cooperative Cross-cultural Study of Ethnocentrism, headed by Donald Campbell and Robert Levine (see Levine, R. and D. Campbell 1972). In 1963-64 he was employed on this project as a Research Associate of the Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, to do a year's field research on this topic amongst the Eskimos of Northern Quebec and the Nanokpi-Cree of Shefferville and Great Whale River (see Graburn 1969, 1972 and Graburn and Strong 1973: 118-185). Many of the findings of these researches have been incorporated in Harger's paper in this volume.
Table 1. Traditional Societies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pacific Rim</th>
<th>Other Alaska/Mackenzie</th>
<th>Other Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>Extreme complexity; pervasive similarity of cultural traits</td>
<td>Unclear: fluctuating; occupation with some common cultural traits</td>
<td>Fluctuating, non-overlapping occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal type</td>
<td>Ranked, complex societies, with well defined leadership, and slavery</td>
<td>Mainly egalitarian with some &quot;big man&quot; leadership. organization</td>
<td>Egalitarian, simple band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social unit</td>
<td>Large sedentary villages, often fortified</td>
<td>Well defined societal regions, with central-based bands</td>
<td>Small, nomadic, unstable bands, often reduced to family level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inter-group Relations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pacific Rim</th>
<th>Other Alaska/Mackenzie</th>
<th>Other Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Long distance, multi-ethnic trade, including utilitarian and prestige items, and slaves</td>
<td>Some long distance trade, mainly for prestige items</td>
<td>Mare &quot;silent&quot; trade between language groups; irregular trade within language groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade fairs at regular peace time; trade through long-term partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfare</td>
<td>Between all social groups, with trans-linguistic alliances, and peace-making mechanisms</td>
<td>Warfare between all social groups, with peace-making mechanisms</td>
<td>Raiding across, and to a lesser extent, within language boundaries; fear and mutual avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-marriage</td>
<td>Between all groups by peaceful means at leaders' level; common marriage of captives; mainly endogamous</td>
<td>Intermarriage across language boundaries only at few places; permanent and temporary. Pervasive endogamy</td>
<td>No marriages across language boundaries; frequent marriage within linguistic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td>Common in all groups</td>
<td>Common in a few boundary regions</td>
<td>Almost nonexistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical anthropology (Szathmary) and the archaeology (Dumond) of this area are particularly problematic for understanding pre-historic Indian-Eskimo differences and inter-group gene flow.

2) There is a rough continuum from complex to simple as one goes (North and East) from the Pacific Rim around Alaska and along the coastline through Canada to Labrador. The individual societies themselves, whether central-based bands (Chang 1962), demes (Burch and Cotrell 1972, Burch 1979) or tribes, in previous anthropological parlance (Helm 1976:3), decrease in sedentariness, population density and amounts of inter-ethnic trade as one moves from West to East. Furthermore, though the physical anthropological picture is not entirely clear for some regions (Szathmary) mainly due to inadequate data, the archaeological picture (Dumond, this volume, 1977) is remarkably clear from the McKenzie area eastwards. In this latter area, the archaeological and most of the ethnographical accounts give us a picture of no continuous contact between Eskimos and Indians and of differential occupancy of the arctic and subarctic zones such that few if any areas were occupied by both groups simultaneously until white colonization. Thus, the intermediate areas of the Mackenzie region (Krech), North Alaska (Burch) and West-Central Alaska (Van Stone) are differentiated both from the Pacific Rim, because they were more egalitarian societies with fewer inter-Indian-Eskimo relationships than...
intra-macro-group, and from the more Eastern societies, because they were more complex, trading and ecologically privileged and because they exhibited greater degrees of internal stratification. Without oversimplifying, one might say that these intermediate areas were more like the Pacific Rim case as far as societal identity and inter-societal and inter-ethnic behavior were concerned; conversely they were more like the Eskimo and Indian societies farther East as far as inter-organizational and intra-societal behavior were concerned.

3) Because they stand half way between the Pacific Rim case and the Canadian situation, the West and North Alaskan cases present us, perhaps, with the best clues to the understanding of these traditional social groups for the area as a whole. As Burch (1975, this volume) has explored the phenomena most fully, we shall follow in part his leads.

a) Traditional units of identity and organization, which Burch calls societies, consisted in all areas of culturally and linguistically homogeneous groups who inhabited contiguous and quite well defined regions. The size and ecological complexity of the regions and the size of the populations varied from area to area; however the lower and upper limits of the populations ranged from a hundred or so, in the less favored areas, to a few thousand at the most in the ecologically richest areas; the range of size of the areas was likely to be governed by topographical features, such as river basins, watersheds and bay coastlines. But where ecologically homogeneous areas were larger than the annual cycles of the local groups could encompass, the social groupings were multiple within the area, and the societies were marked by cultural and linguistic diversities, even when following ecologically identical subsistence patterns. To put this in another way, we could state political societies did not expand or ally to fill the land allotted (with apologies to C. Northcote Parkinson).

b) Linguistic differences were always markers for societal identification, even through the historic and recent periods, and language became the major criterion imposed from the outside by laymen and anthropologists alike. Other cultural markers, used traditionally between adjacent groups within larger areas, were of the same kind as language, i.e., signs (Pierce 1931) or symbols (de Saussure 1916) in their arbitrariness and lack of direct connection with the imperatives of subsistence. Other criteria of a less arbitrary nature, such as hunting techniques, use of different materials depending on availability (e.g., wood, furs) or biologically observable differences, were secondary, and only served to mark groups of societies from other major groups, often at gross ecological boundaries, such as the treeline. It is important to note that white outsiders, unable to observe the more subtle differences of dialect and pattern variation, have usually taken these secondary characteristics to be the major societal markers in their invention of cultural, tribal and area classifications.

In the historic period, and most recently through diffusion from academic culture, these grosser markers have been imposed on the native peoples in reconstructing the scheme of ethnic difference and classification. Because of the legal, political and cultural power of the whites, the dominant language and phylum labels, such as Na-Dene, Inupik, Alcet etc., have remained to this day as the diacritica of both native and white classifications in a socio-cultural situation far removed from the "at contact" ethnographic present.

c) Inter-ethnic relations were originally those between small scale "societies" across all levels of linguistic boundaries—phylum, language and dialect. Each society was a largely endogamous deme (Murdock 1949; Burch 1975:10-12) sharing sociocultural characteristics, a region, face to face personal knowledge, centripetal kinship relationships, and, of course, a dialect. None of these societies lived in total isolation, and most exchanged subsistence products with their neighbors, even though they were largely self-supporting. However, there was great variation within our area of study: from the Mackenzie East, there was traditionally no significant peaceful contact across the language (and phylum) boundary, i.e., between the Indians and Eskimos, until the period of white intervention. The major contacts were within each language group, between societal dialect/regional groups, Eskimo-Eskimo and Indian-Indian, with the exception that Cree (Algonkian) avoided the Chipewyan (Athapascan) almost as much as the Eskimos avoided either. In North and West Alaska, the relations across language and phylum boundaries did not differ nearly so significantly from relations across dialect/society boundaries; in this area all inter-ethnic relations were characterized by trade through partnerships, warfare, raiding and mutual fear, and occasional inter-ethnic marriage, either permanent or temporary. The Pacific Rim presents the extreme case wherein all levels of language boundary were equally "inter-ethnic," permitting frequent warfare, trade, intermarriage and alliance formation. Furthermore these societies enjoyed higher levels of political organization, such as leaders (chiefs, "big men"), social stratification, technology as well (as organization) for warfare, and trade in human slaves or "chattels" (Townsend).

d) From West to East there was a decreasing
degree of "cosmopolitanism" of the cultures, related to the ecological and societal degree of complexity. In the Pacific Rim and to some extent of West Alaska (VanStone) the groups partook in long distance trade and travel, enjoying resources and personal contacts with people way beyond their home base regions. The trade across the Bering Straits, as far as the Chuckchee and Kolyma River in Asia, and trade and travel up and down the Northwest Coast, in some cases as far as the Galish, where the two major features which tied those societies into larger economic systems, and which were so important to their lives that the nature of their socio-cultural systems came to depend on them. The North Alaskans, Eskimo and Kutch in, were more peripherally tied into these systems, at least for prestige items such as copper and denumallium shells, but it is doubtful that their lives would have been greatly affected had this material trade stopped. From the Mackenzie area east trade contacts did not play as important a part in Eskimo or Indian lives, at least until white penetration, and each society was organized at a much lower level and, perhaps, individuals and family groups, were forced to be more self-sufficient and autonomous. (Whether this was true of the Thule Eskimos during the florescent period of whaling, we do not know, but archaeological and informants' evidence support these contentions for the prehistoric past).

5) Moving from East to West provides evidence of an internal/migration of those socio-cultural features which characterize the intra- and inter-cultural relationships. For the three major types of warfare, trade and inter-marriage, we may list the degree of intimacy of the relationships. We have already stated that total avoidance and isolation was not found within our area, but, for all intents and purposes there were many areas of the Eastern Arctic where it did characterize certain inter-societal relations, for instance between the inuit and indians in the interior of the Ungava Peninsula and this assertion suggested by the archaeological evidence; similarly between the Inuit and the Chipewyans in the area west of Hudson Bay (Smith and Burch) and, perhaps, even between the Inuit and the Central Eskimo of Southampton Island, there was little significant interaction in the hundreds of years before the white contacts.

Let us therefore try to relate the various levels and intensities of contact in the three spheres of trade, warfare and intermarriage across language boundaries.

a) The minimal level of contact was characterized by infrequent and unplanned relationships, with no bilingualism, such as between the Eastern Inuit and the Naskapi-Cree (Barger, Taylor, Graburn 1969, Graburn & Strong 1973) and the Central Inuit and the Chipewyan (Smith and Burch). In these areas all interactions were characterized by suspicion and fear and there were no "peace-making" mechanisms. Warfare was characterized by stealth and raiding, with the aggressor group taking advantage of their larger numbers or opportunity for surprise. The object was to kill all the enemy, and only very rarely to take captives in the form of women and children. More common, elements of the weaker group — hunting party, camp — fled if possible, sometimes leaving behind their weaker members and always leaving behind material paraphernalia which would impede their getaway. In many instances the sighting of smoke from distant fires or the discovery of a recently abandoned camp in the barren lands was enough for the intrusive group to withdraw to safer territory. But this kind of raiding did give opportunities for the acquisition of the material cultures, furs and foods of the other group. Even the discovery of an empty camp, or the observation of an "enemy" from a distance gave many clues to the use of material culture, which might then be taken or envied, perhaps providing an incentive for further raids or for "silent trading".

Trading would have had to be "silent" because there was no bilingualism and no opportunity to learn the opposite language. Various accounts of inter-language trades, as suggested by accounts of attempted trade with the early white explorers, such as Hudson (Graburn 1969: 56-58), show that offers of exchange of material goods or leaving the goods to be replaced by the "other side" were possible, but the historical accounts showed them to have been very rare before regular white contact. It is possible that both the Inuits and the Eskimos knew roughly the annual cycle of the other group and would avoid them, unless they went armed and in strength to try to initiate this "silent trade".

Sexual and marital relationships must have been very rare across this language boundary. No one went voluntarily to the "other side", indeed each side saw the other as "less than human" (Graburn & Strong op. cit.) The occasionally stealing of young girls or spared in raids would have allowed for a kind of "inter-marriage" but the spouse never returned to their natal group. Furthermore each side thought that the members of the opposite group, once adults, were unable to know the fundamentals of life and would be incapable of making satisfactory spouses. We may summarize this minimal set of relationships by relating lack of bilingualism and extreme mutual fear to lacking of peacemaking institutions, and hence lack of regular trade, intermarriage or co-residence.

b) The intermediate level of contact, in the area from the Mackenzie to West Alaska,
was characterized by a quantum leap of intensity, institutionalization and regularity.
Perhaps we could say that the Mackenzie delta area (Krech) was transitional, because it appears that the relationships between the Kutchin and Inuit were more fearful and violent and less institutionalized than those further west.

The major features of this boundary culture zone included limited bilingualism stemming from an enabling a greater regularity and institutionalization of modes of warfare, trade and intermarriage. Those warfare of the raiding type was common, and fear of warfare was endemic across language boundaries, peace-making mechanisms existed, among them the crucial summer "truce period" during which one could travel without being murdered—for which there was no equivalent East of the Mackenzie. The ability to declare truces was closely related to the desire for trade and allowed for the development of institutionalized "trade fairs". Much as in the case of the North African "peace of the souq (market place)" (Benet 1957:198) all parties put aside their enmities for what they considered essential business of trade and most probably the enjoyable business of socializing with people from outside their immediate societal regions. This trade was, by the time of the first reports, highly developed, covering enormous distances, tying various small societies into a vast network crossing the sea, mountain ranges, "tribal" and linguistic boundaries. The resultant inter-societal socialization, often in the form of long-term trade partnerships brought members of each group close to "foreigners" enabling them to see the others as "more human", as individuals, to a degree not found across the language boundaries further East. Other forms of "partnership" included both temporary and permanent inter-marriage. Both intermarriage and adoption were institutionalised possibilities, rather than occasional results of raids and stealing. Some marriages produced bilingual offspring, who in turn were able to serve as trans-societal links and facilitated the trading and other forms of regular inter-linguistic contact. The institutionalisation of partnerships of all types within and cross social boundaries was much more highly developed in this area, except perhaps amongst the Kutchin. Such relationships reflected the higher degree of social organization and incipient stratification amongst these peoples, even north of the Pacific Rim. In this connection it is significant that much of the trade in this area was for prestige items, such as the whitest caribou skins, dentallium, shells, etc., facilitating the strong tendency for material differentiation between "rich and poor", or "big men" and others, characteristic of all the Indian societies and those Eskimo societies at least as far north as the southern Inupik groups.

c) The greatest intensification of the institutions of inter-societal contacts occurred in the Pacific Rim area. Though resembling some of the characteristics mentioned above, there were other features which produced a different level of organizations. Compared with their Northern neighbors all the societies, Aleut, Eskimo, Athapaskan and Tlingit were ranked with the common presence of wealthy leading families, commoners and chattle or slaves. This more complex organization, along with the presence of more permanent, large settlements and a richer environmental base, had consequences for warfare, trade and intermarriage. Furthermore, this "heterogeneous mosaic of small independent societies" (Townsend) conducted their inter-societal affairs without regard to linguistic alignments. It was as though they were all societies of the same type, with the same internal organization, values and goals, who just happened to speak a variety of mutually unintelligible languages.

Warfare was conducted on a more massive scale, led by "big men" who organized their whole societies not only for raids but for the acquisition of territory; these wars were often conducted with allies in the form of other whole societies from different language groups. It is perhaps significant that this is the only area where Eskimo peoples developed armour for warfare. Similarly trade was on a more massive scale, conducted regularly by partnerships between leading families, and between all manner of men at regular annual fairs. The regular inter-societal trade in this area included a heavy component of subsistence and utilitarian goods, such as meat, oil, fish, all kinds of skins, and even whole boats. Trade and warfare were linked not only through the alternation of war and peace and the directionality of alliance and partnerships, but they were also alternative means of acquiring the very same goods. Furthermore, unlike the other peoples in our study, such "goods" available for barter or capture included other human beings, chattels as Townsend calls them. These captive foreigners could be used for work, for prestige or ownership, for exchanging for other goods i.e. ransom or even to cement alliances through exchange and intermarriage. This human trade, more than anything else set the Pacific Rim societies off from the more egalitarian others, and, of course, supported the stratified nature of these societies. Surprisingly, perhaps, we know little more about "voluntary" inter-marriage between these societies than we do for the more Northern peoples, though it is clear that various forms of co-residence of
foreigners and consequent bilingualism, was more common here than farther north.

ETHNICITY AND HISTORICAL CHANGE

While it is clear that in the traditional situations independent but interconnected societies could be called "nations" in the true sense of the word, it is not clear that this "ethnicity" in the sense used in the modern social science literature existed except in analytical hindsight. Ethnic groups have often been defined as though they were yet another label for any kind of "culture-bearing units" (Barth 1969:11) yet even in recent works, there is the implication that they must be part of an "unequivocally" larger whole. In discussing studies of ethnic phenomena before Barth's landmark work Deprez (1975:189) states that he surveyed the literature and found "few important studies of racial and cultural minorities" and quotes Smith (1969) for showing that ethnicity is part of the study of "social and cultural pluralism" (idem). In order to retain the usefulness of the concept of ethnicity as opposed to "culture" itself, this author proposes that it be restricted to situations where the culture-bearing group is aware of their being part of a larger socio-cultural system (not including the whole of known humanity). This makes explicit the requirement that ethnicity exists in a situation of cultural pluralism, but leaves open the question whether the culture-bearing, self-identifying unit, has to be a minority group within the system. Though the term ethnic group has most usefully emerged through the study of marked minorities, it is not clear that numerical paucity was the operative factor which allowed useful comparisons and generalizations about the common characteristics of "minority groups"; the socio-psychological features minority ethnicity, are more likely to stem from lack of power than lack of numbers. In relatively egalitarian societies, lack of numbers is directly related to lack of power, but in power-stratified societies, e.g., South Africa today, Quebec before 1961, or even the U.S.R. it is the numerically preponderant peoples who are (or were) marked with the characteristics commonly assigned to ethnic groups.

Even among the Pacific Rim societies it is not at all clear that they conceived of themselves as small parts of a permanent larger socio-cultural or even economic system. With evidence of shifting trading and warfare alliances, the concept of nationhood is much more applicable, in spite of the long prehistoric period of contact and the general similarity between the societies. In the rest of Alaska the same concept might be applied to the small societies, as Burch has carefully shown. Farther east, I am not sure that there is enough evidence of feelings of regional solidarity and cultural uniqueness within either the Inuit or the Athapascan and Algonkian speakers, to usefully apply the idea of nationhood or "society". I suggest that another, more "primitive" form of politico-cultural organization was extant, best described by the anthropological concept of the band (Damas 1969). Though we often speak of band organization in Indian and Eskimo Alaska, those of the Canadian North had less well marked regional and linguistic diacritics, and were less securely territorial. Material and dialectical criteria, rather than marking unitary groups with clear boundaries, were cumulative such that the farther from one's home base one traveled the more marked the differences appeared. Furthermore such recognised dialects (see for instance Graburn and Strong 1973:110, 172, 172: Graburn 1966) contained numbers of bands, and these bands interacted as much across the native-named dialect boundaries as within them. Between bands were minor linguistic and cultural diacritics that were recognized but not named, and were sometimes the subject of comments and jokes, but could not be raised to the status of "societal" boundaries to the degree characteristic of north and west Alaska. Thus in the Canadian area annual cycle, kinship, material pattern and linguistic boundaries coincided less than necessary for the designation of these fluid social groups as "nations" or "societies". We have thus outlined a rough ordering of characteristic social groupings into nations, societies, and bands, none of which were identical to ethnic groups in any useful sense.

The historical impact of outsiders of European origin occurred at very different times within our huge area, but eventually produced a narrowing of the great cultural differences traditionally extant between the extremes, eliminating independent societies and nations, and resulting in the emergence of ethnicity within large scale plural societies. This convergence and simplification of the "ethnic" situation, followed in all areas a general historical pattern (see Table 2) that I have previously outlined (Graburn 1967: 1978) as characteristic of all cases of small-scale societies overwhelmed and colonized by militarily, technologically and (at least in the mother country) numerically superior nations. This directional schema is characteristic of the evolution of Fourth World (Graburn 1976) societies everywhere.

1) In the initial contacts, warlike or peaceful, the eventual superior power of the intruders forced an initial politico-economic relationship on the "native" societies to accomplish the ends of the intruders. When the native societies resisted, as did some of the Pacific Rim societies, they were even
### Table 2. Stages of Acculturation and the Emergence of Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process or Stage</th>
<th>Relations with Europeans</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) First contacts</td>
<td>Warlike, or Peaceful</td>
<td>Russians to the Pacific Rim, occasional violent raids between whites and Canadian Indians and Inuit. North Alaskans and whalers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Takeover and Initial Economic Relationships:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Direct Resource exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probisher, in Baffin Island: Inuit withdrew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Use of native labour</td>
<td></td>
<td>As servants at posts; as laborers in mines; on ships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Use of native skills and products</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Rim peoples as otter hunters; Interior Indians as fur trappers; Inuit as white fox trappers; Natives as guides, generally; Occasional use as warriors; Kutchin, Chipewyan, and others as intermediate traders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Structural Incorporation</td>
<td>Natives as &quot;lower caste&quot;</td>
<td>Post servants; non-traditional labor. Loss of traditional culture, houses, igloos; missionary imposition; loss of traditional leadership; epidemic diseases, especially in Alaska and Mackenzie; Occupational and life-style recruitment on the basis of &quot;race.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Loss of special economic relationship</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>Benign neglect of Canadian Inuit; Reservation status for some Canadian and Alaskan Indians; mission and Govt. schools; rhetoric of assimilation in Alaska. Native frustration, conspicuous deviance, drinking; messianic movements in Canadian Inuit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Native realization of minority status, and later, of &quot;Native&quot; status; inter-ethnic communication in English. Emergence of native power movements, in Alaska and Canada. New, younger political leadership in response to massive resource exploitation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

beaten into submission with considerable cruelty. In some cases, for instance among the Eastern Eskimos, the smaller society reacted in fear characteristic of their earlier fear of Indian raiding parties, and avoided the intruders while watching them from a distance (Graburn 1969) allowing the Europeans to sail or settle where they wished. Though at first the native groups tried to react and think of the intruders in the same way as they had other local societies, for the purposes of trade, war, alliances and so on, the actions and reactions of the outsiders produced a realization that they were not of the same nature, not to be negotiated with the same way, and not on a cultural par.  

2) The establishment of permanent posts, backed with military power and threats often produced a stable situation, where the native peoples reoriented their social life and economic life to accommodate the newcomers. Though they continued to act as interdependent societies in west and south Alaska— raiding, trading and intermarrying with each other—they lost a degree of independence of action, particularly in the economic sphere. Most groups adjusted their material culture and their religious beliefs in the direction of the
Russian colonists. Even their annual cycles and social arrangements changed in response to the Russian demands for hunting, trapping, trade and certain standards of social behavior.

At this state of permanent contact but incomplete takeover of the region, the colonizers had certain economic goals. In some parts of the world, but rarely in the American North, they are only interests in direct resource exploitation, without native intermediation, e.g., if the whalers had not used native pilots and women. One clear instance of direct resource exploitation was the series of expeditions by Martin Frobisher in Baffin Island in search of gold; here the natives were not used, and they either withdrew from the conquered area or they suffered in armed clashes with the conquerers. More common, however, was the coloniser's use of either native skills and products: using Pacific Rim societies as sea mammals hunters or the Cree and Athapaskan Indian as trappers in the Canadian Subarctic, or the intruders' direct use of native labor for new purposes, as the whalers' using Eskimos for shipboard labor in north Alaska or as mica miners in the Hudson Strait. This kind of economic exploitation required a great degree of accommodation and subservience on the part of the native peoples, often accompanied by a loss of traditional skills. Intermediate between the use of native skills and products, and native labor, was the use of native intermediaries in trading, for instance the Kutchin to trade with the North Alaskan and Mackenzie Eskimos, or the Chipewyan to trade with more distant Athapaskans. Although this was a kind of use of "native skills" it was carried out to a much higher degree, often using entirely novel material items, such as guns, and it upset the inter-ethnic relationships with irreversible consequences.

Nevertheless, this initial economic relationship—the use of natives as hunters, trappers, middlemen or laborers—was often a period of stability and perceived mutual gain. Many of the native peoples realized that they were not all powerful, but that they could use their new material and cultural paraphernalia to ease their lives and to establish military or prestige superiority over their "less fortunate" neighbours. External trade became institutionalized, and native individuals sometimes manipulated their relationships to achieve power as foreign imposed "chiefs" intermediaries or rich men, often with considerable degree of emulation of the powerful conquerors.

3) The initial colonial dominance slipped often unperceived into an institutionalized and permanent stratification character of established colonies all over the world. As the external nations of Europe and the Americas asserted their territorial claims to all the northern lands, with the consequent right to exploit them economically or not, as they saw fit, the native peoples became subjects rather than partners to the outsiders. A structural incorporation took place which resembled the emergence of caste relationships wherein a) there was division of labour by race, b) the native peoples were ascribed the lower rungs of the economic ladder, c) their leaders became intermediaries but never bosses in the political hierarchy, and d) their social behavior was governed, either through emulation or direct intervention, by externally imposed standards. Such societies could never again become fully independent, because of loss of traditional skills, severe epidemics and decimation, and disruption of the local fauna, e.g. whales, walrus and caribou. Sometimes it was by preference that the native peoples came to depend on imported foods and clothing and other externally produced material culture. And it was in this milieu that we can say that "ethnicity" emerged. No longer were the native people organized into or convinced of their being separate nations or societies—though they may still have retained the more amorphous form of bands—but they had become part-societies, knowledgeable and often resentful of their loss of independence and power. As a number of native informants have expressed to me, though life might be physically easier and less risky, they feel "like children", living in relative safety, but always receiving their life directions "from above". That adults should feel thus, is characteristic of "ethnic" minority or powerless groups in the stratified pluralistic societies of much of the modern world.

4) The clear realization of one's ethnicity and relative powerlessness, comes to such peoples when the initial special, and often mutually advantageous economic relationship comes to an end. In nearly all cases in our area of study this came about when the original source of game, e.g., sea otters, beaver, or white foxes became less abundant or less desired, and when the native skills or labour, e.g., as whalers' pilots and labourers, trading intermediaries or travelling guides, were no longer in demand. Few of these peoples were able to readapt to their previous independent lives, so they fell "let down" and totally at the mercy of the colonizing nations with whom they had cooperated or by whom they had been conquered.

With the loss of the initial special economic relationship into which some of the native peoples had entered willingly and others by force, the colonizing nations had the choice of a) totally neglecting their "wards" with potentially disastrous results for the
no longer autonomous peoples, b) maintaining them in a special status of dependency, with minimal economic support, or c) assimilating the minority groups into the culture and economic system of the larger society. All three choices have been or are being exercised in the recent history of northern North America, but they have rather different consequences. Relative neglect has at times characterized the relationship of Canada to her Northern peoples, particularly Eskimos, in the period between the decline of the fur trade in the early 1930s and the rise of government interest in the 1950s. Indeed it was partly the sensational reporting of the disastrous consequences of this neglect (Movatt 1951, 1959; Honigmann 1951), along with the geopolitical needs for northern radar bases (DEWline and INCO), that instigated the new policies.

Canadian Indians faced somewhat differently, for they were at least formally registered by or granted reservation status by the government, and were given minimal economic maintenance and educational opportunities. In Alaska, the governmental policies were somewhat similar, but included, at least rhetorically, the goal of general assimilation through education and concomitant economic opportunities.

"Benign" neglect and special or reservation status produces a number of characteristic symptoms among dependent native peoples all over the world. These include self-devaluation, apathy and internal conflict; the inability to live like or achieve the powers of the dominant group, lead to a "blaming of self" where the frustration of the situation cannot be safely directed at the outgroup. The lack of creative outlets, and the confused "ethnic" identity, sometimes also lead to megalomaniac movements or to what Clairmont (1963) has called "conspicuous deviance" which may show up in drinking, suicide or the flaunting of both native and acculturated codes of sexual morality.

At this time period, which lasted roughly since the turn of the century in Alaska and from the 1930s in Canada, up until the 1950s and 1960s respectively, the previous well adjusted ethnic situation became very confused for many of the native peoples. The Canadian Inuit, in their situation of "benign" neglect — lack of education in English and lack of assimilatory economic contacts — were the last group to have their identity shaken. Though there were great disruptions of the way of life and of residential groups, they remained firmly Inuit, conscious of their ethnic, linguistic and often dialect status. One exception was along the Labrador Coast (Taylor) where the early paternalistic activities of the missionaries, plus the admixture of white "settlers" brought a unique "metis-like" status, separating them from their Inuit cousins until the recent resurgence of ethnic pride in the late 1960s.

The subarctic Indian groups were subject to a much more differentiated ethnic identity (Craburn and Strong 1973: 183-201), depending on their treaty and reservation status, particularly in parts of Alaska and western Canada, where epidemics and numerically superior intrusive whites thoroughly disrupted the original societal or national groupings. Though many retained a "tribal" identity, based on either language and territorial criteria or white-imposed legal labels, the growing use of the English language, and population displacement for educational and economic opportunities, enlarged the possibilities of "ethnic" identity. Most peoples became aware of their "Indian" or "Eskimo" status in our way that whites have often used these labels, and, more recently, many became aware of their combined position as "native" peoples, especially through contacts engendered at boarding schools. In the Pacific Rim area, these ethnic confusions hit much earlier, because of forced population movements, earlier and more intensive acculturation through missions and education, and more varied economic opportunities.

So, by the 1960s, nearing the end of this stage of economic dependency, separate legal status and liminality to assimilate, most native north individuals were aware of a layered set of identities which they chose amongst according to the social context:

A) Local village or group identity of origin (may or may not be based on language and dialect), used for interactions between people within one category at the next level, e.g., Diomede Islanders, Bethel Kuskwamtlut, or Nunamiat among the category Alaskan "Eskimo", or Old Crow (Yunta) amongst the Kutchin, Fort Churchill amongst the Chipewyan.

B) "Tribal" identity, based on larger regional or language groups, often mixing native criteria and imposed white labels, e.g., North Alaskan Eskimos, Cree, Tanaina. While this level of identity was useful for some inter-native contexts, it was rather vague except in certain political situations and in interactions with certain white institutions.

C) "Cultural" identity, embracing large and usually non-native categories, such as Eskimo, Alut (in the case of the Aleut, levels B and C coincided for most individuals), Athapaskan, Algonkian, and, perhaps, "liyser" among the people of the Labrador Coast. These gross categories meant more in white than to native peoples, and were instilled through education, but were only rarely used except in mixed and boundary situations, such as mixed schools and
multi-ethnic communities (Graburn 1966b) such as Great Whale River (Karger), Inuvik (Honlmann and Honlmann 1970) or large Alaskan towns.

D) Legal identity, as Native or Non-Native, has emerged as a primary pair of categories, earlier in Alaska (Lantis 1973) than in Canada (McElroy 1974). The realization of situational identity in spite of historical cultural differences, led educated individuals or different groups at all lower levels to form alliances against the colonizing nations within which they found themselves. This required a broad world view and, most importantly, the ability to communicate with members of all groups usually in the English language. Additionally, a consciousness and purpose for such identification has often been inspired by well-meaning white people who are sympathetic to the frustrations of the native peoples. The context for this level of identity is primarily in the political arena, where native lands rights (Berry 1975; Salisbury 1972) and legal, union and work status (Strong 1971) are at stake.

E) International identity as members of the aboriginal, indigenous Fourth World group of peoples (Manuel and Poslums 1974; Graburn 1976: 1-2) is the latest in an ever widening world view. Much as Indians and Eskimos became aware of their common status and problems, in spite of diverse cultural backgrounds, many of the most politically active individuals of the North have learned of their common minority status with other Fourth World peoples. This has led to a series of written and personal interchanges between these peoples and other subjects of internal colonialism, such as American Indians, Mowí, Black peoples of Southern Africa, Australian Aborigines and Pacific Islanders. The fora for such a worldwide identity are not those of everyday life, but are limited to political gathering and visits of "delegationism" and to representations to such international bodies as the United Nations. In addition there is a resurgence of "ethnic nationhood": All- Eskimo conferences, such as those at Point Barrow in 1975 and reactions to resource exploitation leading to claims for the Bering Nation stem from new concepts of "belonging", using political and linguistic criteria which stem from the modern age rather than from the localized ideas of society and nationhood of traditional times. Even the ideas of unity and nationhood are proposed indirectly through emulation of the conqueror (Koster 1974) and directly through imposition of the colonizers, ideas of the nature of ethnic unity. For instance, in contrast to the example given by Burch this volume, that the Eskimos do not like to be called by this term because they know it is a derogatory Cree word, one Eskimo teenager wrote to my wife, who was her former teacher in Puvungnituq, to say "We are not Eskimos any longer, we are Inuit; we know this because our teacher (white) told us." (Máina Qaluluk, personal communication, 1973)

Not all Indians and Eskimos use or are even aware of these levels or ethnic identity. As English language becomes the only means of communication and urban migration spreads, many native peoples, especially in Alaska, are losing the use of levels A and B. They know they are "Eskimo" or "Aleut" but have lost their local and tribal identity. Because of historical circumstances in the Pacific Rim area, some are even unsure of their appropriate category at level C claiming to be Aleut Kodiak Islanders and so on, where legal identity as Alaskan Native is the most common and obvious self-identification. On the other hand, many of the rural native peoples, whether using English or their own language, are not aware of the extent of the higher level categories. Older Alaskan Tarimuk were surprised to hear me talk Inuktut and ask me where I learned it; when I replied "Canada" or "The Hudson Bay area" they did not know where these were or that there were Inuit there. Most Naskapi of Shefferville or Naskapi-Cree of Great Whale are unaware of other kinds of Indians, such as Athapaskans and only recently, after concern with the James Bay Project, have some of them identified with their former enemies, the Inuit, as forming a definite category of "native peoples" within Canada. One could predict, that with further education and articulation with the pluralistic systems of the modern nations of Canada and the U.S.A. the important identities that will emerge for the next generation will be a) local group (village, town, or upbringing), b) cultural identity, which will form the base of "nativistic" movements and symbols, conspicuous in clothing and arts, c) legal identity, political and macro-economic rights, and d) international identity, which will always be restricted to the few politically active leaders, much travelled peoples who form the "intelligentsia" for the various native categories, "ethnic nationhood" will emerge, by hindsight, as important units of identity spurred by the granting of autonomy to Greenland (1979) and the necessity for group consolidation in the struggles for minority rights within North America.

5) The logical endpoint of these processes is cultural and biological assimilation. While this was a goal of the American government and a desire of many individual native peoples, it has only been partially achieved, and, where biological differences remain,
worldwide experience has shown us that it is indeed a rare event. With the common use of the English language, of universal education and of population displacements to more urban areas, cultural assimilation has already made great inroads. The native leaders, those conscious of identities at the highest levels, have already incorporated much of the legal, terminological, religious and behavioral characteristics of the social worlds of the middle classes of the nations which engulfed them, not only in North America, but in Greenland and the U.S.S.R. too. Biological assimilation is a slower process, for phenotypic characteristics are, in Anglo civilizations, the "bottom-line" markers of identity (as opposed to Latin nations). However, after a century or more of white male-native female liaisons, producing an anomalous group of Metis (Krech; Globolin 1966) the scales are now being tipped by intermarriages in both directions, ending the situation of "caste-like" ethnicity (Graburn 1966b; 1969: 228-230). Thus caste-like relationships are finally being broken down, and being replaced by a class stratification resembling to some degree that typical of the industrial societies of North America. Persons of mixed ancestry and culture do not automatically devolve to lower status, but retain a somewhat anomalous status within the identity levels mentioned above, and caste status, usually reflecting their white parent.

Ascription to occupation according to native-white status is also breaking down, as more opportunities are either reserved for people of native status or as educational background comes to count more than biological background (Strong 1977). Rather than total and rather meaningless "assimilation", there is emerging a true pluralism, divided somewhat between native and non-native, but in which relative economic autonomy for both individuals and groups (such as Native corporations and political brotherhoods) has blurred the lines of traditional enmities and alliances, and has encouraged the emergence of parallel, mutually respecting groups, whose inter- and intra-ethnic boundaries are somewhat permeable to motivated individuals.
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