

Review Essay

CANADIAN JOURNAL OF NATIVE STUDIES: An Assessment

The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, Vol. IV, Number 2, 1984, Society for the Advancement of Native Studies, Brandon University, Brandon, Manitoba, Canada. Pp. 179-388. Subscriptions: Individuals, \$20.00, others \$30.00. (Canadian funds inside Canada, US funds outside.)

Richard T. Price

The *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* presents readers with a microcosm of Native Studies scholarship in Canada.¹ Much solid, scholarly work has been done in the fields of history and anthropology, and to a lesser degree in such fields as law, political science, and education. Academics have been very tentative, however, in moving beyond the comfortable niches of their own disciplines into interdisciplinary native studies research encompassing a broader scope of sources and a wider variety of methodologies. Fortunately, some scholars recently have pointed in new directions, including interdisciplinary, international, holistic and community-based ways of handling native studies research.

This review of the *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* represents, at least symbolically, a desire for greater interaction and cooperation among American and Canadian Native/Indian Studies scholars and scholarly publications. The *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* is to be commended for this initiative. It bodes well for the future of research in the United States, Canada and beyond.

This review will describe, and critically analyze, a particular recent volume (Vol. 4, No. 2) of the *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* (CJNS), which contains a wide-ranging group of articles. Three main topics characterize these articles: history (Indian treaties and Indian policy administration); resource development impacts

Richard T. Price is director of the School of Native Studies at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

(reserve land flooding, native health and fishing); and native education (case studies using new methods). Before examining this specific edition of the *CJNS*, I will present a brief sketch of the journal's history and make a status report, so that readers have a broader context for the review which follows.

By way of background, it is necessary to point out that the *CJNS* is still in its initial development stage. The first volume was published in 1981. Without a long tradition of publication, it manifests the strong and weak points of any new, exciting venture. Some of the most effective volumes have been devoted to particular themes and have included overview articles. Those themes have included: "Learning for Self-Determination"; "The Metis since 1870"; "Development and Planning"; "After Land Claims"; and "Native Literature."² Other issues of the periodical, up to and including the volume under review here, have been simply diverse groupings of articles without a particular theme. Each issue also displays native artwork on the cover and contains review articles on current books in native studies.

In 1982 and 1983, Volumes 2 and 3 were produced, and Volume 4, Number One, was published in the spring of 1984. Then publishing ceased until the spring of 1987, when Vol. 4, No. 2 appeared. This three-year lapse in publishing explains why a journal dated "1984" is the subject of this review late in 1987. The principal reason for the lapse was the need to obtain a grant to keep the journal viable. The editor of *CJNS* had apparently financed the initial issues of the journal from his own pocket. Clearly, this type of philanthropy could be sustained for only so long. A grant has now been secured, and in 1987 three volumes were published (Vol. 4, No. 2, 1984, Vol. 5, Nos. 1 and 2, 1985). The editors seem to be making up for lost time. However, in the haste to publish the backlog of articles that were previously accepted for publication, several problems were revealed.

The three-year gap between the submission of articles and the actual date of publishing Vol. 4, No. 2 presents an obvious problem: namely, that the articles are not current in terms of other recent research. An effective solution would have been to ask the authors to resubmit revised articles and then publish the revisions. This was not done. Two scholars were interviewed to determine how *CJNS* editors handled this delay in publication.³ One person described the journal editors as very "unprofessional" and the other was quite "unsatisfied" by the way this

publication was managed. For example, correspondence was left unanswered, and proofs were never provided as promised. These facts indicate problems that are linked to both the delay in publication and the professional management of an important journal. A careful reading reveals that the proofreading of the publication was quite sloppy. For example, part of an important sentence is completely missing.⁴ In another article, the footnotes are so jumbled that footnote 42 precedes footnotes 38–41.⁵ The blame for this problem, and potential problems related to the articles being superseded by newer research and thinking, rests with the *CJNS* editors.

Scholars can be held accountable only for research available to them at the time they submit their articles. Consequently, I will limit my critical evaluations of the articles to pre-1984 research sources. Research scope and methods however, are matters unrelated to publication dates and merit comment. In relation to the *CJNS*, perhaps one should give the editors the benefit of the doubt and assume that they are open to constructive criticism and will be able to put their house in order for future editions of this important native studies journal.

Moving on to a review of this volume, the longest articles (all over 25 pages in length) are reviewed because these articles represent the most substantive handling of specific subjects.⁶ The other articles are relatively short, and while interesting are mostly descriptive. Moreover, limitations on the length of this review essay preclude evaluation of the shorter articles. However, the three articles selected—two on historical topics and one regarding resource development impacts—do present a fair sample of the type of articles found in the *CJNS*.

David Hall's essay, "A Serene Atmosphere? Treaty 1 Revisited," is an excellent piece of research and historical reflection. Hall's thesis is stated as follows:

It is the contention of this paper that the negotiation for treaty 1 was badly handled by an ill-prepared government and its officials; that the Indians not only forced major changes in the government's plan, such as it was, but raised most of the issues that appeared in subsequent treaties; and that in its process, form and "broken" outside promises Treaty 1 had a major impact on future treaty negotiations. (p. 324)

Hall, to his credit, places his paper within the context of recent scholarship that utilizes a relatively balanced approach to understanding treaties and treaty negotiations, namely that both Indian and government negotiators had significant inputs to the eventual outcome. Recent critiques have questioned the traditional premise of historians that the Indian treaties of the 1870's in Canada (Treaties 1 through 7) were the result of government " . . . deliberation, wisdom and benevolence."⁷ On the contrary, as Hall points out in a close examination of Treaty 1 negotiations (which are included as an appendix to Hall's article), it was the Indian negotiators who thought through and beyond the government's initial offer of reserve land and annual cash annuities. The Chiefs looked at the economic and educational implications for themselves and their children's children. Indeed, the impasse in the stalemated Treaty 1 negotiations came from Chief Henry Prince, who raised concerns about the future of the land and his children and asked: " . . . the Queen wishes the Indians to cultivate the ground. They cannot scratch it—work it with their fingers. What assistance will they get if they settle down?" (p. 327, 353-4)

The government quickly responded that the Queen would provide agricultural assistance and schools/schoolmasters for each reserve. The logjam was broken and the treaty signed soon thereafter. However, many problems of treaty implementation remained. These difficulties related to the verbal, so-called "outside promises" made by government officials. These promises of the treaty were confirmed legally only many years later.

Hall, through a skillful and balanced analysis of the negotiations, is able to demonstrate effectively the main elements of his thesis. One part of the original purpose that Hall might have elaborated more explicitly is the impact of Treaty 1 negotiations on subsequent treaty negotiations. For example, while agricultural assistance in the form of ploughs to cultivate the ground was negotiated in Treaty 1, Indian negotiators in Treaty 6 asked for a three years' supply of grain to start farming, and Treaty 7 Chiefs requested cattle for ranching. These requests in Treaties 6 and 7 were fortunately included in the written treaties.

More importantly, it also would have been very helpful if Professor Hall had broadened his sources and examined more clearly the relationships and context that had developed in the fur trade prior to treaty signing. For example, Arthur Ray, a

historical geographer, writes in his fur trade study that Treaty Commissioner Simpson was aware by 1871 of the increasing tendency of Indians to have a farming livelihood:

As time passed it became increasingly difficult for Indians in Southern Manitoba to make a living in the fur trade as hunters, trappers, canoe men, boat men or cart drivers, and they were forced to rely increasingly on agriculture—either as part-time farmers or as hired hands on the farms of settlers.⁸

However, it was Indian leaders who took the initiative to put agricultural development assistance into Treaty 1. Government officials, as Hall showed, responded quickly. Were these officials protecting the “public purse” or simply acting under specific instructions by not taking the initiative themselves? Hall has, nevertheless, broken new ground by illuminating the negotiations concerning Treaty 1, the first treaty to be negotiated between the new (post-1867) Canadian federal government and the Chippewa (Ojibway) and Swampy Cree Indians of Southern Manitoba.

More research and reflection on these vital treaty negotiations still needs to be done, using the rich potential of oral history as well. One focus of research should be the indigenous forms of self-government in relation to the pivotal event of Indian treaties. Research questions could include: (1) how have the various tribes practiced (or attempted to practice) their forms of government in relation to treaty negotiations and the subsequent implementation of repressive legislation (in Canada, The Indian Act)?; (2) there was a recognition of the authority of the Chiefs and Headmen at the treaty negotiations, but what types of post-treaty tribal authority were anticipated and put into practice by the tribes of various regions?; and (3) did subsequent Indian resistance to the federal government’s attempts to impose non-Indian models of municipal government (through The Indian Act), constitute a *de facto* assertion of indigenous forms of Indian community structures and processes? Some Indian bands have begun this painstaking research through interviews with elders and archival searches.⁹ Some work in this area has also been done by university-based researchers.¹⁰ At the level of federal/provincial/Indian constitutional discussions from 1983–1987, Indian, Inuit and Metis politicians asserted an “inherent right of

self government." Most Treaty Indians of the western provinces, on the other hand, boycotted these discussions but continue to seek negotiations with the federal government alone. These Treaty Indians want assurances from the national government that no Indian jurisdiction was given up in the negotiations for Treaties 1-8. However, research and reexamination of treaty negotiations/agreements and post-treaty practices of both western Indian tribes and the federal government are required to shed more light on these controversial and important assertions of rights.

The question of implementation of the federal government's national policies (treaty-making and subsequent assimilation threats) is the focus of another historical article in the journal: "Best Left as Indians: The Federal Government and the Indians of the Yukon, 1894-1950." Ken Coates begins his essay by stating: "In his assessment of the current state of historical research on government-Indian relations in the United States of America, Francis Paul Prucha recently argued that too much attention had been paid to the origins of federal programming and too little to the implementation of policy."¹¹ Coates argues that this lack of attention to policy implementation holds true for his case study on the Yukon, which is situated in the northwestern part of Canada, far from the locus of Indian policy decision-making in the federal capital of Ottawa. Describing traditional Indian subsistence pursuits of hunting, fishing and trapping and the patterns of dispersed indigenous settlements, Coates contends that these factors precluded a regional/local implementation of national policy by Yukon-based government officials.

Through extensive archival research of government records, Coates documents that governmental policy implementation practices were different in the Yukon from those in southern Canada. By doing so, Coates is able to raise serious questions about policy generalizations characteristic of some of the literature in this area. There are, however, several problems with the essay. First, Coates has too narrow a base of sources for his Yukon case study. He reviews some of the secondary literature, but principally concentrates on government archival documents, while ignoring anthropological and Indian oral history sources. This leads Coates to a preoccupation with government perspectives on policy issues. For example, he does not acknowledge

Catharine McClellan's pioneering ethnographic study, *My Old People Say: An Ethnographic Survey of Southern Yukon* (parts 1 and 2).¹² McClellan's ethnographic research covers primarily ". . . the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the time when the first whites arrived in the Yukon" and focuses on the Southern Tutchone, Tagish and Inland Tlingit. A number of chapters have relevance to the Coates case study, including: "Southern Yukon and Its People," "The Yearly Round," "Fish and Fishing," and "Settlement Patterns and Housing." One of McClellan's conclusions provides helpful insights into Yukon Indian perspectives and their somewhat unique focus on the individual:

Basically, the Yukon Indian expects to handle many aspects of his life by means of his own efforts and to be judged on those terms. He can adopt a new technology, gain a new nickname, manipulated his kin ties, acquire power in his own distinctive fashion without too much protest, or for that matter without too much approval from his relatively few fellow men. (p. 578)

By using this source alone, Coates could have developed more effectively Indian perspectives on the questions at issue.

Secondly, in his analysis of government policy, Coates tends to underestimate the impact of pressures on government officials to control the "public purse" by keeping the lid on Indian expenditures. This vital aspect of Indian policy implementation receives short shrift in the Coates essay. It is in all likelihood, given the experience elsewhere in Canada, the key factor that accounts for the federal government's approach to Yukon Indians, namely to encourage Native people to follow traditional economic pursuits, and therefore minimize any government expenditures on their behalf. In other words, there was a welding or meshing of governmental policies to restrain expenditures for Indians with the Yukon Indians' own desire to continue their traditional hunting, fishing and trapping. This meshing of interests effectively dictated and made possible the policy implementation that occurred in the Yukon.

This critique is not meant to underestimate the importance of case studies in the development of a broader analysis. As the outstanding scholar Bruce Trigger has recently stated:

. . . I am convinced that it is worthwhile to trace the history of specific native groups from pre-historic times to the present. Such studies are not only interesting as ends in themselves to native and Euro-Canadian readers but also provide building blocks from which a detailed picture of native history can be constructed on a national and continental scale.¹³

Moving on to a case study related to resource development impacts, James Waldram, an anthropologist, has written about "Hydro-Electric Development and the Process of Negotiation in Northern Manitoba, 1960-1977." This modern study presents a situation somewhat parallel to the treaty negotiations a century before in that non-native development interests are pitted against Indians and their lands. In this case the negotiations are with a provincial government, the government of Manitoba, and its electricity development agency, Manitoba Hydro (a Crown corporation). These powerful interests sought access in the 1960's to Indian lands because of the hydro-electric potential of nearby rivers. The Swampy Cree and Metis community of Chemawawin faced the construction of a 472-megawatt generating station at Grand Rapids, and through a process of negotiations they relocated in the mid-1960's to another site on Cedar Lake in northern Manitoba. Following those negotiations and in return for relocation, the community was given a "letter of intent" from the provincial government that provided the following benefits: electricity, a road to the community, a new school, exclusive use of a forest management unit, employment in townsite construction, a two for one swap of old reserve for new reserve land, scientific studies of wildlife propagation, and a cash payment of \$20,000. The legality and interpretation of this letter of intent, coupled with the "rocky" relocation site at Easterville, have provided continuing sources of grievances for the Chemawawin community against the government and its corporation.

A subsequent hydro-electric project in the late 1960's and mid-1970's, "The Churchill River Diversion," brought the same two powerful interests in conflict with the South Indian Lake community. A great deal of controversy and media attention surrounded the proposed 8000-megawatt generating station. This controversy was expanded by the intervention of third parties,

including a group of scientists from the University of Manitoba, who insisted that Manitoba Hydro had made an inadequate evaluation of development alternatives and ecological impacts. Consequently, there were differences between the two negotiating situations for the native communities; Waldram assessed these differences as:

The great amount of public attention given to the South Indian Lake case, the advent of public hearings of impressive magnitude, and the provision of legal counsel for the community. (p. 235)

As the result of the controversy generated by the Churchill diversion project, a number of bands in northern Manitoba formed the Northern Flood Committee, including the Nelson House Band (part of the Band is located at South Indian Lake). With financial support from the federal government for legal costs, and also threats to withdraw these funds if litigation was pursued too aggressively, the Northern Flood Committee negotiated the "Northern Flood Agreement" on behalf of five Indian bands with the federal and provincial governments and the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board in 1977.

Waldram notes the importance of the agreement, which includes the following clauses: the right to an arbitration hearing for compensation in hydro-electric damages, the right to consultation of future projects, a 4:1 formula for land exchange for flooded-areas, employment during hydro construction, first priority to wildlife and fish resources within certain zones, assistance in achieving the maximum of self-maintenance from hunting/fishing/trapping, and individual compensation for fishing and trapping damages (p. 232). Waldram makes a valid point that there is no specific mention in the agreement of South Indian Lake, the community which bears the brunt of impacts. It is unclear, in other words, to what extent the general clauses of the agreement provide protection for South Indian Lake.

However, Waldram seems to downplay the value of this Northern Flood Agreement, especially from the perspectives of the five Northern Indian bands. For example, Joe Keeper, a leader from these northern communities, continues to stress in public conferences the vital role of this agreement for northern bands. Keeper has written an article on his experiences with

negotiating the agreement and the lessons he learned that may assist other Indian people.¹⁴ Moreover, an arbitrator was appointed as a result of this agreement; he has made an award to the effect that the Northern Flood Committee is entitled to governmental financial support for operating costs, in order to ensure that the committee can monitor the implementation of the agreement.¹⁵

The strength of the Waldram article is that he effectively portrays the tactics and tricks of the Manitoba government and Manitoba Hydro. The Tritschler Commission of Inquiry into Manitoba Hydro lends support to Waldram's findings:

Government and Hydro adopted a stance towards native communities and the NFC of confrontation, hostility, and procrastination with, on more than one occasion, a lack of frankness. (p. 233)

Waldram analyzes clearly the methods of the provincial government and Manitoba Hydro, especially their "all systems go" approach to construction; their interaction at the highest level to try to get legal funds to the National Flood Committee cut off; and their "divide and conquer" approach to individual Indian communities and trappers. Where Waldram's analysis lacks balance is in his neglect of the economic and pro-development pressures (both internal and external) on the Manitoba government to press ahead with hydro-electric development as a key element in modern industrial development. From the existing literature, one can infer that concerted pressure was exerted over time on the Manitoba government and Manitoba Hydro.¹⁶ This pressure could be expected to come from a variety of sources: citizen pressure for jobs; Manitoba manufacturing concerns and businesses, from whose perspective hydro-electricity and its accompanying infrastructure are essential for economic development; and senior economists and treasury officials within the government, who perceive a need to bolster Manitoba's wealth by selling electricity to other western Canadian provinces and the northern Midwest of the United States. Based on similar situations elsewhere, it may be presumed that these pressures provided a tremendous forward push for the Churchill diversion project, despite the organized opposition from universities, environmentalists, churches and native communities. A developmental versus environmental (including In-

dian interests) policy dilemma was posed for government politicians, who had to contend with conflicting pressures within their various electoral constituencies. This economic development versus environmental impact dilemma has been the focal point of public debate in the western Canadian provinces for the past decade. If Indian interests are to be protected and advanced, strategies must be devised that, for example, effectively use public education and the media to change public opinion, and bring together Indian governments and other interest groups, who tend to be concerned with long-term impacts as opposed to short-term economic gain. The powerful interests lined up on the other side ought not to be underestimated; nor should they be mythologized to the point that no realistic strategies are devised and undertaken.

At this juncture, I want to conclude with a few evaluative comments. First, with one notable exception, none of the articles in this journal include maps of the geographic regions under review. This poses a problem for readers outside Canada, already noted by a reviewer in the Australian journal *Aboriginal History*.¹⁷

Secondly and more importantly, I want to support recent critical assessments and new directions for indigenous peoples research. Two American Indian studies scholars, Benally and Martin, have recently provided an excellent impetus for research into holistic, indigenous peoples' philosophies.¹⁸

In terms of interdisciplinary research, anthropologist Trigger states that if we hope to understand Indian history adequately from the inside, we must broaden our sources and approaches to include oral traditions, language (ethnosemantics), understanding biases in writing sources, archaeology, the role of women, current writings by Native people, economics and ecological perspectives. (p. 333-336) He goes on to suggest that:

No one scholar can be expected to become equally proficient in all of these fields and the combinations mastered by individuals will vary according to personal preferences and the nature of the problem being investigated. Yet, if ethnohistory is to expand as a methodology for understanding the history of Native peoples, all ethnohistorians must display growing sensitivity and openness to the methods that are collectively available to them in their work. (p. 336)

In a similar vein, Cornelius Jaenan, a respected Canadian historian, put forward a challenge in 1982 which has continuing relevance to Canadian native studies scholars, and to the *CJNS*:

. . . individuals and programmes concerned with Native Studies need to broaden their perspectives and their outreach. The Journal itself would benefit from broadening its base to include linguistics, social scientists, ethnohistorians and specialists who do not belong to the two "traditional" disciplines presently represented.¹⁹

Based on these American and Canadian perspectives, which can be characterized as interdisciplinary, holistic and implicitly international, much still needs to be done to overcome the narrowness of sources used and the tendency to shy away from oral history and from new methodological approaches. It is a sign of strength, however, that scholars already are pointing in new directions for research.

Another vital research approach involves a need for increased interaction between scholars and native communities themselves. As anthropologist Dr. Bea Medicine pointed out in a recent lecture at the University of Alberta, new research projects should reflect native community needs, participation and insights.²⁰ Similarly, legal scholar Thomas Berger, in his recent book *Village Journey*, provides a vehicle for expression and collaboration of the claims and aspirations of local Alaskan Natives from 60 different villages.²¹ This community-based approach to research is beneficial because it grounds research in the reality of the needs of native communities, which are often going through a painful process of trying to recover from the devastating impacts of governmental assimilation policies, and attempting to re-establish effective community control.

If these newer research approaches, which have developed through the crucible of our collective historical experience to date, are implemented with vigor and openness to change, then the future for native studies research looks bright and increasingly credible.

NOTES

1. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* is the oldest and most widely supported native studies journal in Canada. For example, it is supported by the Canadian Indian Native Studies Association. The other important native studies journal, the *Native Studies Review*, published by the Native Studies department at the University of Saskatchewan, emphasizes native public policy matters.

2. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies: Special Issue—Learning for Self Determination: Community-Based Options for Training and Research* (Vol. 2, No. 1, 1982); *Special Issue—The Metis Since 1870* (Vol. 3, No. 1, 1983); *Special Issue—Development Over Planning: After Land Claims* (Vol. 3, No. 2, 1983) and *Special Issue—Native Literature*, (Vol. 5, No. 2, 1985.)

3. Telephone interviews with two of the scholars, who had articles accepted for this volume of the *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* (Interviews on Dec. 29, 1987 and Jan. 4, 1988).

4. D. J. Hall, "A Serene Atmosphere? Treaty 1 Revisited" in the *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, Vol. IV, No. 2, (1984), 321-358. The sentence at the top of page 330 should read:

When Simpson finally returned west in the summer of 1872, he did undertake to give to Indians who were setting down "certain articles which they believe were promised to them such as hoes, axes, & c.," necessary for the cultivation of soil which the government wished to encourage.

(emphasis mine to denote missing phrase, source of footnote 17 on p. 357 of Hall's Notes)

5. Ken Coates, "Best Left as Indians: The Federal Government and the Indians of the Yukon, 1894-1950," in the *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2, (1984), 179-204, 188.

6. Unless otherwise stated, the quotations from articles by D. J. Hall, Ken Coates, and James B. Waldram are all found in *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, Vol. IV, No. 2, (1984). The article by Coates is titled "Best Left as Indians: The Federal Government and the Indians of the Yukon, 1894-1950," 179-204. The article by Hall is titled "A Serene Atmosphere? Treaty 1 Revisited," 321-358. The article by Waldram is titled "Hydro-Electric Development and the Process of Negotiation in Northern Manitoba, 1960-1977," 205-240.

7. John Leonard Taylor, "Canada's Northwest Policy in the 1870's: Traditional Premises and Necessary Innovations" in *The Spirit of the Alberta Indian Treaties*, ed. Richard Price (first published by the Institute for Research on Public Policy in 1979; new edition, Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1987).

8. Arthur Ray, *Indians in the Fur Trade: Their Role as Trappers, Hunters and Middlemen in the Lands Southwest of the Hudson Bay 1660-1870* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 219.

9. For example, the Ermineskin band at Hobbema, Alberta has a treaty research group doing this type of research.

10. See for example, John Tobias, "Canada's Subjugation of the Plains Cree—1879-1885" in *The Canadian Historical Review*, LXIV (1983), 519-48.

11. Francis Paul Prucha, *Indian Policy in the United States* (Lincoln, NE and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1981), 14 (no citation provided in original).

12. Unless otherwise stated, the quotations from Catharine McClellan are in *My Old People Say: An Ethnographic Survey of Southern Yukon* (parts 1 and 2), National Museum of Man, National Museum of Canada, 1975, XIX. McClellan is a Professor of Anthropology at the University of Wisconsin, edits the journal *Arctic Anthropology*, and was recognized by her colleagues through her Presidency of the American Ethnological Society.

13. Bruce G. Trigger, "The Historians' Indian: Native Americans in Canadian Historical Writing from Charlevoix to the Present," *Canadian Historical Review*, LXVII, 3 (1986), 315-342, 341. Unless otherwise stated, all references to Trigger are to this article.

14. Joe Keeper, "The Northern Flood Committee and the Northern Flood Agreement" 1980, 1-18, appendix A in "Impacts of Hydro Projects on Indian Lands in Western Canada: Indian Strategies," Michael Harvey (unpublished consultant's report, Sept. 1984).

15. *Ibid.*, see Appendix B for Arbitrator's 55 page assessment and award, September 6, 1983.

16. Two useful books on hydro-electric development and provincial government economic development pushes are: H. V. Nelles, *The Politics of Development: Forests, Mines and Hydro-Electric Power in Ontario 1849-1941* (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1974) (see especially the chapters on "Hydro as Myth" and "Power Politics," which deal with the formative days of hydro in the neighboring province of Ontario); and Phillip Mathias, *Forced Growth*, (Toronto: James Lorimer & Co., 1971) (see especially chapter 6, "A Good Deal for Manitoba: The Churchill Forest Industries Project," which deals with the Manitoba government and an off-shore development enterprise).

17. Sue Kesteven, Review of *CJNS*, Vol. 3, No. 2, in *Aboriginal History* (1984), 8:2, 212-215.

18. Herbert Benally, "DINE BO'OHOO'AAH BINDII'A': Navajo Philosophy of Learning," *Dine Be iina*, 1987, Navajo Community College, Shiprock, Arizona. This paper was presented at the World Conference of Indigenous Peoples' Education (June, 1987, Vancouver) and illuminates traditional, holistic Navajo creation stories and philosophy, and their relationship to university disciplines. Calvin Martin, ed. *The American Indian and the Problem of History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1987). Martin edits a collection of articles that re-examine indigenous and European philosophies, including the accompanying values, interests and goals.

19. Cornelius Jaenan, "Comment on Price: Native Studies in Canadian Universities and Colleges," *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1982) 179.

20. Bea Medicine, guest lecture on "Native American Studies as a Discipline," Native Studies 300 class, School of Native Studies, University of Alberta, November 26, 1987.

21. Thomas Berger, *Village Journey*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1985).