

Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit: Social History, Politics and the Practice of Resistance

FRANK JAMES TESTER¹ and PETER IRNIQ²

(Received 26 June 2007; accepted in revised form 6 February 2008)

ABSTRACT. The creation of the Nunavut government has been accompanied by an emphasis on Inuit knowledge—*Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit* (IQ)—in the making of policy and in procedures affecting Nunavutmiut (Nunavummiut). Definitions of IQ parallel those of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), indigenous knowledge (IK), and traditional knowledge (TK). The extent to which cosmologies and belief systems are incorporated into definitions of these terms and the extent to which their use is narrowly focused on the management of biological resources are ongoing sources of concern. The language used to define and promote IQ often serves to move IQ away from its cosmological implications and define it as a tool useful for filling gaps in scientific knowledge. To appreciate a seamless definition of IQ, a better understanding of Inuit social and cultural history is necessary. An examination of this history depicts IQ as a form of resistant practice that can seriously challenge characteristic assumptions of Western science, such as the separation of humans from other forms of life. Inuit operating with a seamless definition of IQ are, however, confronted with contemporary social, economic, and political realities that challenge and may limit the use of IQ in the management and development of Nunavut.

Key words: *Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit*, culture, rights, Inuit social history, wildlife management, resistance, Nunavut government, Western science

RÉSUMÉ. Dans le cadre de la formation du gouvernement du Nunavut, l'accent a notamment été mis sur les connaissances des Inuits (ou *Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit* – IQ) en matière d'établissement de politiques et de procédures touchant les Nunavutmiuts (Nunavummiuts). Les définitions de l'IQ sont parallèles aux définitions relatives aux connaissances écologiques traditionnelles (CÉT), aux connaissances indigènes (CI) et aux connaissances traditionnelles (CT). La mesure dans laquelle les cosmologies et les systèmes de croyances sont intégrés aux définitions de ces termes de même que la mesure dans laquelle leur utilisation est étroitement liée à la gestion des ressources biologiques sont constamment à la source de préoccupations. Souvent, les termes dont on se sert pour définir et promouvoir l'IQ ont pour effet d'éloigner l'IQ de ses incidences cosmologiques et de le définir comme outil utile pour combler les écarts en matière de connaissances scientifiques. Afin d'apprécier une définition continue de l'IQ, il faut mieux comprendre l'histoire sociale et culturelle des Inuits. L'examen de cette histoire illustre que l'IQ est une forme de pratique de résistance qui peut sérieusement contester les hypothèses caractéristiques de la science occidentale, telle que la séparation des humains d'autres formes de vie. Toutefois, les Inuits qui ont adopté une définition continue de l'IQ sont confrontés à des réalités contemporaines d'ordre social, économique et politique qui contestent et peuvent même restreindre l'utilisation de l'IQ dans la gestion et le développement du Nunavut.

Mots clés : *Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit*, culture, droits, histoire sociale des Inuits, gestion de la faune, résistance, gouvernement du Nunavut, science occidentale

Traduit pour la revue *Arctic* par Nicole Giguère.

INTRODUCTION

The attention paid to *Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit* (IQ) is not a recent phenomenon, although the Inuktitut expression has a modern history. It was translated as “traditional Inuit knowledge” by Rebecca Mike, who was representing the office of the Interim Commissioner at a meeting of the Nunavut Social Development Council held in Igloolik, Nunavut Territory, in March 1998. The meeting was called to examine how a new Nunavut government would deal with Inuit culture in its operations. The seamlessness of the concept is

found in the definition recorded at the time, as encompassing “all aspects of traditional Inuit culture including values, world-view, language, social organization, knowledge, life skills, perceptions, and expectations” (Anonymous, as reported in Wenzel, 2004:240). IQ has often been recognized as a “holistic” concept that includes spiritual as well as factual knowledge (Wenzel, 1999, 2004; Simpson, 2001; Huntington, 2005). The adjective “holistic” emphasizes the organic or functional relation between the parts of something and the whole. It has its origins in a decidedly Western way of thinking about subject matter: the notion that under-

¹ School of Social Work, University of British Columbia, 2080 West Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z2, Canada; ftester@interchange.ubc.ca

² 2328 Jefferson Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1H 7A3, Canada; aananaga@hotmail.com

standing the whole can be achieved by understanding the parts and how they fit and work together to produce something greater than the parts. “Seamless” may therefore be more appropriate than “holistic” in describing IQ. Something that is seamless has no discernable parts. In other words, everything is related to everything else in such a way that—counter to the logic of Western science—nothing can stand alone, even in the interest of gaining an appreciation of the whole. The Inuktitut word that best captures the concept is *avaluqanngittuq* ‘that which has no circle or border around it.’

How does IQ relate to traditional knowledge (TK), the more generic term, indigenous knowledge (IK), and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), the latter focusing on aboriginal knowledge about the biophysical environment? Different issues arise, depending on how TK and IQ are defined. These include a perception that the use of the term “traditional” implies Inuit traditions (i.e., old knowledge) that, while interesting, may have a difficult time finding a place and role in modern Inuit society (Bell, 2002). This issue suggests the importance of language and contests over the use of language in defining IQ. Bell and others maintain that IQ is properly defined as “the Inuit way of doing things, and includes the past, present and future knowledge of Inuit society” (Bell, 2002:3; see also McCluskey, 2001; IQ Task Force, 2002; Simpson, 2004).

As traditional ecological knowledge, IQ has obvious relevance to biophysical concerns like climate change and game management. However, IQ, as traditional knowledge, faces more notable challenges in relation to modern social processes, for example, in applying IQ to the built environment and institutions with which Inuit have virtually no historical experience (Tester, 2006). Furthermore, IQ must confront values, as well as social and material relationships, that contrast sharply with the predominantly hunting culture of the Inuit, the core of which, Brody (2000:299) maintains, is “individual egalitarianism.” The transformations that have taken place in Inuit culture, social relations, and ways of making a living in the past 40 years are easily as dramatic as those of the industrial revolution, documented by many, including Karl Polanyi in his classic, *The Great Transformation* (1944). The challenges posed to IQ by market relations and what Harvey (1989) identifies as “creative destruction,” or the rapid technical and social change characteristic of modern economies, are considerable. What is the relevance of IQ—however defined—to a modern Inuit society? In fact, these realities are reflected in how IQ is defined; narrowly, as a concept either useful to a more nuanced management and development of resources or important to cultural survival and resistance to dominant Western ideology.

This paper examines the historical and socio-cultural context within which IQ is located. We attempt to understand IQ in a broader socio-political context, characterized by various forms of resistance, the most common of which has been described as a “dragging of feet,” covert rather than overt in its practice (Scott, 1985; Abu-Lughod, 1990;

Kulchyski and Tester, 2007). Inuit resistance has never been overt; what has from time to time, characterized relations between the state and First Nations in southern Canada, is covert resistance. This “dragging of feet” can take two forms: advancing IQ as deserving of serious attention by virtue of claims found within Western European notions of rights and liberal democratic politics, and advancing a seamless definition of IQ that includes notions about human relations to nature that challenge Western Enlightenment logic. The struggle relevant to defining and using IQ is over the appropriation of IQ as a management tool or its articulation as a challenge to Western notions of progress and development. The suggestion made by Huntington (2005) that TK or IQ be considered and used as “traditional ecological knowledge” or “traditional cultural knowledge,” depending on the context, is illustrative of what happens to a seamless definition when attempts are made to avoid the complexities and challenges posed by linking factual with spiritual or cosmological aspects of IQ. As used by the Nunavut government, and as illustrated later in the text, IQ can be both empowering of Inuit and Inuit culture—as in its incorporation into the Nunavut Wildlife Act—or co-opting (for example, a reference to IQ made by a Nunavut Minister of Finance in one of his budget statements). Simailak (2006:4), cited later in the text, noted that removing barriers to business activity was consistent with Inuit traditional knowledge, a claim suggesting that IQ could be used to justify policies that had little or no relevance to traditional Inuit culture.

Contests between cultures over language and definitions are critical. The outcomes determine how reality is to be constructed and, more importantly, what human interactions with the environment will be permitted. Will the language of science prevail, or that of moral philosophy and cultural survival? As Morrow and Hensel (1992:46) ask in the case of Yup’ik struggles over terms relevant to custom, tradition, and regulation, will “subsistence rights that are saved by science ... include what Alaska Native people want most to preserve: subsistence as a way of relating to the world and as an important component of identity”?

IQ AS ECOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, OR AS CULTURAL WISDOM

The definition provided by Rebecca Mike, and elaborated by others, is controversial. The focus is on *culture*: information that includes knowledge about animals and non-living forms is only one item in a list that has profoundly social and spiritual content (see, for example, Usher, 2000 and Simpson, 2004). This seamless definition contrasts with what has become a narrower definition implied through practice: namely, that IQ is predominantly biophysical information relevant to co-management boards such as the Nunavut Water Board and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, which is concerned

primarily with biological resources. Although the Nunavut Impact Review Board is concerned with social as well as biophysical and economic impacts, it has not given as much attention to social and cultural issues. Making IQ an integral part of the Nunavut government, including how government is conceptualized and operates, is a formidable challenge that can be made easier by defining IQ in a manner compatible with Western science and logic.

A narrow focus on Inuit environmental knowledge is a recent development in the history of an interest in Inuit culture that typically has involved the historical (and contemporary) enquiries of anthropologists and other social scientists. This focus parallels what has happened to IK elsewhere since the 1970s, with increasing emphasis on private-sector (rather than state-led) initiatives related to intensifying domestic and global resource development. In the Canadian Arctic, the energy crisis of the early 1970s generated a new interest in, and controversy about, northern oil and gas reserves. The logic of northern development suggested, even to some *Qablunaat* (*Qallunaat*) writers, that the cultural logic of Western civilization in relation to other species and the biosphere was fundamentally flawed. Livingston (1981:128) referred to this flaw as “speciesism,” defined as “a prejudice or attitude of bias toward the interests of one’s own species and against those of members of another species” that allows other living things to be seen as “resources.” (Note that we have used *Qablunaat*, a term used in the Kivalliq region, to refer to people who are not Inuit, although *Qallunaat* is more commonly used in the Baffin region.)

These developments were accompanied by reduced government emphasis on social and cultural concerns. In the West, for complex social and political reasons, these reduced concerns were associated with the demise of the modern liberal welfare state. Internationally, similar changes were associated with a Third World debt crisis involving the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in operations that, consistent with neo-liberal economic logic, emphasized economic rather than social and cultural development. Since the Second World War, but particularly since the 1970s, Canadian society has become increasingly secular: our needs and wants are defined as primarily material, to be met by the economic development that accompanies such a definition (Taylor, 1994). These are all logics to which Inuit must now relate. By way of illustration, the 2006 budget of the Ministry of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (\$19 million) was less than 2% of the Nunavut government’s total budget of approximately \$1 billion (Simailak, 2006). It is therefore understandable that, in relation to the breadth of traditional knowledge, TK has often been reduced to TEK. The emphasis of TEK is primarily on biophysical resources (i.e., management and assessment functions related to economic development and the conservation of species). The challenge at a historical moment that has emphasized market relations and economic development over social and spiritual (existential) concerns is to create a genuine

role for IQ in the making of healthy (and not just economically viable) communities and human relations.

It is a mistake to regard the modern attention paid to IQ as something recognized and sought by an enlightened *Qablunaat* contingency, disillusioned, as Agrawal (1995:145) suggests in his account of the development and use of traditional knowledge, with “the failure of grand theories of development.” Anyone who insists on applying IQ to the management of Inuit affairs can be seen as resisting both the logic and totalizing agenda of colonial state power and a Nunavut government that, some have argued, inherited this colonial legacy (IQ Task Force, 2002). Therefore, IQ is both embraced and subverted by the state. As Cruikshank (2005:256) argues, TK is seen as a new management category that can be “systematized and incorporated into Western management schemes,” and to the extent that TK is defined as factual and primarily environmental knowledge, it can serve state purposes well. However, Cruikshank also notes that throughout the colonized world, local or traditional knowledge that subverted Western rationality—a clear reference to cosmologies that challenged Enlightenment logic—has been subverted and repressed for centuries. In Canada’s eastern Arctic, this has been true for at least as long as Edward Peck’s mission to the Inuit of Baffin Island in the late 1890s (Laugrand et al., 2006). We might ask: Just how traditional is traditional knowledge, particularly the element of “worldview,” identified by Rebecca Mike in defining IQ in anticipation of the newly formed Nunavut government?

It can be argued that within the logic of the modern developmental state, collective rights, cultural practices that differ from a majority culture, and bureaucratic processes with emphasis not directly related to economic objectives are to be considered where it is politically expedient and legally or institutionally necessary to do so. Collective rights and cultural practices not in line with these objectives are won only through struggle, and understanding this struggle is important to a definition of IQ that reflects Inuit culture. The necessities imposed upon modern economic development (the foremost of which is “the bottom line”) cannot be ignored in evaluating and assessing limitations, as well as the roles and potential roles that IQ might play in the management of Nunavut’s resources. These necessities (and some might argue, the subversion of IQ) are clearly represented by the following statement found in the text of the 2006 Nunavut budget address:

Consistent with the *Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut* [‘moving toward understanding of IQ] principle of *Qanuqtuurniq* [‘exploring or discussing ideas’], our government will work with the business community, with Inuit organizations and other stakeholders to continually seek new ways to thrive. That includes identifying and removing barriers to business, removing unnecessary regulations, and enhancing business development programs.

(Simailak, 2006:4)

Only a few papers dealing with IQ reflect the struggle to reconcile IQ or IK with the interests of industrial capitalism. Among them are optimistic contributions by Stevenson (1996), who was working at the time as a consultant to the transnational mining corporation BHP, and more pessimistic analyses offered by anthropologist Paul Nadasday (1999, 2003). Although Nadasday does not address industrial development directly, his analysis is relevant in its critique of the state apparatus that manages biological resources, often with similar interests in mind.

IQ is not merely something useful to a development agenda. Advocating IQ can be a political act, advancing a social and cultural agenda that attempts to counter, or at least buffer, the totalizing agenda of a colonizing culture. We have used the concept of totalization, after Sartre (1991), in reference to a process whereby attempts are made to bring all aspects of life (spatial, temporal, social, and economic) into line with a dominant or overarching logic: in the case of Canada, that of a modern capitalist state committed to “the idea of progress.” Totalization is a process that includes not merely incorporating as yet unincorporated geographical fragments of a nation (as was true of the eastern Arctic), but also affecting the consciousness, beliefs, and behavioural patterns of those seen to be within the state’s influence. Totalization inevitably encounters contradiction and resistance. It is a concept of critical importance to healthy Inuit communities. The values, worldview, and social relations that constitute IQ affect the functioning of institutions like the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and other initiatives. These initiatives include the community-based narwhal management program, which involves Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Armitage, 2005) and local hunters and trappers’ organizations, as well as attempts to involve communities in the co-management of other species, including caribou, polar bear, and bowhead and beluga whales. There are good reasons why social relations should be a focus for IQ.

Nadasday (1999:2) maintains that “in spite of nearly 15 years of effort by countless scientists, resource managers, aboriginal people, and social scientists to develop a method for integrating scientific and traditional knowledge, . . . there has been little actual progress toward achieving it.” This generalization is serious. No doubt some co-management boards and institutions have been more successful than others at incorporating indigenous perspectives. Most likely this success has a great deal to do with the extent of the power and control that indigenous people have over the processes in question. It also most likely relates, with rare exceptions, to the extent to which definitions of TK align with the goals and objectives of management boards and related institutions. Organizations like the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board and Nunavut Justice appear to have been more successful at integration than the Yukon-based, ad-hoc co-management boards that were the focus of Nadasday’s attention (White, 2006).

Recent changes to the Nunavut Wildlife Act (2003) are encouraging. The content of the legislation and problems in developing the regulations associated with the Act illustrate IQ as a form of resistance to forms of governance, regulations, and ideas borrowed from other jurisdictions. Henderson (2007:198) states that: “IQ is fundamentally about power, about Inuit taking charge and making positive changes for the future.” She goes on to make an important observation on the symbolic value of IQ as a reflection of Inuit identity, citing the Inuit definitions of IQ as “the Inuit way of doing things” (p. 191) and, as recorded by the Nunavut Ministry of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (CLEY) in 2000, “a philosophy and a way of living and thinking that is difficult to put into a few words” (CLEY, 2000:14). Henderson also notes that elders at a 1999 workshop refused to create a checklist-inspired definition. This, it can be argued, indicates the difficulty of articulating a seamless definition of the concept and an unwillingness to risk defining IQ in a manner consistent with Western ideas about the whole being the sum of (and greater than) the parts. She comments on IQ notions of power and the way power was traditionally linked to skill and practice, suggesting that IQ is the opposite of a “rigid hierarchy and credentialism,” both of which are hallmarks of Westminster-inspired systems of government (Henderson, 2007:198).

Tensions found in the Nunavut Wildlife Act—passed in December 2003 and announced on 8 July 2005, subject to new regulations being finalized in subsequent consultations with stakeholders—illustrate the application of a seamless definition to the challenge of wildlife management and IQ as resistance. The legislation refers to the principles of *Pijitsirniq* ‘a person having the power to make a decision, doing so in a way that serves the interests of others,’ *Avatimik Kamattiarniq* ‘the treatment of nature with respect, recognizing that what is done to something has implications for something else and that actions can have good and bad consequences,’ and *Iliijaaqaqtallniq* ‘prohibiting treating animals with disrespect.’ Finally, the new legislation invokes the concept of *Papattiniq* ‘the idea that nature is not a commodity.’ This use of IQ suggests that there are some areas where the development of policy and law can incorporate IQ as a seamless concept. However, it also suggests that this may be possible because certain activities are seen as largely unrelated to the development and use of resources essential to modern economic development. Inuit hunting can be seen as an activity on the periphery of modern industrial activity and therefore amenable to a seamless definition of IQ.

Issues related to the drafting of regulations to accompany the legislation illustrate the ongoing challenge that IQ can pose to Western science. The use of both IQ and Western science is to be found in the Nunavut Wildlife Act. Some commentators have observed that: “There is broad support in Nunavut for the idea that integration of IQ and (Western science) can offer more effective knowledge for approaching discrete applications such as resource

management ...” (Simpson, 2004:11). However, when the Act was declared on Nunavut Day, 9 July 2005, the accompanying regulations had still not been finalized. Hunters and their organizations had delayed the regulations, subject to further study. They objected, apparently, to the allowable harvest numbers and limitations, particularly for muskoxen, wolverines, and grizzly bears. Under the Act, these numbers are determined primarily by surveys conducted using the methods of Western science. Hunters complained that the proposed regulations were not giving Inuit communities enough input in establishing limits (Younger-Lewis, 2005). Thus, even within a piece of legislation that largely incorporates a seamless definition of IQ, IQ can be seen as persistent resistance to non-Inuit ways of doing things. A recent proposal to make violations of these principles prosecutable within the Western legal system also raises interesting questions about the cultural context within which IQ is to be used. How does adjudicating these principles within the confines of a Western legal system alter the worldview underlying the principles?

The concepts used in the new Wildlife Act challenge *Qablunaat Qaujimaqatunangit* ‘the non-Inuit way of knowing and doing things.’ Whether similar concepts might be incorporated in legislation or procedures governing mining or hydrocarbon development is an interesting question. In the minds of most non-Inuit regulators, *Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit* (most often defined as information about species) is now being applied largely to the management and regulation of biological resources. It is to the credit of those who drafted the new Nunavut Wildlife Act that they challenged the idea of wildlife as “Other,” as a resource to be managed, but as noted, IQ has posed a further challenge to regulations accompanying the legislation. This challenge demonstrates the importance of taking a seamless definition that includes the social and spiritual dimensions of IQ seriously. The social dimension, as called for by hunters, locates power at the community level. Without considering these dimensions, IQ can be treated as information about species and can be bent to purposes at odds with Inuit values toward all of life and human experience. We might well ask what treating IQ as primarily environmental knowledge, or facts useful in managing Arctic resources, implies for the social and personal well-being of Inuit, or Inuit identity.

The experience of Inuit is not different from that of indigenous people worldwide who, having endured centuries of colonial suppression of their “primitive” beliefs, now find their cosmologies and traditions threatened anew by the logic of globalization. For Nunavutmiut, whose population growth rates are among the highest in the world, the need to encourage development that addresses a long list of negative social indicators related to income, employment, shelter, food security, and social and personal well-being, is considerable. The fate of *Inuit Qaujimaqatunangit* in the face of these global developmental pressures merits careful consideration.

In the foreword of David Pelly’s (2001) book, *Sacred Hunt: A Portrait of the Relationship between Seals and Inuit*, one of us (Irniq, 2001:x) stated that: “Inuit Elders want our youth to know their ancestral knowledge but at the same time to get modern education and training.” Should Inuit youth not only know, but be able to practice and live with ancestral knowledge at the same time as they get modern education and training? Is such a thing possible or, in this scenario, do cultural practices and belief systems become classic “museum pieces” as modern education and training promote modern ideas about “progress” and development? Does a modern education include serious consideration of the environmental crisis accompanying modern economic development? These questions raise a matter that dominates the literature dealing with IQ, TEK, and IK. What is the best way to integrate indigenous knowledge (particularly cultural and spiritual dimensions) and Western science (Colorado, 1988; Johnson and Ruttan, 1992; Nakashima, 1993; Agrawal, 1995; Bielawski, 1996; Zamparo, 1996; Duerden and Kuhn, 1998; Pellerin and Grondin, 1998; Huntington, 2000; Watson et al., 2003; Collignon, 2004; Whiteman, 2004)? Can this be done? Can it be done without challenging the assumptions underlying the application of science to the idea of human progress?

IQ AND HISTORICAL RELATIONS TO POWER

To illustrate the significance of these questions we consider the fate of the seal hunt and the European market for seal pelts, well documented by Wenzel (1991) and Pelly (2001), and Inuit responses to historical attempts to manage the game upon which they depend.

It has been suggested that the ban on importing harp seal and hooded seal pelts imposed by the European Union in 1983 not only contributed to the destruction of essential local economies, but also served to undermine Inuit cosmology and the values it incorporates (i.e., cultural norms, beliefs, and practices that together constituted identity and well-being for Inuit) (Keith and Simon, 1987). Wenzel (1991:176) puts it this way: “The worst effects ... have fallen directly on the socio-economic stability of the traditional subsistence adaptation which Inuit ... have maintained through decades of intensive *Qallunaat* contact.” For inland Inuit and those who historically combined spring sealing with a fall caribou hunt, attempts by the state to regulate the caribou hunt had a similar impact on food security and, it can be argued, on the strength of relationships between animals and Inuit that established and maintained Inuit identity in a modern world (Kulchyski and Tester, 2007; Sandlos, 2007).

The struggle to address the impact of opposition to the seal hunt and the European ban is as significant as the outcome. Getting Inuit to participate in the effort was difficult. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Inuit were still very much afraid of their “colonial bosses” and *kiumajut*

‘talking back’ to those who claimed authority was, for many, a new and challenging idea. This was a form of resistance uncomfortable to many Inuit. A colonial history that instilled in Inuit (and others) such fear of the RCMP, the law, and northern administrators that they now have to deal with anger and resentment is a social fact relevant to working relationships between Inuit and *Qablunaat* in the operation of co-management boards. The origins of these relations of ruling are illustrated in the following correspondence between the authors in the course of writing this paper:

Very few Indian Affairs employees in my early life were very determined to help the “Eskimos.” The whole thing about this colonialism is that many Canadian Government employees were colonialists. Hudson’s Bay Company people were most terrible men. [One particular Hudson’s Bay Company Manager] used to put down the Inuit all the time. “We got a whole bunch of sons-of-bitches around here. They do not know how to hunt and trap!” Who the heck did he think I was? [He] looked down on and put down the Inuit. Except my father. As scared as he used to get, sometimes, my father got brave and let me miss a year of residential schooling. Father Dedier had said to him: “If you don’t let your son go to school, the Government can cut off your family allowance, and the RCMP could put you in jail.” In Inuktitut my father responded: “Never mind. Let me go to jail. Cut off the money that I get from the Government. He’s my son. I want to teach him about Inuit culture.” That summer, we went on the land in search of caribou, as we always do, and no one came to look for us. That entire winter I thought the RCMP was going to come around and come and take my father, just because he took me a hundred miles away from Naujaat, but no one came. And next summer, we were living 10 miles away – my father brought me back to Naujaat, to go to school in Chesterfield Inlet. I think he feared that if he didn’t let me go, the RCMP was going to come and take me to Chesterfield Inlet.

—Peter Irniq (letter to Frank Tester, 10 July 2006)

A failure to appreciate the historical context and power relations within which IQ has developed (and which, for many elders, continue to affect its expression and use) generates problems for its definition and use.

As noted, both missionary activity and colonial relations to power have served to mute cosmological and spiritual dimensions of IQ. At the same time, the post-modern sensibility of Canadian culture has now granted a measure of power and autonomy to Inuit in the form of a Nunavut government, defined by the Nunavut Act. Similarly, IQ has gone from being something transmitted orally to something encoded in text. These considerations are relevant to how IQ will be defined and used. As all texts are subject to struggle, to interpretation and reinterpretation, we must ask: What are the contemporary contexts and power relations within which IQ is considered, not considered, or subverted by language,

reassuring phrases, and gestures in a post-modern (or post-colonial) world? In order to better understand the vulnerability of IQ to these struggles, it is important to understand how Inuit traditional knowledge has been treated historically and what this historical treatment means for its contemporary use.

Historically, an interest in IQ was confined largely to anthropologists pursuing objectives more esoteric than practical, although they sometimes were asked for advice on the administration of matters affecting Inuit. Their interpretation of Inuit and other aboriginal cultures bore all the characteristics to be expected of a historical moment committed to the idea of progress, nation building, and the superiority of Western (European) culture. Franz Boas’ (1888) observations of Inuit were followed by contributions from Diamond Jenness (1991), who worked in the western Arctic just before the First World War, and explorers like Vilhjalmur Stefansson, who gained notoriety through his expeditions of 1908 and 1913–18. Although their observations covered a considerable breadth of Inuit knowledge, and especially cosmologies, belief systems, and cultural practices, they played no role in the early attempts to manage wildlife that developed after the First World War. Inuit were socially constructed—sometimes obliquely and often overtly—as primitive.

Even Boas, whose theoretical orientation changed over time from environmental determinism to cultural relativism, and who exhibited considerable ambivalence about the idea of progress, never entirely escaped the Darwinian logic of his generation. Cole (1999:263), citing passages from Boas’ writings, states: “He did not ... dispute evolution as development; indeed he implicitly accepted ‘the development of civilization’ and continued to speak of ‘stages of culture.’” Further evidence for this view is found in both the language and the content of “The Ethnological Significance of Esoteric Doctrines,” a short paper Boas wrote in 1902. Boas states: “It has taken many years for the study of the culture of *civilized* people to broaden out so as to take in not only the *activities of the great*, but also the *homely life* of the masses. ... If it is true that for a full understanding of *civilized* society the knowledge of the popular mind is a necessity, it is doubly true in more *primitive* forms of society... (Boas, 1902:874; emphases added). Writing about Jenness in relation to the colonial objectives of the Canadian state, Kulchyski (1993:38) concludes that “the anthropological thought of Diamond Jenness was deeply complicit with the practices and policies of the same State he frequently criticized.”

Authors like Stefansson portrayed Inuit as having little or no capacity to adapt *Qablunaat* technology to their life circumstances. Given rifles, he suggested, they were likely to engage in the “wanton slaughter” of game (Stefansson, 1962). Knud Rasmussen of the Fifth Thule expedition (1921–24), appearing before a territorial council meeting in Ottawa in 1925, recommended against permitting traders to make high-powered rifles available to Inuit, “the natives having no idea of conservation.” He stated that it

was “impossible to keep the natives in their original primitive state” since they had already become “partially accustomed to products of civilization.” He recommended that they be “allowed to complete the process as soon as possible, but under supervision” (Northwest Territories Council, 1925:2). Supervision is what Inuit were to get plenty of for decades to come.

Inuit resistance, personal and serialized until the creation of consolidated settlements commencing in the mid to late 1950s, emerged in response to the state’s increasingly desperate attempts to regulate Inuit hunting. Regulation was the government’s reaction to Canadian scientists’ interpretation of their data as pointing to the wanton slaughter of caribou (and other species) by Inuit hunters. Attempts to educate and regulate Inuit hunters were subsequently driven by the science of wildlife biologists; for caribou, it was the research of Frank Banfield and John Kelsall in the late 1940s and 1950s. Although a detailed examination of this research is beyond the scope of this paper, a study of Banfield and Kelsall’s work reveals that a science claiming to be highly technical, relying for the first time on aircraft surveys and on-the-ground studies, and claiming that caribou were on their way to extinction, was driven by many racist assumptions—including the commonly held belief that Inuit, as “primitives,” once they had access to rifles, were engaged in the “wanton slaughter” of game (Kulchyski and Tester, 2007). Inuit knowledge played no role in determining what appropriate regulations might be. Inuit resistance was passive and most commonly took the form of simply ignoring the law and continuing to hunt as always.

Subsequent changes to game laws had chilling implications for Inuit well-being. The Inuit resisted these changes in every way, which resulted in attempted prosecutions and ground-breaking court decisions. In the early 1960s, Justice Sissons of the Northwest Territories Supreme Court invoked the Royal Proclamation of 1763 in the cases of Matthew Kunangnaq and Frances Kallooar, in an attempt to block state attempts to subvert Inuit hunting rights (Eber, 1997). His interpretation was that Inuit, as aboriginal people, were included under the terms of the Royal Proclamation and thus had a guaranteed and unobstructed right to hunt on all lands that had not been ceded to or purchased by the Crown. By the late 1960s, the science that had been applied to Canadian Arctic game populations, particularly caribou, was falling apart. New studies conducted by Bob Ruttan, a Canadian Wildlife Service biologist, along with the persistent observations of Inuit hunters, made it increasingly clear that, if anything, caribou herds were growing. Inuit resisted by “talking back”:

Inuit were given a certain amount of quotas for certain things – for certain animals. We finally found out that just because there’s a wildlife officer—that, you know—we didn’t need to follow that. It wasn’t necessary for us because—ah—the caribou were almost being treated the same as polar bears. Polar bears have quotas and if the

caribou have quotas, then the Inuit were afraid that they would be starving. And—um—because we have to have a license—well, we were told we would have to have licences even for fishing! And after that, well, we started—that’s when we realized that we had to talk back—for our food; for the food’s sake. We didn’t say: “How can we do it?” We just said “No!” Later on, there was no in-between. It was just no!

—Barnabus Piruyeq of Baker Lake
(Interview by F. Tester and P. Kulchyski on 22 May 1997)

By the late 1960s, the Inuit voice was loud and clear, not only in regard to game management, but in response to the Carrothers Commission and the idea of autonomy for Inuit-occupied regions of the Arctic. Inuit increasingly recognized that protecting their culture and lifestyle required Inuit control of Inuit lands and institutions. The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, an organization concerned with Inuit rights (now called Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami), was created in 1971, and an Inuit land claim was initiated.

The energy crisis of the 1970s and the success of aboriginal people working through the courts threw the status of northern lands into question just when their resource potential was attracting attention. Internationally, the stage had been set for recognition of aboriginal rights as early as 1957, when the United Nations International Labour Organization recognized indigenous rights to customary law, social organization, land tenure, and customary practices in its Convention 107. By the 1970s, however, as global economic development accelerated, there seemed to be less room to accept concepts like “customary law,” “social organization,” and “customary practices” or worldviews. Indigenous people began to organize internationally, and the World Council of Indigenous Peoples put together its own declaration on human rights, released in September 1977. This effort has had a significant impact on international declarations affecting the rights of indigenous people. These rights have been incorporated into international bodies and agreements to which Canada is signatory, including the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, ratified in 1993. The latter makes specific reference to TK in a number of its provisions, particularly Article 8(j), which commits states to “preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity...” (Mauro and Hardison, 2000:1265). Article 8(j) illustrates the nature of the struggle between TK as fact and TK as cosmology. The subject of protracted debate, it moved TK in the direction of fact, with a pragmatic focus directed at knowledge and practices relevant to species conservation. It is no surprise that the attention paid by Inuit and other indigenous people to their rights developed in parallel to a growing interest in global resources, often located in remote and previously unexploited parts of the world. It is also not surprising, given the developmental emphasis of the historical

moment, that the consideration given to TK has in some ways been compromised.

Initially, the focus on northern TK was highly contextualized. TK was explored in relation to cosmologies and belief systems. Much of this research was heavily influenced by the cultural perspective of anthropologists and others who related hunting activities not only to environmental knowledge, but to forms of cultural and social organization (Nelson, 1969; Feit, 1973, 1988; Brody, 1981; Cruikshank, 1981). The fate of this embedded perspective is worth considering in light of the pragmatic focus on environmental assessment and management to which such knowledge has increasingly been applied by management and co-management boards created in the 1990s. Our attention is drawn to this pragmatic focus by the Nunavut Social Development Council's contrasting ethical and cosmological definitions of IQ, and by contrasting definitions of TEK advanced by Usher (2000) and Abele (2007).

Given the hunting culture of the Inuit and the history briefly outlined above, it is not surprising that IQ should find its most obvious and direct application to the management of wildlife. This application did not arise simply from weaknesses and limitations in the capacity of Western science to deal with migrating species as part of complex and poorly understood ecosystems. Inuit resistance to the regimes imposed upon them, which were based on an inadequate, inaccurate Western science driven by racist and ethnocentric assumptions, must properly be recognized as the original source for the incorporation of IQ into processes affecting Inuit lives. The formation in October 1980 of the Keewatin Wildlife Federation, an amalgamation of seven hunting and trapping organizations, provided the first substantive vehicle for Inuit input into wildlife conservation. Although it used survey methods common to Western science, the harvest study undertaken by the Federation confirmed what Inuit had claimed for decades: that caribou numbers were likely many times greater than Canadian Wildlife Service biologists had estimated (Riewe and Gamble, 1988). There are good reasons to doubt the capacity of Western science in relation to northern wildlife, and many examples of these limits have been documented (Freeman, 1992). It is therefore not difficult to appreciate the curiosity aroused by the idea that IQ might be able to enhance or complement Western science.

By 1982, the Tunngavik Federation of Nunavut, negotiating a land-claim settlement, accomplished the first agreement-in-principle with the federal government, an agreement formalized in 1986 and ratified as part of the Nunavut Final Agreement in 1993. That agreement and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board have since been the focus of many papers examining the application of IQ to questions about the management of species hunted by Inuit (e.g., Wenzel, 2004; Armitage, 2005; White, 2006). Canadian attention to and interest in IQ and other forms of IK—regardless of how these terms are defined—have been driven, in the context of indigenous rights, by the

efforts of indigenous people themselves. Since Western culture breaks the whole into constituent parts for purposes of study and management, it is not difficult to see how hunting is viewed within Western culture, how an Inuit definition of IQ has been broken into its constituent parts, with an emphasis on its relevance in managing species. Both the nature of Western science and developmental pressures are relevant to understanding how TK and IQ have been defined. However, if Inuit culture is to survive—as a hunting culture that links social relations to ideas about ecology and treats animals as something other than, or more than, a resource—a seamless definition of IQ is required.

RE-DEFINING IQ

Sadler and Boothroyd (1993:2–3), reporting on observations made by O'Neil and Solway (1990) at a northern workshop on human health and environmental impact assessment, make the point: "Indigenous participants repeatedly emphasized that 'when the land is sick so are we.' When they return to summer camp, 'nutrition, the socialization of children, personal identity and self-esteem all improve.' Indigenous peoples do not separate the spiritual, physical and socio-psychological relationships. Ecological and community health become one and the same."

The profoundly social and cultural nature of the original definition applied to IQ, noted previously, is recognized in many definitions of TEK or IK. Berkes (1999:8) defines IK as: "A cumulative body of knowledge, practice and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission about the relationship of living beings (including humans) with one another and their environment." Wenzel (1999:114) provides a similar definition: "the knowledge held by Inuit that pertains to the dynamic interactions that occur among all the elements, cultural as well as biophysical, within the northern ecosystem." At the same time, many aboriginal communities are concerned with the use of indigenous knowledge in practice, as noted by Simpson (2001:139):

Most often, definitions reflect what the dominant society sees as important. The ecological component of our knowledge is emphasized rather than its spiritual foundations. TEK "data" or factual information is at the fore, rather than seeing our knowledge as worldviews, values and processes (AFN/NAFA, 1995). In a sense, constructing Aboriginal knowledge into "TEK" has been a process of "scientizing" our knowledge for use in and the consumption of Euro-Canadian society (Stevenson, 1998; Stevenson 1997).

Usher (2000) notes that the absence of a clear definition allows co-management bodies and assessment panels to decide for themselves what constitutes TEK. This leaves TK or IQ open as a site of struggle over words and

meanings. It is no surprise that the dominant culture is intent on wording that facilitates a more sensitive, nuanced, and informed approach to resource development and management, or at worst, wording that acknowledges indigenous concerns and TK as an appeasement necessary to getting on with the business of resource development.

Usher has identified four categories of TEK: (1) factual/rational knowledge about the environment, (2) factual knowledge about past and current use of the environment, (3) culturally based values statements about how things should be and what is fitting and proper to do, and finally (4) culturally based cosmology—the foundation of the knowledge system—by which information derived from observation, experience, and instruction is organized to provide explanations and guidance (Usher, 2000:186). This definition, despite the label TEK, does not limit knowledge to that which is traditional. As noted, the use of the term “traditional” in concepts like TEK, or the translation of IQ, is problematic. It suggests that contemporary insights—which may be a combination of insights handed down from generation to generation and new knowledge acquired by people who study, travel, and interact with a contemporary world—may not be considered IK.

An example of how indigenous knowledge and assessment are treated compared to similar observations and conclusions made by someone trained in the Western scientific tradition is Duerden and Kuhn’s (1998) comments on an observation made by Peter Irniq at a workshop on climate change held at the University of Alberta in 1992. The observation was that, judging by what was seen on a trip through the Keewatin District in the summer of 1992 and changes to the land, it appeared that global warming was taking place. These conclusions were based not simply on an intimate knowledge of the territory in question, but on knowledge and understanding acquired from years of exposure to non-Inuit science and discussions about global warming. Making such a statement was no different from the action of any social scientist, whose research and observations are only part of a whole to which they can be related. Duerden and Kuhn (1998) raise questions about the appropriateness of making inferences about global warming based on a few local observations. In this case, the authors are asking if local observations that are typical of the nature of TEK are valid in making inferences about “the bigger picture.” They suggest that “scale and context are key components in maintaining the validity and integrity of TEK” (Duerden and Kuhn, 1998:37).

A similar problem arose in the context of an inquiry into the socio-economic and environmental implications of a pipeline proposed in the late 1970s to carry gas from the Hecla field of Melville Island south through the Keewatin (Kivalliq) District, connecting with the TransCanada pipeline at LongLac, Ontario (Tester, 1978–79). Near Baker Lake, the proposal was to take the pipeline across the Thelon River by means of a bridge. Many Inuit in Baker Lake had never seen a bridge before. They were introduced to the concept with slides taken of a gas pipeline that

crossed the Fraser River just below Hope, British Columbia. The idea was to generate discussion about what impact this bridge might have on caribou, or anything else of concern. The proponent criticized this approach, saying that rather than collecting information based on TK, Tester was influencing opinion by performing an educational function that included introducing modern concepts with which Inuit had no experience, and about which they were not qualified to comment.

The inference from these two experiences appears to be that TK (unlike its scientific counterpart) should be restricted to local observations with which Inuit have historical experience, thereby precluding Inuit from participating in discussions that, collectively, point to truly universal problems like global warming. The suggestion has been made that “the primary validity of TEK is with describing and explaining detailed *local* geographies and prescribing *locally* appropriate resource management strategies” (emphasis added; Duerden and Kuhn, 1998:37). This conclusion underlines a multitude of problems and certainly does not fit with the role that organizations like the Inuit Circumpolar Conference have played in dealing with the international problem of global warming. Usher’s third and fourth categories of definition, aspects of TEK with potentially universal relevance, appear not to be part of the definition of TEK implied by Duerden and Kuhn (1998).

The term “traditional” can therefore generate the idea that IK, and IQ, are classic “museum pieces” with some limited use in completing what is otherwise scientific knowledge. Collignon (2004:377) suggests they are “a bulk of beliefs and inherited practices related to ignorance, lack of understanding and fear of the unknown, or, at best, to pleasant traditions which value lies in their exoticism.” Although TEK appears not to be treated as such in the working of most Canadian assessment panels and boards, the observations of Nadasdy (1999) suggest that such attitudes toward IK may lie just below the surface of the more publicly acceptable position of some non-indigenous participants in this debate. Language construction and use are political acts, and not simply a means of getting as close as possible to what might be regarded as factual or pre-existing truth.

It is categories 1 and 2 of Usher’s (2000) definition of TEK (knowledge about the environment and about its use) that appear to have the most relevance in studying and preparing baseline information or data relevant to assessing the implications of human activity. However, it is category 3 (values about the environment) that typically is presented in hearing processes and invoked in decision making, the issue being whose values prevail. Category 4 (the knowledge system itself), while noted in hearing processes, has the most potential to raise fundamental and troubling questions about the nature of development in relation to human values, relationships, and purposes. In this regard, IQ can be a place for resistance. Nadasdy (1999:11) observes that it is statements made about

cosmologies and belief systems that are greeted with “eye rolling, audible sighs, and/or under-the-breath comments” on the part of government officials with a far narrower agenda. Not surprisingly, Usher’s fourth category, with some exceptions, has received little attention in processes considering IQ (TEK or IK) and is problematic for the workings of a contemporary Nunavut government.

MAKING SENSE OF THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXT FOR IQ

That the Nunavut government should closely parallel the workings of a Euro-Canadian bureaucracy is understandable. Unlike some indigenous populations, Inuit have no history of being politically or socially organized in anything other than small, scattered camps based on extended family and kinship relations. The move to settlements was far from being a natural and voluntary process, as has been suggested (Damas, 2002). It was a process set in motion by assumptions about the importance of bringing Inuit into what was regarded as a modern and progressive world, and by the deliberate and calculated policies and practices that followed these assumptions. There is likely no other group of indigenous people in the world that has made such a transition—from scattered hunting camps to settlements steeped in the organizational logic and material realities of high modernism—in such a short time (from ca. 1955 to 1965). The disruptions to Inuit life and culture were incalculable.

Faced with a need to manage communities and Inuit affairs in a way foreign to historical experience, Inuit learned to adapt to administrative forms patterned after *Qablunaat* institutions (such as cooperatives, hunters and trappers’ associations, settlement councils, non-governmental organizations like Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, and ultimately, a territorial government). What have Inuit learned of relevance to understanding the processes within which IQ is to be considered? Wenzel (2004) examined in detail not only IQ in the context of co-management boards, but the potential for the Nunavut government to incorporate the concept of human-animal relations inherent in Inuit use of wildlife. His analysis is useful, but narrowly focused on wildlife management and the values and beliefs governing human-animal interactions. In fact, the extent to which the Nunavut government is able to use a full range of IQ is limited by the creation of a rather typical Euro-Canadian bureaucratic structure for the governance of the territory. Although special provision has been made for elders in structures like the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (White, 2006), the Nunavut government is organized in the mould of a classical Weberian bureaucracy. Authority is concentrated at the top. Recognition, promotion, and power are related to merit, defined not by age and experience with Inuit lands and culture, but by recognized educational and academic credentials. When these attributes cannot be found among the Inuit population, they

are imported. The prominence of non-Inuit in the Nunavut civil service is therefore not difficult to explain. Expertise has been defined in a decidedly Western European way. By way of illustration, the legal system dominating the territory is a classical adversarial system, with features like cross-examining witnesses and impugning their truth, which are anathema to Inuit cultural and social practices, socio-psychological characteristics, and personal beliefs. At the same time, a willingness to use IQ in matters related to sentencing and diversion is a step—but only one step—forward (Department of Justice, 2005).

Fitting cultural norms and definitions of IQ that challenge the status quo with these arrangements is an incredible challenge, complicated by an unseemly lack of attention to Inuit history, culture, and cultural norms in a school system geared to training Inuit youth for a modern world. Inuit culture is now getting more attention, but integrating it and applying it to modern Inuit affairs presents the system with a far greater challenge. Cataloguing Inuit knowledge is a necessary but insufficient first step (Bennett and Rowley, 2004). It is also not difficult to understand why a class of Inuit managers who at least appear to speak the language of *Qablunaat* officials has emerged. Young Inuit have been born into a meritocracy that requires non-Inuit certification (certificates, degrees, training seminars, and courses) and seldom addresses the historical struggles of their parents and grandparents, thrust into a modern world. While elders, in the context of IQ, pursue an agenda born of a historical and political struggle that *Qablunaat* and young Inuit alike often fail to understand, Inuit of the younger generation, with some exceptions, pursue the modern world. They do so with what is often a confused mix of social relations: steeped in Inuit culture, they have considerable exposure to and participate in a world characterized by very different social relations, goals, and objectives. These contradictions are relevant in contemporary struggles to make a seamless definition of IQ and place it at the center of contemporary Inuit culture.

CONCLUSION

It is evident from this history that definitions of IQ are subject to considerable contest in both Inuit and non-Inuit cultures. The seamless definition of IQ advanced by Rebecca Mike in 1998 is severely challenged by modern realities facing many Inuit and by the Nunavut government. It is supported in part, but clearly compromised in the presence of “the idea of progress” associated with the development of Nunavut Territory, the need for wage employment and, some would argue, the need for industrial development. Activities related to mining, the military, and Arctic sovereignty are likely to figure prominently in the future development of Nunavut.

Nevertheless, given the magnitude of the environmental problems Canadians currently face—climate change notable among them—the articulation of IQ as a concept

raising fundamental questions about how human beings relate to nature, and the norms, practices, sensibilities, and respect that constitute that relationship, has a place in contemporary Canadian and international debates about how to live on a planet of limited means. That we need different ways of thinking about human interactions with nature is nothing new; the idea has received much attention since 1962, when Rachel Carson's book, *Silent Spring*, launched the contemporary environmental movement. And while Inuit cosmology may not find a home in the consciousness of most Canadians, demonstrating that alternative attitudes toward nature are both possible and practiced suggests to Canadians and to others that different ways of thinking about human interactions with nature are a reality. A seamless definition of IQ has an important role to play in debates relevant to this historical moment.

Inclusive or seamless definitions involve a struggle over language in relation to the objectives of different actors, including those on the outside of Inuit culture. A definition reflecting an Inuit worldview has obvious and positive implications for the everyday life and health of Inuit communities. These implications include empathetic, conscious, and informed relations among people, and roles and responsibilities for elders, youth, and parents. There are implications for an ethic of sharing, of caring, and of respect for the autonomy of individuals. The processes used to bring Inuit together in attempts to define modern Inuit culture and to produce a different statement of who Inuit are can build strong relationships within Inuit communities. The problem with a seamless definition of IQ—one that incorporates an Inuit worldview—is that an Inuit worldview has suffered from decades of colonial rule and repression. Rediscovering and rearticulating that worldview is a task best undertaken by Inuit, and it contains the possibility of rejuvenating and invigorating Inuit culture and relations between youth and elders. Such an exercise involves an important exploration of Inuit social history, which includes a history of resistance to, as well as compliance with, the edicts of a colonizing culture.

IQ, and especially the processes of defining and using it, can be seen as exercises in struggle and resistance: attempts to protect and develop Inuit culture in ways that challenge the logic and operations of a modern, "province in waiting" Nunavut government. The struggle goes back and forth. Progress is made. An IQ Task Force was formed in 2001, but it disappeared inside a government ministry while trying to address what it saw as state failure to operate with IQ as a foundation. It called for an IQ senate-like organization to "help integrate the Nunavut government into the Nunavut culture" (IQ Task Force, 2002:20). Members of the task force—whose optimism was revealed by the title of their report, *The First Annual Report*—were not reappointed.

As we noted in reference to statements made by the minister of finance while trying to attract private sector investment, the language of IQ is subverted from within the Nunavut administration itself. In September 2006,

Nunavut premier Paul Okalik announced that all civil servants would be expected to speak Inuktitut within five years. In February 2008, he claimed that senior managers had mastered the basics of the language, but also noted that his 2006 announcement had been "largely a symbolic gesture" (Thompson, 2008). A recent study by linguists Louis Jacques Dorais and Susan Sammons suggests that the Inuktitut language is in serious trouble (George, 2006), while a book by French geographer Béatrice Collignon (2006) suggests that knowledge about people and places in the Kitikmeot region is rapidly disappearing with the loss of language. The Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth has created the *Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit Katimajitt* 'the Inuit traditional knowledge committee that meets'—a council of 11 people external to government but clearly dependent on its support—to advise the government on the context in which government activities are conducted. Representatives from government departments have formed groups of *Inuit Qaujimagatuqangitta Isumaksaqsiuqtingit* 'Inuit traditional knowledge thinkers' to do the same internally. Will these initiatives make a difference? Is this the language of appearances? At a time when it could be argued that progress was being made in integrating IQ with the management of game and marine mammals in Nunavut, controversy erupted over the use of IQ in raising polar bear quotas, and the apparent failure on the part of the Nunavut government to record the IQ used in the determination. This controversy was coupled with an insistence by the United States, in relation to the import of polar bear skins, that "the best available scientific data must be used to decide if the quotas are sustainable" (George, 2005:1). Those committed to a seamless definition of IQ must take seriously the struggle over language in defining the concept and making it operational.

Finally, we all make mistakes. Western science has been mistaken about many things it has examined—a list too long to reproduce here. Western science also has incomplete explanations for many subjects of its interest, and its language, categories, definitions, and relevance are subject to ongoing debate. The same can be said for IQ. What happens when ideas about Christianity, clearly imported from Western European cosmologies and creation stories, become part of what some might consider IQ? What about global warming, with current conditions changing so rapidly that the experiential knowledge of elders found within Inuit culture is confronting circumstances never seen before? This situation parallels the difficulty *angakkuit* 'shamans' had in dealing with diseases introduced by Western Europeans, with which Inuit had no previous experience.

Definitions of IQ should also make reference to the social spaces and places, the contexts where IQ is articulated, debated, and developed. IQ, by definition, should be identified as a space, a context within which respectful dialogue, discussion, questioning, and listening can take place. The questions need to flow both ways. In recognizing this, non-Inuit must understand Inuit social history and

Inuit/*Qablunaat* relations. This knowledge reveals why it is important, at every opportunity, to create a *kappi-ananngittuq* ‘a safe, or non-scary, place’ where these matters can be discussed across cultures. Opportunities must be provided to help those who, for personal and historical reasons, may be intimidated by non-Inuit experts. More effort needs to be put towards the design of social processes and social spaces that help Western scientists and Inuit understand each other’s historical, cultural, and political contexts. This conjunction is essential if Inuit and *Qablunaat* are to work together on universal problems like global warming.

What might be the fate of IQ? As Nadasdy (1999) observes, attempts to absorb TK or to define it in terms of bureaucratic purposes, in such a way that it poses no threat to existing agendas and management regimes, are a serious matter for the status and future of such knowledge. If the spiritual and cosmological aspects of IQ are taken seriously, the Nunavut Wildlife Act being an example, the implications for human/non-human relations and community functioning clearly contradict values, relations, and objectives embedded in the culture to which Inuit must now relate. The promotion of IQ and a cosmology that melds the distinction between human and other living forms and that requires special (i.e., non-Western) consideration of other living and non-living forms in the course of human activity constitutes a social cost for those interested in conventional resource development. Treating other living forms in this way is an impediment to development within the logic of Western capitalist economies. Operating with a seamless definition of IQ clearly involves struggle and resistance.

IQ, we suggest, is a place, a foundation—a *kappi-ananngittuq* ‘safe place’ made so by the historical struggle of elders. It is a place legitimized by ancient wisdom that defines all of us in ways that have profound implications for human survival in a world of dramatic and threatening environmental change. As Stevenson (2006) argues, IQ is about remembering, an ethical injunction that lies at the root of Inuit identity. It is also about acting from a particular intellectual and spiritual location. IQ, as resistance, is persistently present. It is, as Kulchyski (2006:263) argues, written everywhere: “the syllabic writing of Elders, the inscriptions on the landscape on the body, the material structure of communities incarnated in architectures and gestures...” IQ can be a spiritual and intellectual home, a safe place from which elders and youth alike can practice resistance through stories, art, music, research, writings, and very many forms of practice. As *kappainartuqanngittuq* ‘a place about which there is no reason to be scared,’ IQ can bring together generations of Inuit in a common challenge. That challenge is to hold in check relations that seriously threaten Inuit culture and, in so doing, put before us relationships between and among people, animals, and landscapes relevant to all of us that might otherwise be absorbed by a very different, totalizing logic.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper was supported by funding from Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Our thanks to University of British Columbia student Sarah Lynch for her research assistance.

REFERENCES

- ABELE, F. 2007. Between respect and control: Traditional indigenous knowledge in Canadian public policy. In: Orsini, M., and Smith, M., eds. *Critical policy studies: Contemporary Canadian approaches*. Vancouver: UBC Press. 233–256.
- ABU-LUGHOD, L. 1990. The romance of resistance: Tracing transformations of power through Bedouin women. *American Ethnologist* 17(1):41–55.
- AFN/NAFA (ASSEMBLY OF FIRST NATIONS/NATIONAL ABORIGINAL FORESTRY ASSOCIATION). 1995. The feasibility of representing traditional indigenous knowledge in cartographic, pictorial or textural form. Ottawa: NAFA National Atlas Information Service and the Environment Division of the AFN. Available at AFN, Suite 810, 473 Albert St., Ottawa, Ontario K1R 5B8, Canada.
- AGRAWAL, A. 1995. Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change* 26: 413–439.
- ARMITAGE, D.R. 2005. Community-based narwhal management in Nunavut, Canada: Change uncertainty, and adaptation. *Society and Natural Resources* 18:715–731.
- BELL, M. 2002. Nunavut literacy development in the context of Inuit *Qaujimaajatuqanginnut* (IQ) (Inuit Traditional Knowledge): A discussion paper. Yellowknife: Inukshuk Management Consultants. <http://www.nunavutliteracy.ca/english/resource/reports/paper/cover.htm>.
- BENNETT, J., and ROWLEY, S. 2004. *Uqalurait: An oral history of Nunavut*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- BERKES, F. 1999. *Sacred ecology: Traditional ecological knowledge and resource management*. London and Philadelphia: Taylor and Frances.
- BIELAWSKI, E. 1996. Inuit indigenous knowledge and science in the Arctic. In: Nader, L., ed. *Naked science: An anthropological inquiry into boundaries, power and knowledge*. New York: Routledge. 216–227.
- BOAS, F. 1888. The central Eskimo. 6th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1884–1885. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of American Ethnography. 399–669.
- . 1902. The ethnological significance of esoteric doctrines. *Science* 26(413):872–874.
- BRODY, H. 1981. *Maps and dreams: Indians and the British Columbia frontier*. Vancouver and Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre.
- . 2000. *The other side of Eden: Hunters, farmers and the shaping of the world*. Vancouver and Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre.
- CARSON, R. 1962. *Silent spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- CLEY (DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE, LANGUAGE, ELDER AND YOUTH). 2000. Report from the September *Inuit Qaujimagajatuqangit* Workshop 1999. Iqaluit: CLEY, Government of Nunavut.
- COLE, D. 1999. Franz Boas: The early years, 1858–1906. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre and Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- COLLIGNON, B. 2004. It's a long way to the other geographers and geographic knowledge. *Geojournal* 60:375–379.
- . 2006. Knowing places: The Inuinait, landscapes, and the environment. (Translated by Linna Weber Müller-Wille.) Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute Press.
- COLORADO, P. 1988. Bridging Native and Western science. *Convergence* 21(2/3):49–68.
- CRUIKSHANK, J. 1981. Legend and landscape: Convergence in oral and scientific traditions in the Yukon Territory. *Arctic Anthropology* 17(2):67–93.
- . 2005. Do glaciers listen? Local knowledge, colonial encounters & social imagination. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- DAMAS, D. 2002. Arctic migrants, Arctic villagers: The transformation of Inuit settlement in the central Arctic. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE. 2005. Review of the Nunavut Community Justice Program: Final report. Ottawa: Department of Justice, Government of Canada. http://canada.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2005/rr05_7/toc-tdm.html.
- DUERDEN, F., and KUHN, R.G. 1998. Scale, context and application of traditional knowledge of the Canadian North. *Polar Record* 34(188):31–38.
- EBER, D. 1997. Images of justice. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- FEIT, H. 1973. Ethno-ecology of the Waswanipi Cree – Or how hunters can manage their resources. In: Cox, B., ed. *Cultural ecology readings on the Canadian Indians and Eskimos*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. 115–125.
- . 1988. Self-management and state-management: Forms of knowing and managing northern wildlife. In: Freeman, M.M.R., and Carbyn L.N., eds. *Traditional knowledge and renewable resource management in northern regions*. Occasional Publication 23. Edmonton: Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, University of Alberta. 72–91.
- FREEMAN, M.M.R. 1992. The nature and utility of traditional ecological knowledge. *Northern Perspectives* 20(1):9–12.
- GEORGE, J. 2005. Nunavut IQ on polar bears not documented: Where is it? U.S. wildlife officials ask. *Nunatsiaq News*, August 5.
- . 2006. Inuktitut slowly dying across Nunavut, study shows. *Nunatsiaq News*, July 7.
- HARVEY, D. 1989. *The condition of post-modernity*. London and Basil: Blackwell.
- HENDERSON, A. 2007. *Nunavut: Rethinking political culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- HUNTINGTON, H. 2000. Using traditional ecological knowledge in science: Methods and applications. *Ecological Applications* 10(5):1270–1274.
- . 2005. “We dance around in a ring and suppose”: Academic engagement with traditional knowledge. *Arctic Anthropology* 42(1):29–32.
- IQ TASK FORCE. 2002. *First Annual Report*. Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut. Available at Government of Nunavut, P.O. Box 1000, Station 800, Iqaluit, Nunavut X0A 0H0, Canada.
- IRNIQ, P. 2001. Foreword. In: Pelly, D. *Sacred hunt: A portrait of the relationship between seals and Inuit*. Vancouver and Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre.
- JENNESS, S., ed. 1991. *Arctic odyssey: The diary of Diamond Jenness, 1913–1916*. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- JOHNSON, M., and RUTTAN, R.A. 1992. Traditional ecological knowledge of the Dene: A pilot project. In: Johnson, M., ed. *Lore: Capturing traditional ecological knowledge*. Hay River: Dene Cultural Institute. 35–63.
- KEITH, R.F., and SIMON, M. 1987. Sustainable development in the northern circumpolar world. In: Jacobs, P., and Munro, D.A., eds. *Conservation with equity: Strategies for sustainable development*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. 209–225.
- KULCHYSKI, P. 1993. Anthropology at the service of the state: Diamond Jenness and Canadian Indian policy. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 28(2):21–50.
- . 2006. Like the sound of a drum: Aboriginal cultural politics in Denendeh and Nunavut. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- KULCHYSKI, P., and TESTER, F. 2007. *Kiumajut: Game management and Inuit rights, 1900–1970*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- LAUGRAND, F., OOSTEN, J., and TRUDEL, F. 2006. *Apostle to the Inuit: The journals and ethnographic notes of Edmund James Peck, the Baffin years, 1894–1905*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- LIVINGSTON, J. 1981. *Arctic oil: The destruction of the North*. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- MAURO, F., and HARDISON, P.D. 2000. Traditional knowledge of indigenous and local communities: International debate and policy initiatives. *Ecological Applications* 10(5):1263–1269.
- MCCLUSKEY, K. 2001. Something old: Marrying Inuit knowledge with contemporary government. *Northern News Service*, April 30. http://www.nnsl.com/frames/newspapers/2001-04/apr30_01trad.html.
- MORROW, P., and HENSEL, C. 1992. Hidden dissensions: Minority-majority relationships and the use of contested terminology. *Arctic Anthropology* 29(1):38–53.
- NADASDAY, P. 1999. The politics of TEK: Power and the “integration” of knowledge. *Arctic Anthropology* 36(1/2): 1–18.
- . 2003. Hunters and bureaucrats: Power, knowledge, and aboriginal–state relations in the southwest Yukon. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- NAKASHIMA, D.J. 1993. Astute observers on the sea ice edge: Inuit knowledge as a basis for Arctic co-management. In: Inglis, J.T., ed. *Traditional ecological knowledge: Concepts and cases*. Ottawa: International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge and the International Development Research Centre. 99–110.
- NELSON, R. 1969. *Hunters of the northern ice*. Chicago: Aldine.
- NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL. 1925. Minutes of meeting, 1 May 1925. RG 85, Vol. 2266, file 500-2, Vol. 1, 1921–1930. Ottawa: National Archives of Canada.

- O'NEIL, J.D., and SOLWAY, J. 1990. Human health and environmental assessment in the North. Background paper and workshop report. Ottawa: Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council. Available at Micromedia Limited, 165 Hôtel de Ville, Place du Portage, Phase II, Hull, Quebec G8X 3X2, Canada.
- PELLERIN, J., and GRONDIN, J. 1998. Assessing the state of Arctic ecosystem health: Bridging Inuit viewpoints and biological endpoints on fish health. *Ecosystem Health* 4(4):236–247.
- PELLY, D. 2001. Sacred hunt: A portrait of the relationship between seals and Inuit. Vancouver and Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre.
- POLANYI, K. 1944. The great transformation. Boston: Beacon.
- RIEWE, R., and GAMBLE, L. 1988. The Inuit and wildlife management today. In: Freeman, M.M.R., and Carbyn, L.N., eds. Traditional knowledge and renewable resource management in northern regions. Occasional Publication 23. Edmonton: Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, University of Alberta. 31–37.
- SADLER, B., and BOOTHROYD, P. 1993. Traditional ecological knowledge and environmental assessment. Report prepared for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council, Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, Hull, Quebec. Available at Micromedia Limited, 165 Hôtel de Ville, Place du Portage, Phase II, Hull, Quebec G8X 3X2, Canada.
- SANDLOS, J. 2007. Hunters at the margin: Native people and wildlife conservation in the Northwest Territories. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- SARTRE, J.-P. 1991. Critique of dialectical reason. London and New York: Verso.
- SCOTT, J. 1985. Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- SIMAILAK, THE HONOURABLE D. 2006. Budget address, 2006–07, 22 February 2006. Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut.
- SIMPSON, L. 2001. Aboriginal peoples and knowledge: Decolonizing our processes. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 21(1):137–148.
- . 2004. An Inuit way of knowing and the making of Nunavut. *Policy Options* (August):9–12.
- STEFANSSON, V. 1962. My life with the Eskimo. New York: Collier Books.
- STEVENSON, L. 2006. The ethical injunction to remember. In: Stern, P., and Stevenson, L., eds. *Critical Inuit studies: An anthology of contemporary Arctic ethnography*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press. 168–183.
- STEVENSON, M.G. 1996. Indigenous knowledge in environmental assessment. *Arctic* 49(3):278–291.
- . 1997. Inuit and co-management: Principles, practices and challenges for the new millennium. Unpublished manuscript prepared for the Inuit Circumpolar Conference. Available at President's Office, Inuit Circumpolar Conference, P.O. Box 204, DK-3900, Nuuk, Greenland.
- . 1998. Traditional knowledge and environmental management? From commodity to process. Revised version of a paper prepared for the National Aboriginal Forestry Association Conference "Celebrating Partnerships," 14–18 September 1998, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. Edmonton, Alberta: Sustainable Forest Management Network. http://www.sfmnetwork.ca/docs/e/WP_1998-14.pdf.
- TAYLOR, D.M. 1994. Off course: Restoring balance between Canadian society and the environment. Ottawa: The International Development and Research Centre.
- TESTER, F. 1978–79. Socio-economic and environmental impacts of the proposed Polar Gas Pipeline, 2 vols. Ottawa: Environmental-Social Program Northern Pipelines, ESCOM Numbers A1-20 and A1-32, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Government of Canada.
- . 2006. Iglu to Iglurjuaq. In: Stern, P., and Stevenson, L., eds. *Critical Inuit studies: An anthology of contemporary Arctic ethnography*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press. 230–252.
- THOMPSON, J. 2008. Senior team have mastered basic Inuktitut: Okalik. *Nunatsiaq News*, January 22.
- USHER, P.J. 2000. Traditional ecological knowledge in environmental assessment and management. *Arctic* 53(2):183–193.
- WATSON, A., ALESSA, L., and GLASPELL, B. 2003. The relationship between traditional ecological knowledge, evolving culture, and wilderness protection in the circumpolar North. *Conservation Ecology* 8(1):2[online]: <http://www.consecol.org/vol8/iss1/art2>.
- WENZEL, G. 1991. Animal rights, human rights. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1999. Traditional ecological knowledge and Inuit: Reflections on TEK research and ethics. *Arctic* 52(2):113–124.
- . 2004. From TEK to IQ: *Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut* and Inuit cultural ecology. *Arctic Anthropology* 41(2):238–250.
- WHITE, G. 2006. Cultures in collision: Traditional knowledge and Euro-Canadian governance processes in northern land-claim boards. *Arctic* 59(4):401–414.
- WHITEMAN, G. 2004. Why are we talking inside?: Reflecting on traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and management research. *Journal of Management Enquiry* 13(3):261–277.
- YOUNGER-LEWIS, G. 2005. Hunters shoot down proposed wildlife regulations. *Nunatsiaq News*, May 20.
- ZAMPARO, J. 1996. Informing the fact: Inuit traditional knowledge contributes another perspective. *Geoscience Canada* 23(4): 261–266.