

treatment of history because it is still being written as a teleology of Western Civilization based on the cultural values of the doctrine of cultural evolution.

Strangely enough, the anthropological paradigm of cultural relativism is not the obvious antidote to cultural evolutionism that it may have appeared to be to the Boasian school and its followers or practitioners. Critical historians, Georges Sioui (1992) in particular, are now acknowledging the moral dimension of history and arguing against the relative evaluation of culture. By underscoring culture as a system of values, we may explore the development of values over time. Such an approach is partly consistent with the central tenet of this thesis: where contact between people occurs, ideas combine in time and space. And the process cannot be one-sided. It is impossible to say that one society has affected another without acknowledging that the reverse is also true. In this way, the history of Canada may become a chronicle which acknowledges the effort and contribution of all people and not just the pursuits and adventures of a given few (Trigger 1985:343).

Official history, or historiography, is fraught with faith-affirming statements woven into myth. The stories are those stories told by and believed in by those who hold power. Wolf tackles the problem of power and its anthropological implications in "Facing Power: Old Insights, New Questions" (1990). Instead of constructing a monolithic image of power (like Hobbes's Leviathan and de Jouvenal's Minotaur), Wolf proposes, instead, a categorization of power incumbent upon different kinds of social relationships. 1) Power as a personal attribute, understood as potency or capability. 2) Power as the ability of *ego* to impose its will on an *alter*, either in social action or in inter-personal relations. 3) Power as tactical or organizational, moving beyond inter-personal relations and into *settings*. 4) Power that not only operates within *settings*, but which actually organizes or arranges the *settings* and specifies the energy flow of tactical or organizational power (Wolf 1990:218). The fourth categorization of power is, perhaps, what Foucault refers to as "the ability to structure the possible field of action of others", or what Wolf calls structural power or the power that structures political economy (Wolf 1990: 219).

We may use Wolf's fourth categorization of power to challenge, as Keesing asked us to do, the liberal stereotypes of the 'traditional sector'. The social field of action at Oka was

shaped by people who have long been identified and defined according to those same constraining stereotypes. To paraphrase Elijah Harper on *The People of the Pines* dust-jacket, anyone wanting to understand the situation of aboriginal people in Canada should look closely at the Oka crisis.

In her article, "A New Paradigm in Canadian Indian Policy for the 1990s", the late Sally Weaver argues that the opposition of Elijah Harper to the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord and the crisis at Oka are examples of "the current turmoil in the field of Canadian Indian Affairs... [and] a newly emerging policy paradigm ... [which] severely challenges current policy thinking in regard to the relationship of the Canadian state to Indian First Nations" (Weaver 1990:8). Her words are especially prophetic in the post-Mulroney years as Jean Chretien's Minister of Indian Affairs, Ron Irwin, struggles with Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs Grand Chief Phil Fontaine for a prototype of Aboriginal self-government in Manitoba:

I would argue that Indian policy is experiencing a *paradigm shift* from the old to a new way of conceptualizing First Nations issues, and that during the transition period to the new paradigm we should expect to see erratic policy experiments, unfocused initiatives and false starts until the new mode of thinking settles into acceptance (Weaver 1990:10).

Structural power shapes the social field of action, permitting behaviour that is possible and prohibiting other less possible and impossible behaviour. The new paradigm of Indian policy, which is changing the relations between the First Nations and the Canadian nation-state, may be part of a larger movement toward process.

It is precisely in the notion of structural power that anthropologists may delineate the forces of the world and how they impinge upon people, without resorting to the naive (and much criticized) anthropological 'tropical island syndrome' (Wolf 1990:219). In order to address the relations between tactical or organizational power and structural power, Wolf proposes a focus on process – away from the building blocks of social organization like gender, clan, or lineage (which were constructed at a time when anthropology was concerned with product) and toward an understanding of social organization as process, fluid in time and space (Wolf 1990:223-4).

The essential idea in the new paradigm thinking comes from the symbolism of the Iroquois Two-Row Wampum as found in the 1983 Penner Report on Indian Self-Government. "The relationship between the First Nations and [the Canadian nation-state] is a *permanent organic relationship* that will prevail into the distant future" (Weaver 1990:11).

The deep flaws in the federal land claims policy were a key reason for the outpouring of support across Canada for the Mohawk warriors in the summer of 1990 (York & Pindera 1991:278).

The finality of land claims is being challenged – "once-and-for-all settlement is misguided" (Weaver 1990:11) – and the concept of termination as found in the 1969 White Paper is no longer a part of the new paradigm. Despite the insistence of the federal government that it would not negotiate land claims at gun-point, the Mohawk managed to control the social field of action:

Even before the crisis was over, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney was promising a dramatic increase in federal money for land claims.

"There were Cabinet ministers who had never dreamt they would be talking about native issues and they had to deal with it," Georges Erasmus said. "Everyone started to talk about Canada's relationship with aboriginal people, treaty rights, land rights... The Mulroney agenda is being pushed by this issue. Whether they want to or not, they have to deal with it" (York & Pindera 1991:286-7).

Regarding treaty rights and land rights, "the second new paradigm notion is that the relationship between the state and the First Nations will exist at many levels, but one of these will be the very important level of *sanctioned rights*" (Weaver 1990:11).

Oka sparked a serious display of First Nations unity across Canada:

They felt the same burning anger.

"If you are pushed around for a hundred years... and you run out of patience... and there's nowhere to move, then it's a legitimate reason to take up arms," said Gary Potts, Chief of the Bear Island Indians of Lake Temagami in northern Ontario.

Potts was applauded by a roomful of aboriginal people when he made those comments on a TV program at the end of the Oka crisis. He was voicing the frustrations of a new generation of natives who are more willing and able to fight for their rights than their forebears (York & Pindera 1991:273).

Other important aspects of the new paradigm thinking include a *re-conceptualization of culture* to include ‘pizza-eating’ AK-47-carrying Mohawk Warriors as “real Mohawk” despite their deviation from those old liberal stereotypes; the idea of *jointly formulated policies*, the importance of *aboriginal knowledge*, and of real *empowerment* through self-government (Weaver 1990).

The new paradigm thinking has begun to challenge old ideas, but the process is slow. The federal government responded to Oka as a crisis of ‘law and order’ while the Mohawk and other First Nations rallied behind the warriors. If we follow Wolf’s conceptualization of structural power in an analysis of First Nations and the Oka Crisis (using Weaver), we learn that the factions or ‘building blocks’ are less important than the processes. The Longhouse Mohawk, the Chief and Council Mohawk, the Catholic Mohawk, the Anglican Mohawk, the pro-and anti-gambling and cigarette-smuggling Mohawk – all were engaged in the same struggles, the same processes of empowerment, of land rights, of a permanent relationship with Canada.

Within the social sciences the movement of deconstruction has opened up a reinterpretation of modern world histories. We are only now beginning to understand the very complex dynamics of a cultural encounter that began centuries ago. With the new tools, methodologies and insights afforded us by the movement of deconstruction, including a focus on process, we may move ahead to the task of writing a more inclusive and multi-dimensional history of all North American nations.

Someday, when the dominant society becomes more concerned about reciprocity and less concerned about superiority and domination, we may be able to join hands and celebrate the diverse roots of the American democratic tradition without the blinders of indifference and cultural arrogance (Grinde & Johansen 1991:xxiv).

In the book *Exemplar of Liberty*, Donald Grinde and Bruce Johansen (1991) explore the unconventional, critical side of American history. The two scholars offer an historical analysis of the evolution of American political ideas and democracy which departs from the meeting of cultures; notwithstanding their exclusive focus on American history, this thesis has only to gain from the incorporation of their hypothesis.

The cultural encounter between Europeans and non-Europeans manifested itself in many ways. As explored in the previous chapter, those critiques of European societies which highlighted the Noble Savage as ideal revealed more about European society than about North American indigenous societies. Locke, Rousseau, and scores of travel writers used the Noble Savage to comment upon the foibles of Western Civilization. Thus lived the Noble Savage, as much a sardonic descriptor for the Aboriginal of the Western Hemisphere as it was a satirical, ironic label for the European noble, quite fallen in the corrupt wiles of Western Civilization.

The Noble Savage may have been an apparition created by the European imagination but its influence on the European philosophy and ideology of the Enlightenment was very real. The dastardly effects of the Noble Savage have been documented most extensively in the now familiar Berkhofer Jr. book, *The White Man's Indian* (1979); however, the more positive effects which sprang from the contact between cultures, no matter how fanciful the manifestations, have usually been ignored or overlooked. "...Did the mixture of fact and fancy even matter, since the Europeans who made the New World into a metaphor for liberty absolutely believed what they thought they saw" (Grinde & Johansen 1991:72).

A political idea, even one as inaccurate and whimsical as the liberty of the Noble Savage, Grinde and Johansen remind us, does not require a completely factual base in order to affect or "have a profound influence on the course of intellectual history" (Grinde & Johansen 1991:72). Countless allusions and references have been made to the influence that the Iroquois Confederacy had on the constitutions and nations of the North American continent. Grinde and Johansen present a most persuasive case as they argue that the Fathers of Confederation were well aware of the sophistication and complexity of the Iroquois Confederacy. Some of the social philosophers, historians, and statesmen were informed by the ancient American Confederation (said to be the oldest in the world). The Iroquois themselves were also aware of the opportunity to influence.

'Our wise forefathers established union and Amity between the Five Nations. This has made us formidable, this has given us great weight and authority with our neighbouring nations. We are a powerful confederacy; and by your

observing the same methods our wise forefathers have taken, you will acquire strength and power (Canasatego, cited in Grinde & Johansen 1991:94).

Canasatego's famous speech was made during a treaty conference held at Lancaster in 1744. The treaty was held as war broke out between Britain and France. The representatives from Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania were anxious to procure Iroquois assistance in what became commonly known as King George's War.

At a meeting with the Six Nations in August 1775 at Albany, the Commissioners of Indian Affairs made reference to the speech of Canasatego.

Brethern,

Our business with you, besides rekindling the ancient council-fire... is... to inform you of the advice that was given about thirty years ago, by your wise forefathers...

Our forefathers rejoiced to hear Cannasatego speak these words... They said to one another, 'The Six Nations are a wise people. Let us harken to them, and take their counsel... Our old men have done so... We thank the Great God that we are all united; that we have a strong Confederacy... (Commissioners for the 12 United Colonies, cited in Tooker 1988:310).

Few Americans, regardless of their historical awareness or sophistication, are unaware that the tea-dumping patriots were dressed as Mohawks. The Boston Tea Party was not a spontaneous prank pulled by a street gang. The Boston Sons of Liberty were a serious group of men using a very symbolic form of protest: "and they had chosen their symbols with utmost care" (Grinde & Johansen 1991:112).

The tea symbolized British tyranny; the Mohawk symbolized American freedom – an antithesis to the British and an emerging national consciousness. The image of the Noble Savage informed the idea of American democracy and the *Gayaneshakgowa* provided a blueprint or a prototype for the creation of a nation composed of an amalgamation of fairly independent states. It is not terribly difficult to see the parallels between the United States and the Iroquois Confederacy.

The bicentennial of the American constitution provided a ripe atmosphere for serious acknowledgement of the role that the Iroquois Confederacy played in the formation of the United States of America. Articles were published, speeches were made, and cries to include the knowledge in the public school curricula were made (Tooker 1988:306). Across the

centuries, many statesmen, philosophers, and academics have made the argument that the Iroquois Confederacy provided a model for the creation and constitution of the United States. The argument is very old and somewhat contentious. Contrary to the work of Grinde and Johansen is that of the ethnohistorian Elisabeth Tooker, who claims that there is no support for this thesis in either the historical or ethnographic literature (Tooker 1988:305).

The work of those who claim that the Iroquois Confederacy influenced the American democratic system and constitution are divided by Tooker (1986:306) into two camps. One is the populist idea that only the Indian knew true democracy and that Western Europeans learned democracy from the Indians. The other idea specifically holds that the Iroquois Confederacy influenced the American Confederation and constitution.

There are many followers in the second camp. Many Americans have written about the influence of Iroquois political and philosophical traditions on the formation of the United States of America (The Commissioners of Indian Affairs 1775; William E. Griffiths 1891; Herbert M. Lloyd 1901; Ely S. Parker 1916; William B. Newell 1928; J.N.B. Hewitt 1936; Matthew W. Stirling 1937; Clark Wissler 1940; Paul A.W. Wallace 1946; Frank Underhill 1953; Irving J. Hallowell 1957; Reaman 1967; Marriott & Rachlin 1968; Farb 1968; Eckert 1969; and most currently Grinde & Johansen 1991). Ironically, Elisabeth Tooker documents all of these men in an article which refuses to acknowledge the “‘direct chain of evidence linking the basic document of the American Government’ to Canasatego and his speech at the 1744 Lancaster Treaty Conference... [and] ‘an Iroquois origin for the American system of government’” (Smithsonian Press Release 26 March 1936, cited in Tooker 1988:325).

The most quoted and explicit passage, however, concerning the influence of the Iroquois Confederacy on the United States of America is found in a letter written by one of the Fathers of Confederation himself, Benjamin Franklin:

...it would be a very strange thing, if six nations of ignorant savages should be capable of framing a scheme for such a union, and be able to execute it in such a manner, as that it has subsisted [for] Ages, and appears indissoluble; and yet a like Union should be impracticable for ten or a dozen colonies, to whom it is more necessary, and must be more advantageous; and who cannot be supposed to want an equal understanding of their interest (Franklin, cited in Tooker 1988:308-9).

Tooker steadfastly denies the influence the Confederacy may have had on the founding fathers by doubting that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, July 1787, would have proposed a system whereby only their relatives could become members of congress (Tooker 1988:312). Leaving aside the irony of Tooker's last statement (the founding fathers did not have to overtly propose this system because by virtue of its nascent social organization, a complex industrial society has a controlling elite which implicitly orders a system of governance whereby relatives of a few select families by and large rule), her literal interpretation of the argument is otherwise flawed because she is looking into history for an empiricism which does not exist (see Hayden White's *Tropics of Discourse* 1978).

The evidence for the influence of Western European institutions and ideologies upon indigenous societies and cultures has not been manifested entirely in tangible ways; yet no one would deny that there has been influence on traditional ways. It would be equally ridiculous and dangerous to think that following centuries of contact, the indigenous societies and cultures would not have influenced, at all, the transplanted European cultures in North America.

If one segment of the population now believes that the Iroquois Confederacy directly shaped the American Confederation and Constitution, the interesting analysis is one which reflects upon the historical circumstance during which time such an assertion was made and not one which negates the directness or indirectness of the influence (or indeed if it existed at all).

The story of how European immigrants to America shared ideas with native peoples goes much deeper. While the example of America's native societies was cited in the creation of the constitution, we must also examine the ideas behind this seminal document to understand how the examples provided by native political organizations helped shape the thinking of Europeans as they became Americans (Johansen 1990:279).

The indigenous threads of American democracy and ideology cannot be denied (Deloria 1988); they were woven into the American tapestry "at a time when 3 million people of European descent lived in small islands of settlement among more widespread American Indian nations" (Johansen 1990:281). Lewis Henry Morgan himself, father of American

anthropology, wrote that the Iroquois Confederacy contained ‘the germ of modern Parliament congress, and literature’ (1965 [1881]:32).

Thus, while the founders of the United States certainly did not copy the Iroquois’ matrilineal, clan-based system of governance any more than they copied the unwritten constitution of the British... it is possible to argue that the concept of our system of federalism, of state within a state, owes a substantial debt to that of the Haudenosaunee (Johansen 1990:284).

When we look beyond the official historical record and re-write or re-think it so that it accurately records our past, we come closer to an understanding of how people interact and communicate through deed, word, or symbol. We attain a better understanding of power and process. Furthermore, neither Grinde nor Johansen argue that the Iroquois Confederacy provided *the* model for American Confederation: “the Iroquois ... provided *a* model – one among many – that gave our founders raw material for their own unique, ideological constructs” (Johansen 1990:280). The conclusion that Grinde and Johansen reach is that the Iroquoian model will become another part of the pantheon of political ideas that created the American democratic system and psyche. In short, “Europe and the West... are being asked to take the Other seriously... The subaltern and the constitutively different suddenly achieved disruptive articulation exactly wherein European culture silence and compliance could previously be depended on to quiet them down” (Said 1989:223). Despite a scholarly penchant for historical accuracy, such as the work of Elisabeth Tooker (1988), we do no people any service, historically rightly or wrongly, by denying them a past. The First Nations of the North American continent did affect the transplanted European nations, just as they themselves were affected; they contributed to the massive North American sociocultural complex. Perhaps, as Sioui (1992:65) argues, the First Nations quenched the bloodthirst of the feudal European societies and changed them into more humane ones. Either way, it is the responsibility of the contemporary scholar to use the tools of current theoretical and practical analysis in order to make history a more inclusive, honest process and product.

CHAPTER FIVE

OKA: A POST-MODERN CRISIS?

5.1 BEGINNINGS

On the pages of *The Globe and Mail* and across the video screens programmed and produced by the CBC, the Canadian national news agencies erected an image of the crisis. Clad in camouflage and carrying an AK-47, the Mohawk Warrior became the central symbol of the Oka crisis, 1990. But what kind of world do we live in where Mohawk Warriors carry semi-automatic weapons and wear the green, brown, and olive of the international soldier? What can the image tell us about cultural contact and conflict; relationships between people and nations; or symbols and images; in the contemporary world? On the surface, the image contradicts traditional western knowledge: "Indians" do not carry sub-machine guns and they certainly do not wear camouflage. However, as the myths of Western Civilization erode, so do the precepts of traditional Western knowledge.

To decode the image amidst the rubble of twentieth century truth, the anthropological analyst must step gingerly through the interdependent cultural terrain of colonizer and colonized, Western and non-Western, in which both co-exist and battle for over-lapping experience.

...Because of empire, all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogenous, extraordinarily differential and unmonolithic (Said 1993:xxv).

The tried and true beliefs of our world are crumbling daily (Schultz and Lavenda 1990:xvii). The callous and global machinations of both international and national political or economic interests, along with the apparent human tendencies to conquer, exploit and oppress, have combined with the threat of nuclear holocaust, world hunger, and stock market collapse to create the age of disaster. The age of disaster, also known as the post-modern age, has increased human vulnerability to both natural and human-made disasters (Torry 1979). We live in, the Quechua speakers tell us, *manchay tiempo*: a time of fear.

Postmodernism is a state of things. It is primarily determined by an extremely rapid and freewheeling exchange to which most responses are faltering, impulsive, and contradictory. What is at stake is the constitution of being – the way we perceive ourselves and others...Postmodernism is the only possible contemporary answer to a century worn out by the rise and fall of modern ideologies, the pervasion of capitalism, and an unprecedented sense of personal responsibility and individual impotence (Olalquiaga 1992:xi).

The utopian character of modernity has been ruptured. The old authority cannot be replaced by a new authority (Said 1992:xxiv). No one believes anymore in the progressive goals of the modern age: there is no newer, better world. The effects of the two world wars have taken their toll. Without a future to look forward to and with only a ridiculed and criticized naive past, the modern age has collapsed upon itself, leaving behind a collection of forms with little function. The threat of world annihilation has aborted an innocent age of progress and order.

The fragmentation, intertextuality, and massive commodification of everyday life that began with modernity once had a function that has now been totally lost...

In the midst of this obsolescence... new ways of life emerge, more skeptical of these visions as moving in only one direction. I believe this moment of new life emerging from the ruins of decaying dreams has been properly called postmodern (Olalquiaga 1992:xx).

On the North American continent, the skepticism of visions which move in only one direction has been expounded by both aboriginal and critical western scholars. Euro-American scholars who refuse to believe that Western supremacy is anything but an artificially constructed product of the modern age have not been listening. Assumptions, beliefs, and ideologies are being questioned; if the future is no longer morally progressive, then neither was the past.

5.2 THE POST-MODERN PROJECT

5.2.1 Introduction

Following World War II and the collapse of the European colonial empires, the citizens of former colonies began to vocally reject the myths of Western Civilization. The experience of decolonization created a new political and ideological reality that questioned

the very epistemological status of the master-narratives, or the tenets of Western knowledge. Christened by Lévi-Strauss as the hand-maiden of colonialism, anthropology was also touched.

...A very widespread, empowering distinction has been eroded: the division of the globe into literate and non-literate peoples. This distinction is no longer widely accurate, as non-Western “tribal” peoples become increasingly literate. But furthermore, once one begins to doubt the ethnographer’s monopoly on the power to inscribe, one begins to see the “writing” activities that have always been pursued by native collaborators (Clifford 1986:117).

Since the seventeenth and well into the twentieth century, the Western intellectual elite has maintained a faith in the superiority of Western Civilization, and retained for itself a position as the reference point of the *telos* of history (Bauman 1993:128). The position was used to judge both neighbouring and distant categories of humanity alike. From the vantage point called modernity, “all other known or guessed forms appeared as past stages, side-shoots, or cul de sac” (Bauman 1993:129). The march toward the light of history, the struggle of reason against animal instinct, science against magic, and truth against prejudice, defined the project of the modern age.

On the other hand, the post-modern age may be characterized by the abandonment of the march toward the light – the abandonment of the search for reason.

Instead, it tries to reconcile itself to a life under conditions of permanent and incurable uncertainty; a life in the presence of an unlimited quantity of competing forms of life, unable to prove their claims to be grounded in anything more solid and binding than their own historically shaped connections (Bauman 1993:135).

5.2.2 The Modern and the Post-Modern

Post-modernism may be conceptualized as an aesthetic trend, a period concept to explain the culture of late capitalism, or a loose body of theory (Helvacioğlu 1992:8). Aesthetically, post-modernism is a reaction against the assumptions of modernism. Opposed to the rigid structure of modernity, and supported by a collapsed and chaotic sense of time and space, post-modernism is the pathological symptom of a society that has lost its capacity to deal with the spatial, temporal, and historical dimensions (Helvacioğlu 1992:10). As the

culture of late capitalism, so described by Frederic Jameson and a few other neo-Marxists, post-modernity is defined by the universalization of the capitalist mode of production and characterized as a post-modern sensibility of “diversity, schizophrenia, decentralization, deconstruction, and distraction” (Helvacioğlu 1992:13). Unlike modernity, post-modernity has no unified tradition, even among the neo-Marxists. Unlike the post-modern historical materialists, like Jameson, the post-structuralists, like Jean-François Lyotard, reject historical materialism both methodologically and theoretically. Their point of departure is not the social world; rather, it is a critique of modern philosophy and epistemology. Preoccupied with the present, these thinkers argue that the Enlightenment project of Emancipation falls into error (Helvacioğlu 1992:16). The critique of modernity called post-modernity contains the divergent intellectual traditions of post-Marxism and post-structuralism.

In the post-structuralism camp, according to Lyotard, the post-modern condition refers to the state of knowledge or epistemology in the most highly developed, industrial societies where knowledge is placed within the context of the crisis of narratives. For Lyotard, the modern stands in opposition to the post-modern as a condition or state of things wherein any science (the term here is used generally) legitimates itself by evoking or appealing to a higher discourse, a “meta-narrative of legitimation”(1993), like the Enlightenment or Marxism, “the emancipation of the rational or working subject, or the creation of wealth” (Lyotard 1993 [1979]:xxiii). The term post-modern, extremely simplified, generally refers to a skepticism of these grand or master-narratives. The master-narrative, or meta-narrative, has lost its “great hero, its great dangers, its great voyages, its great goal” (Lyotard 1993[1979]:xxiv). There is a crack in the binding that holds together the narrative elements and they are no longer cohesively homogenous. Instead, a heterogeneity of elements is still manipulated by power-brokers who argue that the elements are indeed commensurable and composing an as-yet-unseen whole.

Our working hypothesis is that the status of knowledge is altered as societies enter what is known as the post-industrial age and cultures enter what is known as the post-modern age (Lyotard 1993[1979]:3)

The modern is to the post-modern as purpose is to play, hierarchy is to anarchy, distance is to participation, synthesis is to antithesis, presence is to absence, genre is to text,

boundary is to inter-text, semantics is to rhetoric, signified is to signifier, master-code is to idiolect, narrative is to anti-narrative, type is to mutant, and God the Father is to the Holy Ghost (Hassan 1993:152). Drawn from diverse fields and many disciplines, the concepts on any given side of the above binary pairs may not be entirely discrete, but their respective rubrics point to or reflect general tendencies of either condition. The post-modern is generally understood as a breakdown in the status of knowledge in architecture, aesthetics, society or culture: a call to abandon the Enlightenment cultural and historical project called modernity. Represented as the progress of reason toward a social end, the project of modernity is now entirely questionable (Docherty 1993:95-7). The post-modern project may reveal epistemological skepticism, or heightened reflexivity, or the conventionality of history. But whatever it does, whichever characteristics of the post-modern condition it chooses to adopt, it can be unequivocally said that post-modernist theory rests upon the assumption that there is no external vantage point, no Archimedean point of view.

We are confronted with, more accurately, incorporated into, a totalizing hermeneutic – a sort of epistemological antinomianism – that rejects totalization, questions the authority of any hermeneutic, and refuses any transcendental position (Crapanzano 1992:91).

The post-modern is very similar to the post-colonial in rejecting the “authority of any hermeneutic” and dismissing a unified world vision or master-narrative. The surface is stressed over depth, and the uncritical acceptance of modern technology (from the pocket calculator to the sub-machine gun) is combined with the absence of historical awareness.

...Like something out of Salman Rushdie, having more to do with the New York art scene, the Milan world of fashion, or the Paris Bar in Berlin than with the pathetic conditions of a Bangkok slum where a man may wear a women’s lib t-shirt, enslave his wife, spend his evenings in a brothel listening to Michael Jackson on a cassette recorder made in Japan, and hope his daughter will win a Miss Thailand contest so that he can open a little restaurant for workers in the center of the city and have his teeth capped in gold (Crapanzano 1992:90).

There is a common thread between post-modernism and post-colonialism, between over-generalizations and loose associations, in a world that seems not to have an all-encompassing, referent narrative anymore. Still, we need to be careful in our own over-generalizations or

loose associations. Roberto DaMatta, in "Some Biased Remarks on Interpretivism: A View from Brazil", regrets that interpretive American anthropology is currently mired in a "rhetorical and programmatic exaggeration" that is still based upon the same cultural and academic imperative it seeks to repudiate (DaMatta 1994:120). And without mincing words, DaMatta comes right to the most "irritating feature" of the new interpretive, post-modern anthropology. Shrinking away from the study of American culture as 'the devil shrinks away from the cross', contemporary interpretive American anthropology remains alienated from the very society, culture and value system that produced it. "What is supposed to be a 'dialogical' and polysemic dialogue becomes once again an authoritarian monologue" (DaMatta 1994:120). To paraphrase DaMatta, what would Stephen Tyler's interpretive, post-modern anthropology look like if he had conducted fieldwork in America instead of India?

5.2.3 The End of the Meta-Narrative

It is no secret that anthropology arose from colonialism (Stocking 1989). One part of the anthropological enterprise was to capture the whole of cultures on their way to extinction in the face of immutable and progressive Western Civilization. But now anthropology is no longer an exclusive Western discipline and the critics of Orientalism have exposed the myths of Western scholarship and knowledge, thus disabling the often crooked, homogenous representations of the Other.

The figure of the primitive or the alien other is no longer as compelling as it was in similar experimental periods... Global homogenization is more credible than ever before, and though the challenge to discover and represent cultural diversity is strong, doing so in terms of spatio-temporal cultural preserves of otherness seems outmoded (Marcus 1986:268).

Veena Das (1994:136), an anthropologist and an Indian, laments that the knowledge categories of non-Western cultures are simply unanchored beliefs, while the knowledge categories of Western cultures are scientific and objective truths. "Other cultures acquire legitimacy only as objects of thought, never as instruments for thought" (Das 1994:136). The production of knowledge about Indian society, indeed the production of knowledge about any society, cannot occur without the input of its indigenous citizens. Knowledge is now

produced by a plurality of voices and people, and a legitimate re-positioning for anthropology and the social sciences is needed (Das 1994:143).

Epistemological skepticism is a hallmark of post-modernity (Crapanzano 1992:88). The epistemology of any intellectual field is no longer constant or infallible (if indeed it ever was). The general critique of colonialism in the post-war period, which encompassed the discipline of anthropology, challenged and undermined both the ability and the authority of the West to represent other societies. The general critique touched off an important process of theorizing about the very limits of representation itself (Clifford & Marcus 1986:10). One significant consequence of the epistemological skepticism of the theoretical and practical discourse of post-modernity has been the erosion of a stable narrative. The ground from which persons and groups securely represented others has been dislodged and altered (Clifford & Marcus 1986:10). There is no single vantage point from which we may observe humanity. There is no culture or society from which the anthropologist emerges to compare with other societies or cultures. The lesson is simple: “human ways of life increasingly influence, dominate, parody, translate, and subvert one another” (Clifford & Marcus 1986:22).

Crapanzano argues that it has been history, more than any other process or product, that has been most profoundly affected by the radical changes in Western discourse initiated by post-modern theory and practice. History is a “positioned narrative that affirms, among other things, its position” (Crapanzano 1986:97). The artifice or mythology of history is denied while it serves as an authoritative reference point. However, once there is a failure in hegemony, once the authoritative reference point is eroded, history is no longer able to speak for everyone. Each has his or her own legitimate position and history. Thus, “the artifice of historical assumption – the incorporation of multiple positions into a single, consuming narrative – is revealed” (Crapanzano 1986:98). In the words of Marshall Sahlins, “the local people articulate with the dominant cultural order” on their own terms, “jiving to the world beat while making their own music” (Sahlins 1994:389).

Edward Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) is supported by two central tenets: one, that there has historically always been a world-wide pattern of imperial culture; and two,

that there has always been an historical experience of resistance against imperial culture or empire (Said 1993:xii). The Western power to narrate or to block narration has been of great significance in the maintenance and perpetuation of both culture and imperialism. However, the imperial, grand narratives of Emancipation and Enlightenment were at one point displaced and replaced by the narratives of Equality and Human Community.. Ironically, the stories which the colonizers told about the colonized also became the tools used by the colonized to assert their identity in the face of the colonizer (Said 1993:xxv).

All cultures are involved in the construction of contemporary reality. The global communication made possible by the modern world empires (Said 1993:6) has also eradicated or blurred the margins between empires. As scholars, our principle aim is not to separate human sociocultural experience into fragmented pockets of existence, post-modern conditions notwithstanding, but rather to connect the nuances of human experience (Said 1993:14), while understanding that the past is constructed according to current sensibilities.

A more interesting type of secular interpretation can emerge altogether more rewarding than the denunciations of the past, the expressions of regret for its having eroded, or... the hostility between Western and non-Western cultures that leads to crises. The world is too small and interdependent to let these passively happen (Said 1993:18-19).

Part of the programme is to acknowledge the complex and convoluted histories of human experience, to do away with or eschew exclusionary theories or histories. "Exclusions that stipulate, for instance, that only women can understand feminine experience, only Jews can understand Jewish suffering, only formerly colonial subjects can understand colonial experience" (Said 1993:31).

No one today is purely one thing. Labels like Indian, or woman... are not more than starting points, which if followed into actual experience... are quickly left behind... Just as human beings make their own history, they also make their cultures and ethnic identities. No one can deny the persisting continuities... but there seems no reason except fear and prejudice to keep insisting on their separation and distinctiveness... It is more rewarding – and more difficult – to think concretely and sympathetically, contrapuntally, about others than only about "us". But this also means not trying to rule others, not trying to classify them or put them in hierarchies... For the intellectual there is quite enough of value to do without that (Said 1993:336).

History is not a singular line. It is a network of forces, a number of directions or historical lineages which flow simultaneously. Opposed to the Enlightenment narrative of linear progress, toward Emancipation or some other *telos*, the post-modern condition defies a homogenous imperial trajectory (Docherty 1993:18). As Marcus and Fischer tell us, we need to see that most local cultures are not able to stand alone, and that broad processes of influence are as much inside as outside of local context (Keesing 1994:302). Unfortunately, the social world does not present itself in easy categories of inside and outside, or we and they. Social and cultural boundaries are less and less coincidental and the polyglot and polychrome spectrum of any contemporary urban landscape points to a growing universal reality of mingled social systems (Geertz 1994:460).

The job of ethnography, or one of them anyway, is indeed to provide, like the arts and history, narratives and scenarios to refocus our attention; not, however, ones that render us acceptable to ourselves by representing others as gathered into worlds we don't want and can't arrive at, but ones which make us visible to ourselves by representing us and everyone else cast into the midst of a world full of irremovable strangeness we can't keep clear of (Geertz 1994:463).

Moral issues that used to only arise between cultures now arise within cultures. From Robert Cross, we learn that the Longhouse remains divided in a cultural impasse that cannot be rendered intelligible in easy terms of we and they, traditional or modern:

We have two Longhouses of traditional people in Kahnawake when there's supposed to be one... Back during the French and Indian wars, and during the American Revolution, they started arguing amongst each other in the Longhouse, and certain traditional people said we should fight for the British... and certain other traditional people said 'We should remain neutral in these disputes'. And what they did was they made their own Longhouses... In the end, the British betrayed their allies from the Six Nations Confederacy, so the two Longhouses, they don't forgive each other, they don't agree with each other, so they won't sit under one roof – even until today (Cross & Sévigny 1994:50).

5.2.4 The Referential Emptiness Produced by High Technology

Perhaps native peoples occupy a space in our own imagination... Perhaps they are our nostalgia for the world we have lost and the image of hope for the world we are stuck in.. And perhaps we'd like to keep them preserved like

Autumn vegetables, grateful that someone somewhere, in the true north strong and free, is worrying about keeping the rivers clean and the land as pristine as we like to think of it (Schechter 1992:74).

The discourse of post-modernity questions the hegemony of Western representation and epistemology by attacking the tropes, or figurative expressions, that legitimate thought and action (Tyler 1992:1), express what we collectively hold dear, and that sustain the master-narratives of Western Civilization. The example that Tyler gives as the trope for modernity is “loss and liberation” of the “past surpassed”.

It is the modernist fable of technology triumphant, of the creativity-in-destruction of the technology of the alphabet, of the rise of civilization from savagery, and the surpassing of the life-world of common sense and oral mnemonics by science and technology (Tyler 1992:1).

Here, the rational plane of Western Civilization is a lonely kingdom where others lurk in shadows cast from a romanticized, noble past, summoned only to legitimize or justify the imposed alienation by their outlandish otherness (Tyler 1992:1). But the counter-trope of post-modernity, of “resistance and recovery”, of the “past recuperated” smashes the myth of modernity and forever extinguishes all hope of an utopian future. Modernity is eroded by the irony of representation and writing is erected as the means of representing reality. In this way, writing is opposed to the oral tradition and given priority, encompassing and preceding orality.

Anthropologists invoke native speech out of nostalgia, a guilty longing for a past before writing and the corruption of civilization that writing creates and symbolizes (Tyler 1992:5).

Tyler further argues that orality and literacy are the poles which make up the contemporary binary pair of the ancient opposition between the ear and the eye. Once the Greeks learned to write, the dominance of the eye swept the West. The old argument comes to the fore again because the instrument of domination, the eye, has now dominated itself and is being challenged by new and ever-changing technologies of representation. The whole idea of computer literacy is one good example of the challenge to writing. “For us, ‘orality’ is the name of the resistance to... this sound-less shuffling of meaningless signs” (Tyler 1986:7).

5.2.5 The Interchangeability of Signs: Parody

The appropriation and transformation of elements or signs is an old process which has reached a high degree of complexity within the post-industrial, post-modern age. With the collapse of the meta-narratives and the referential emptiness produced by high technology, there has been an unprecedented degree of reciprocal appropriation and mutual cultural exchange and change (Olalquiaga 1992:76).

Writing about Latin America, Olalquiaga poignantly describes the multi-cultural realities of non-Western people.

Their own version of international culture tends toward a hyperrealism of uniquely parodic attributes. This 'magical hyperrealism' often inverts the image of a colonized people humbly subservient to metropolitan discoveries into one of a cynical audience rolling over with laughter at what it perceives as the sterile nuances of cultures with very little sense of their own self-aggrandizement (Olalquiaga 1992:75).

By turning issues or objects figuratively or literally upside down, they show off an acquired ability to deal with the unexpected changes of policies and relations, in their own way. Parody and role inversion are two excellent examples of popular resistance.

Parody may very well be, according to Linda Hutcheon (1986), a perfect post-modern form in its simultaneous incorporation and challenge of that which it parodies. Both parody and its less caustic cousin stylization can be challenges to the established order; but while stylization is corroborative and signals submission, parody is antithetical and requires critical, ironic distance and hierarchy. *Parodia*, from the Greek meaning song or counter-song, needs a higher semantic authority (Crapanzano 1992:93). When parody does not have a clear semantic authority, it may be called meta-parody.

In parody, words are double-voiced and interpreted as the expression of two speakers. In other words, "the words of one speaker are appropriated by a second speaker as the words of the first speaker but used for the second speaker's own purposes" (Crapanzano 1992:93). By tapping into a higher semantic order, parody creates a new semantic order or orientation for a word, phrase, or action by inverting or re-contextualizing it while allowing it to retain its old meaning. Parody, in this case, straddles two worlds.

In our post-modern age, parody is a highly creative process, “one whose essential relativism forces us to recognize and reconsider the moral basis of our [own] cognitive outlook that is so often masked by taken-for-granted communicative conventions” (Marcus 1992:94). Parody is an interaction that is designed to be heard and interpreted by a third person whose own process of active reception is anticipated and directed during the parodic episode (Crapanzano 1992:93).

The parodic sensibility of the Mohawk during the Oka crisis clearly shows a creative and not entirely humour-less approach to contemporary politics and experience. “In this way, threatening situations and intricate issues become familiar to a mass audience that would otherwise remain marginalized from such sophisticated reflections... on life” (Olalquiaga 1992:85-6). There are two basic elements in the creation of parody. One is the ability to simultaneously control multiple codes.

Accustomed to dealing with the arbitrary imposition of foreign products and practices, (the) culture has learned the tactics of selection and transformation to suit the foreign to its own idiosyncrasy, thus developing popular integrative mechanisms that are deliberately eclectic and flexible (Olalquiaga 1992:84).

The other is the inherent self-referentiality of contemporary discourse. Considering the Oka crisis, what could be more conscious, or self-conscious, than a masked warrior ‘playing’ golf and allowing himself to be photographed? Not only was he simultaneously controlling codes and inverting images while appealing to a higher semantic order, but he was relying on a third person to actively receive the message. During the Oka crisis, the Mohawk displayed an uncanny ability to adapt, to select what was useful and to discard what was not. People now use the structures, both colonial and pre- or post- colonial, in order to lend weight or currency to their disputes (Sahlins 1994:385). “The first... impulse of the people is not to become just like us but more like themselves”, turning foreign goods, values or structures to the service of their own values, ideas and relations (Sahlins 1994:388). A very good example of the latter occurred in the film *Okanada*. Having successfully slipped through both army and Mohawk lines, the film-maker, Albert Nerenberg, proceeded to capture the warriors on film.

Nerenberg asked one warrior, a MicMac from Nova Scotia, if he had ever been scared enough to cry. The Warrior hesitated momentarily before angrily and profanely questioning

his question. Then he abruptly walked away. There were innumerable replies that he could have made. Instead, he chose to parody the film-maker by asking him to repeat the question and then profanely assessing the question as “stupid”. He discarded the useless semantic domain of the international soldier, which was being invoked by the film-maker and his question, inverted the domain of the reporter by asking him a question, well aware of the present and possible future audience of the video-tape, and then invoked a new semantic order in his assessment of the question. Unable to leap from the higher semantic order of the Western military to the newly constructed one, the film-maker probably never understood why the warrior found his question to be stupid. Presumably only a warrior, with access to the semantic domain of the Warrior Society, could know why the question was stupid. By exposing the multiple codes that non-Western people need to know, the incident parodically reflected some of the tension between the media and the Mohawk, particularly those belonging to the Warrior Society.

Through the use of multiple codes and a self-conscious theatricality, the imposition of added layers of meaning is clearly delineated throughout the crisis in the image and figure of the Mohawk warrior. The contemporary Mohawk warrior is partly an appropriation of the image of the international soldier as well as an amalgamation of traditional Mohawk elements. The Mohawk are drawing from two reserves of meaning. Clad in camouflage and brandishing AK-47s, the Mohawk warriors, some of whom were Vietnam veterans, appropriated the image of the international soldier. Ironically, this subversion was directed at one of the very powers (the Canadian state) that contributes to the composition and perpetuation of that image.

“Our enemies are not imaginary but real”, says the Mexican super-hero, *Superbarrio* (Olalquiaga 1992:87). The Mohawk are not fighting a cold war, nor are they ideologically or militarily trouncing a Middle Eastern target. Like the enemies of *Superbarrio*, the enemies of the Mohawk are real. The Mohawk have replaced the idea of the glory of war with the reality of a struggle for existence. Like *Superbarrio*, the Mohawk wear their masks “on the grounds that it allows collective identity”; also like *Superbarrio*, they have replaced the democratic

struggle of the international soldier with a democratic struggle for their own basic rights (Olalquiaga 1992:57).

In the tradition of resistance, the American Indian Movement (AIM) of the late 1960s and early 1970s used parody to deliver its message. The Red Power slogan was taken from the more established and militant Black Power movement, and during the occupation of Alcatraz the activists announced that they were “‘reclaiming’ the island ‘by right of discovery’ – in a deliberate imitation of the early European explorers” (York & Pindera 1991:170). The Mohawk have continued with this tradition of resistance, and in their strategy of psychological warfare during the Oka crisis, used parody in order to intimidate the army.

...The Mohawks used a variety of home-made devices to imitate the high-powered weapons the army thought they had. A circular cutting tool used in ironworking became an imitation M72 rocket launcher. An ordinary black plumbing tube was placed in the back of a pick-up truck and camouflaged so that it resembled an anti-tank missile launcher (York & Pindera 1991:244-5).

The strategy worked; it worked so well, in fact, that the army called the Warriors liars when they adamantly (and truthfully) insisted that they had no such weapons.

Parody is a common tactic. Artist Louis Hall, the founder of the Warrior Society and unwitting designer of the Warrior Society flag (he had designed a flag in the late 1970s to be used as a symbol of North American Indian identity which was subsequently adopted by the Warrior Society), has consistently used parody in his artwork. On his wall is one poster that reads, “I want you for the Warrior Society (and) shows a Mohawk war chief pointing his finger at the viewer like Uncle Sam in the old American military recruitment posters” (York & Pindera 1991:253). Another poster reads:

There will come a day when the red man shall put the white man in a boat and send him back to Europe where he belongs and keep him... A wall shall be built around Europe, not to keep people out but to keep the white man in. It's not good for the world to have the white man running around loose (York & Pindera 1991:253).

The creation of such artwork reflects an awareness of self and other, as well as mutual interaction between the poles. Throughout the entire crisis, the Mohawk retained a sophisticated awareness, a self-conscious perception of their own place, stereotypically or otherwise constructed in time and space. One Mohawk, commenting generally on the crisis,

said: “if the Mohawks hadn’t taken a stand... they would have been just ‘wooden cigar-store Indians’” (York & Pindera 1991:420).

Trained by a long history of intertwining codes and spectacular roles, post-colonial cultures show in this reversal how the world can also be a scenario for their own directorial and spectatorial delight (Olalquiaga 1992:91).

But, before entering further into a discussion of the crisis at Oka as post-modern, the sequence of events needs to be established.

5.3 THE CRISIS AT OKA

5.3.1 A Sequence of Events

The complexity of the crisis between the Mohawk and the governments of Quebec and Canada has come to be known simply as Oka. The word Oka has a multiplicity of meaning beyond its geographical or social parametres as a “bucolic little Quebec town about twenty minutes from Montreal... known principally for its pungent cheese and one or two surprisingly good restaurants” (Campbell & Pal 1991:268). Oka contains a legacy of colonialism, a struggle for sovereignty, and a dispute over land. The word is synonymous with razor wire, camouflage, tanks, AK-47s, bullets, stones, golf-carts, feathers, tobacco, and human rights. Between March and September 1990, Oka began as a political demonstration against a golf-course expansion with a barricade erected near Kanasatake on 11 March 1990. It escalated to a raid on 11 July 1990 during which time SQ Corporal Marcel Lemay was killed and the Mohawk Warriors at the larger and more powerful community of Kahnawake blockaded the Merceir Bridge. It ended as an international affair which involved the replacement of provincial SQ officers with the Canadian army and a final disengagement that was in no way a Mohawk surrender.

On 11 March 1990, the Mohawk erected a barricade to halt the expansion of the golf course after the talks with the municipality of Oka had broken down, following the March election of a new Chief and Council. The town of Oka received an injunction on 30 June 1990 in order to continue with the golf course development. A week or so later, the Quebec Minister of Native Affairs, John Ciaccia, urged the Mayor of Oka, Jean Ouellette, to suspend

the development of the golf course pending negotiations which strayed beyond “strict legality”.

Exactly four months to the day that the barricades had been erected on the dirt road leading to the golf course, the SQ raided the barricades at Oka. In the ensuing melée, one man was killed. On the morning of the day of the raid, without immediate band approval, the Mohawk Warriors at Kahnawake blocked Highways 132 and 138, which led to the Mercier Bridge, and effectively prevented 60,000 daily commuters from direct access to Montreal. The closure of the Mercier Bridge and the death of Corporal Marcel Lemay turned the protest into a full-blown crisis. The investigation into Lemay’s death and the blockade of the Mercier Bridge had serious and profound ramifications. Speaking specifically about the Mercier Bridge, Campbell and Pal assert that “it made sixty thousand people angry enough that some of them vented their rage in racism and violence” (1991:278).

Immediately following the raid and the closure of the Mercier Bridge, on 12 July 1990, John Ciaccia negotiated for four hours with the Mohawk at Oka, stopping at sundown only out of deference to the Mohawk. An important point in the negotiations was Mohawk immunity from prosecution in connection with the death of Corporal Lemay. Following a call, made in conjunction with Ellen Gabriel on 14 July 1990, for federal involvement, John Ciaccia emerged from a late night meeting on 15 July 1990 declaring that an agreement had been reached.

But crowds kept gathering at the Mercier Bridge, and following six consecutive days of Mohawk effigy burning, a larger crowd of approximately 4,000 people stormed the police gates on the Mercier Bridge. Federal Indian Affairs Minister Tom Siddon issued his first public statement, calling the situation “most unfortunate”, and promising not to interfere with Ciaccia’s negotiations. Meanwhile, American human rights lawyers Stanley Cohen and William Kunstler had arrived in Oka at the invitation of the Mohawk Warriors on that same day, 17 July 1990. The following day, 18 July 1990, Premier Robert Bourassa made his first public statement which alluded to a drawn-out process, and the very next day, 19 July 1990, featured a federal press conference called by Tom Siddon to announce that Ottawa would not negotiate at gunpoint and thus would only step in once the dispute was resolved by Quebec.

Ottawa may not have been involved in the negotiations, but on 23 July 1990, Deputy Minister Harry Swain made several off-the-record remarks about the “armed insurrection” by violent warriors who had intimidated the Mohawk leaders. Tom Siddon, his minister, publically contradicted him as Quebec began to re-negotiate. On 28 July 1990, Ottawa announced its intention to purchase the remaining parcel of land for \$3 million, following an offer made by Quebec (based on Ottawa’s purchase) to buy half of the land in dispute for \$1.4 million. The negotiations resumed, but on 31 July 1990, the municipality of Oka announced its refusal to sell the last parcel of golf course land until the Mohawk barricades were torn down.

On 5 August 1990, Premier Robert Bourassa issued a 48 hour ultimatum and after a meeting of the Quebec Cabinet three days later, called on Ottawa to send in the army. On the same day, both federal and provincial governments and the Mohawk agreed to the appointment of Justice Allan Gold of the Quebec Superior Court as a mediator. The army took position on 11 August 1990, under the command of General Kent Foster, who declared that an armed attack on the barricades was inconceivable. And following a preliminary agreement on 12 August 1990, soldiers and equipment were mobilized and in place by 18 August 1990.

In the midst of military manoeuvres and ongoing talks, the Six Nations Confederacy met in Syracuse, New York, at the Onandaga Reserve. One Chief claimed that the warriors were fakes, solely interested in protecting the gambling and cigarette trade.

On 27 August 1990, the talks broke down once more. Premier Robert Bourassa called upon the army to dismantle the barricades. The next day, as approximately 150 Mohawks left Kahnawake via the Mercier Bridge, an angry mob of about 500 people threw stones and bottles at the procession of cars. Interestingly, later that same day, in the evening, several light planes or helicopters were seen flying low and circling the reserve. The Cessna airlift entered “Quebec mythology” as the media reported that the warriors at Kahnawake had organized an air-bridge (York & Pindera 1991:333). Both the army and the Mohawk benefited from the myth. It was no longer necessary to conduct a house-to-house search for weaponry, as it had

all ostensibly been air-lifted, and the Mohawk enjoyed the illusion that they had an air force as well as the very real assurance that the army would not invade Kahnawake.

Thus, over the course of two days, the barricades were jointly dismantled by the Kahnawake Mohawk and the army; and on 1 September 1990, the army moved to dismantle the barricades at Kanesatake. The remaining warriors at Kanesatake took refuge in the Treatment Centre, as clashes between the SQ and the Mohawk continued. The seventy-third day of the crisis was reached and passed on 21 September 1990, making the Oka crisis the longest stand-off between North American governments and First Nations. On 24 September 1990, the probability of a peaceful conclusion was increased and on 25 September 1990, the Prime Minister announced the commitment of the federal government to deal with the First Nations on land claims, self-government and revisions to the Indian Act. Finally, on 26 September, 1990, the Mohawk at Kanesatake buried their arms and left the Treatment Centre.

5.3.2 Oka as a Post-Modern Crisis

We cannot have in Canada or in Quebec this type of democracy or pseudo-democracy that permits citizens, no matter what the value of their ultimate cause to choose which laws they are going to follow (Premier Robert Bourassa, cited by York & Pindera 1991:316).

The crisis at Oka revealed a deep chasm of serious mis-understanding between indigenous and non-indigenous Canadians. For the First Nations, the crisis represented the real world of their politics; however aggrandized by myth their position might have been, it was grounded in the practice of generations. Furthermore, the Indian Act is not a legal abstraction. "That structure, that presence in every aspect of community and individual life, is inescapable and implacable" (Campbell & Pal 1992:324). For non-indigenous Canadians, the violent images played nightly on their television screens and splashed daily on their newspapers were "surreal and incomprehensible... a bizarre inversion that turned the peaceable kingdom into a Lebanon of the North" (Campbell & Pal 1992:325). For them, the Indian Act remained a meaningless abstraction and the crisis at Oka was not a part of the real world of their politics.

The Mohawk rejected the legitimacy of the Canadian state and law with regard to their land and government. With their nation-to-nation talks, their reluctance to negotiate with Quebec, and their invocation of traditional Mohawk culture, the Mohawk attempted to expand the paradigm of the Canadian polity. The government representatives, both federal and provincial, continued throughout the crisis to affirm and re-affirm their authority over the Warrior Society, the Mohawk, and more generally the First Nations of Canada, within the confines of Canadian law. Both sides were involved in the maintenance and perpetuation, through discourse, of separate and disparate ideological positions. The crisis could in fact be described, in the language of post-modernity, as a struggle between those who still accept the tattered meta-narratives of Canada as a land of peace, order, and good government and those who never did.

5.3.3 Anthropology and the Post-Modern Crisis at Oka

The post-modernist project is both a particular kind of research into cultural activity and a state of things. Cultural anthropology is basically a modernist project. Thus, the discourse of the post-modern has induced a re-evaluation of the central tenets of the discipline which includes: 1) a reconception of the culture concept in terms of power; 2) a different appreciation of cultural meanings as they are constructed in everyday practice; and 3) a study of cultural practices in context as they relate to historical events within a “multinational global economy” (Coombe 1991:188-9).

It has previously been argued (see Chapter 2 on Nations and Nationalism) that modernity arose from the Enlightenment, upon the ashes of the old religious and feudal orders, by processes of rationalization, secularization, urbanization, and industrialization. Indeed, the modern age probably began with the Reformation and the Renaissance wherein the individual as social being ascended as an individual before God, quite apart from the collective or social whole. The separation of the individual from the social whole gave way to the separation of economics, politics, religion, art, and culture from the day-to-day struggle of ordinary existence. This is what Rosemary Coombe (1991:190) calls the project of hermeneutics.

In the form of positivist social science, modern rationalism presented individual and social life as governed by objective laws analogous to those imagined for the natural world (Coombe 1991:189).

Hence culture was a system of meanings and values divorced from but at the same time informing the political and economic spheres. The reification and isolation of culture allowed the bourgeoisie to consolidate and legitimate its social power (Coombe 1991:190). While rejecting the high modern tradition of universality by exalting and venerating the plurality and multivocality of human cultural existence, anthropology did retain the aesthetic of modernism. In this way, cultures share “an egalitarian and democratic ethos as separate and equal” (Coombe 1991:191). Cultures could be compared because of difference in two senses, that is, the internal cultural difference was ignored or overlooked in favour of similarity. Shared patterns of culture were emphasized at the expense of conflict or contradiction; and second, the culture thus defined by a constructed internal homogeneity became further defined in contra-distinction to other cultures, despite zones of similarity across cultures in age, sex, race, gender, class, etc. (Coombe 1991:191).

Anthropology has been touched by the post-modern rubric and the staples of the discipline are being questioned. The former classic ethnographies are no longer classic; no longer are they accepted as holistic, all-encompassing, self-contained descriptors of culture (Coombe 1991:190). Anthropology has slowly come to terms with the differential processes at work within cultures and the zones of experience (age, race, gender, etc.) which transcend them. The contradictions are no longer smoothed over and the boundaries between what were thought to be discrete cultures are no longer visible.

Cultural truths are always partially and historically constructed. Thus, culture needs to be addressed as a creation of conflicting, dialogic processes wherein not everyone has a place at the table. Ironically, as the differences within cultures become difficult to ignore and increasingly visible, the differences between cultures seem more difficult to locate and increasingly invisible. Wolf's *Europe and the People Without History* (1982) showed clearly,

...the historical inadequacy of cultural anthropology's attempts to draw rigid cultural boundaries around particular populations without taking into account their connections with other populations and with larger currents of world history (Coombe 1991:192).

Cultures are not hermetically sealed. “[T]he last residues of cultural anthropology’s modernist heritage... are dissolving in the complex cultural context of a late capitalist, post-colonial era dominated by a multinational economy” (Coombe 1991:192). The post-modern programme or agenda within cultural anthropology has introduced, in part, an approach which analyzes or studies sociocultural systems without the constraints or limitations of modernist discourse (Coombe 1991:193). As a discipline that was always fully aware of cultural plurality, the novelty of the post-modern as cultural critique lay in its ability to expose the differences within cultures. Cultural anthropology may have always been engaged in the study of margins, but now it must further widen its circle and catch the others within the margins, including “their own challenges to and critical commentaries on the singular cultural systems that constitute anthropology’s own master-narratives” (Coombe 1991:194).

Using Coombe’s bifurcated approach to the post-modern, as both analytical paradigm and as a state of things, the crisis at Oka may be explored in the following ways: one, as a study or analysis which is opposed to modernism, acknowledging the referential emptiness, the absence of master-narratives, and the interchangeability of signs; and two, as a condition of post-modernism proper whereby the factionalism of Mohawk culture and society is finally grasped by conservatives and radicals alike and the internal divisions within cultures are finally acknowledged and documented. The people themselves are allowed to challenge and critique the singular cultural systems. In this sense, Oka is a post-modern crisis because it is no longer seen as a cohesive or self-contained event, just as the Mohawk are no longer cohesive and self-contained as a discrete sociocultural entity. Sociocultural homogeneity must be surpassed in order for anthropology to transcend its somewhat tainted historical past of colonialism and imperialism (Coombe 1991:194).

Following World War II, the development of global modernization in the eradication of disease, the spread of literacy, and new economic and political programmes, has resulted in massive civil war, economic instability and disparity, inter-racial tension and inter-ethnic bloodshed (Tambiah 1994:430). Even the introduction of Western democratic institutions or principles like constitutions, human rights bills, majority rule or peace, liberty and freedom have resulted in a collective, localized world violence and a general malaise among “people

who are not aliens but enemies intimately known”; furthermore, “the internationalization of violence and the simultaneity of its occurrences viewed on our tv screens make us all vicarious spectators and participants responding with our own sympathies and prejudices” (Tambiah 1994:432-4).

There is special import in what Tambiah (1994:434) says for the case of British expansion and domination in Canada. By standardizing and homogenizing diverse societies or structures, they were able to develop and progress, or divide and rule. But following two earlier stages of post World War II decolonization and nationalism, terms such as devolution of powers, traditional homelands, and self-determination crept into indigenous politics. People began to claim and want to be different (Tambiah 1994:435-40). In other words, we must accept “the right of formerly un- or mis-represented human groups to speak for and represent themselves in domains defined, politically and intellectually, as normally excluding them” (Said 1986:215).

The effects of the industrial age may be tremendous, but the incorporation of a society or culture into the global economy does not unalterably propel that society or culture along an unpredictable yet homogenous Western trajectory. Anthropologists need to realize that the “consequences of such developments will be shaped by the local conditions” (Coombe 1991:198). Thus the cultural is inextricably bound to both the political and the economic. Unfortunately, many post-modern anthropologists do not practice what they preach regarding inclusion of previously excluded others. “With their roots in the interpretive/cultural constructionist tradition, [they] often rhetorically invoke radical alterity in the same [old] ways. Either way, anthropology is drawn upon to provide the alterities to which envisioned ones are counterposed” (Keesing 1994:302), hence, leading to a dangerous essentialism which has even passed into everyday discourse. How often is culture reified? Too often, says Keesing, who provides a recipe for an alternate anthropological approach to cultural theory, as well as a concept of the cultural which adequately characterizes complex industrial society and small-scale communities of the past and present. The recipe includes: 1) a study of how symbolic power is linked to power and interest, probing what Keesing calls “the political economy of knowledge”; 2) an acknowledgement of how cultural traditions carry ideological

force; 3) a critical conceptualization of the cultural which includes a recognition that in any community or society “there will be multiple subdominant and partially submerged cultural traditions... as well as a hegemonic force of the dominant tradition”; and 4) a re-conceptualization of culture as the cultural which introduces “superimposition... interpretation and pastiche” (Keesing 1994:309-10).

From a superficial perspective the existence of Coca-cola, Exxon, Barbie Dolls, and Big Macs all over the world looks like a globalization and homogenization of culture. However, it doesn't follow that these things have the same meaning in other cultures that they have in our own... It is surely a form of imperialist hubris to believe that they do (Coombe 1991:198).

The Iroquois Confederacy is inherently divisive. Composed of five (now six) nations, the League was built to accommodate difference and heterogeneity. For the Mohawk, internal division has also been a consistent, continuous historical reality. Having both peace chiefs and war chiefs, for example, allowed the Mohawk to continue negotiations or peace talks in times of war. For a nation so ordered, it is no surprise that the Oka crisis brought to the fore the many factions of Mohawk society. This did not mean, however, that the Mohawk were disorganized, disunited, or lacking direction. They were all in agreement regarding the land issue (York & Pindera 1991:113) despite the historical divisions which were further compounded by the religious and linguistic divisions that dated back to the time of the Sulpicians.

The Mohawks who remained faithful to the priests were Catholic and French-speaking, but the majority spoke English and were protestants. The dispute became even more complicated in the mid 1980s, when Bill C-31 was passed, giving back Indian status to hundreds of Kanesatake Mohawk who had lost their treaty rights (York & Pindera 1991:111).

In Kanesatake, there are three basic factions. One is the Kanesatake Band Council. The Band Council is recognized by the federal government and follows the Indian Act with the exception of democratic elections. Through a 1969 Indian Act provision, of leadership according to custom, the Chief and Council are appointed by clan mothers. Opposed to the appointments are the Kanesatakeron League for Democracy and the Group for Change – known during the crisis as the Mohawk Coalition. Usually composed of people who have lost their clans, and therefore have little power under the current custom, they are eager to restore

democratic elections. And finally, third, is the Longhouse, also occasionally known as the traditionalists. They do not recognize the jurisdiction of the Indian Act, nor do they recognize the authority of the Chief and Council.

In Kahnawake, there are also three basic factions. A larger, more militant and powerful reserve, Kahnawake is also the seat of the Warrior Society. Created in the late 1970s by militant Mohawk under the direction of artist and activist Louis Hall, the Warrior Society played a significant role in the Oka crisis, both at Kanesatake and Kahnawake. The militant Longhouse vision of Louis Hall stands in opposition to the Kahnawake Longhouse. The Kahnawake Longhouse is composed of traditionalists who are very concerned about the use of violence and weaponry. Then there is the Kahnawake Mohawk Council; recognized by neither the Warrior Society, nor the Longhouse, they follow the Indian Act and profess to work for change within the system.

Notwithstanding the divisiveness of Mohawk society, a sense of community was constructed and maintained during the Oka Crisis. Repeatedly, the land was invoked as a symbol of shared unity (York & Pindera 1991; Campbell & Pal 1991), and across the country the imagined community of First Nations was constructed through the imagery of communion: land, tobacco, feathers, sovereignty, oppression, racism, a right to livelihood, and in some cases, a right to live.

Mass media communications technologies also enable people to participate in communities of others with whom they share neither geographical proximity nor a common history but an access to signs, symbols, images, narratives... with which they can convey mutual solidarity (Coombe 1991:196).

The cultural must now be understood politically in a late-capitalist context. In the commodified world of our current reality, we are bombarded with signifiers bereft of meaning (Coombe 1991:196-7). To truly understand the post-modern condition and to understand the events or processes which unfold within it, we need to acknowledge the diversity and multiplicity of symbols. Like all cultural signifiers, even western-based symbols may become culturally multivalent, "capable of taking on new meanings in new contexts" (Coombe 1991:198).

On the evening of 13 July 1990, on the other side of the barricades, the Mohawk warriors began to taunt the mob gathered at the Mercier Bridge in protest of its closure. One warrior burned the Fleur-de-Lis and “they played Mohawk chants on loudspeakers at their own bunkers. A warrior on a motorcycle circled in front of the Mohawk barricade holding aloft a Warrior Society flag” (York & Pindera 1991:227). Earlier that day, the crowd had threatened to boycott an IGA that continued to serve Mohawk customers, despite tremendous public pressure. Finally, the Mohawk welcome sign was removed from the window, followed shortly thereafter by the English welcome sign. Only the French welcome sign remained. “By nightfall, the crowd at the barricade had swelled to two thousand. ‘Le Quebec aux Quebecois!’ one of the men yelled. ‘Give the Mohawk a case of beer and they’ll get out’ a woman said” (York & Pindera 1991:227).

Ironically, English-speaking Canadian journalists became the targets of French Canadian anger as the mobs protested that they were unfairly characterized as violent bigots. Yet as York and Pindera (1991) point out, the cries of “maudits sauvages”, the effigy-burning, and the stone-throwing could scarcely be interpreted in any other way. Still, the Quebecers interviewed by the media insisted that they did not hate the Mohawk because they were Indian, but rather because the Mohawk considered themselves “above the law” (York & Pindera 1991:231). On the other side of the coin, the Mohawk were refusing help from anti-French bigots and adamantly asserting that “they wanted no part of a language war” (York & Pindera 1991:242). Thus, it is a “true conceit to believe that... our own common sense categories therefore suffice for making sense of their lives” (Coombe 1991:199). The master-narrative holding the symbols, the signs, the images in place has been eroded.

In conclusion, we offer the staredown between Private Patrick Cloutier and the warrior Brad Larocque.

As he stood near the razor wire, a masked warrior strode up to him and glared into his eyes... In one of Cloutier’s impassive moments, the tense staredown was captured in a photograph that became famous around the world as a symbol of the Oka crisis (York and Pindera 1991:354).

The most well-known symbol of the crisis was, in fact, a composite of multiple realities. The warrior was Brad Larocque, a young Ojibway university student from Saskatchewan. The

soldier turned out to be a cocaine user who was busted twice in the years following the crisis and arrested for a hit and run accident (*The Globe and Mail* 10 Dec. 1993:A6). So blatant an exposure of the fraudulent master-narrative erodes a standard school-book treatment of the warrior and the soldier, particularly as a symbol for the crisis. The warrior was not even a Mohawk, much less an Iroquois. Brad Larocque would also come to serve as an ironic foil for the supposedly stalwart and disciplined Private Patrick Cloutier who would later be discharged and characterized, following the two drug busts, as a cocaine user and criminal. The revelation becomes increasingly significant as we begin to learn more and more about the contemporary Canadian soldier – particularly poignant when we consider the events in Somalia and the rampant racism reflected in the hazing rituals of the Airborne. And so it becomes increasingly difficult to accept the ravaged master-narratives of Western Civilization as the multiple layers of our contemporary reality are so clearly eroded and revealed.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.1 RECAPITULATION

The Oka Crisis serves as a catalyst for the exploration of a myriad of issues enveloping a complex reality of contact between civilizations. The issues may be explored within four not necessarily discrete categories: 1) nations and nationalism; 2) the Indian; 3) the Mohawk; and 4) Oka as a post-modern crisis.

The thesis follows a central and basic argument, one which attempts to analyze the contact between and within cultures, while recognizing the limitations of a Western sociocultural approach. Contact between cultures inevitably occurs, resulting in a bi-directional give-and-take which alters ideology and everyday interaction between ordinary people. First Nations nationalism has been produced by the contact which occurred between traditional aboriginal societies and modern western ones; but conversely, the North American sociocultural complex has also been moderated by its contact with traditional aboriginal societies.

A comprehensive review of the literature yielded few anthropological works which combined a general study of culture contact at the macro level with a particular analysis of interaction between people at the micro level. Canadian anthropologists working in this area usually focus on the macro level interaction between aboriginal societies and the Canadian nation-state, within an academic paradigm of political economy. However, such a strict focus on the macro level often precludes a more particular study of interaction between people, as well as a more general analysis of ideology, history or symbolism. Thus, the strategy within the thesis, of combining a macro study of contact over time, with a micro analysis of

interaction, symbols and ideas, has provided a more generally inclusive framework. Furthermore, micro and macro levels are not mutually exclusive. Thus, the thesis attempts to achieve a balance between the micro and macro level. The ostensible focus of the thesis is the crisis at Oka; however, the surrounding discussion encompasses a broad scope of issues such as nations and nationalism, the idea of the Indian, the Mohawk, and the Oka crisis as a post-modern event within a post-modern state and discipline.

The bifurcated use of both the micro level and the macro level facilitates a discussion of First Nation nationalism. It allows for an analysis which hones in on process, as well as enveloping a larger interaction between nations and ideologies. Indian-White interaction has not simply been a one-sided, uni-directional story of oppression, subjugation, and exploitation.

The nation is a modern creation, the product of a modern ideology called individualism. Individualism developed in the Western world by an ideational or mental revolution that favoured the individual over the collectivity and thus turned formerly traditional societies into modern ones. In the so-called new, or non-Western, world the processes of modernization were sustained by the contact that occurred between aboriginal societies and the transplanted European ones. The First Nations evolved through interaction between both people and ideas. The process was, indeed continues to be, bi-directional; the cultural exchange not only created a modern nationalism out of traditional tribal structures, but established a unique democratic tradition significantly different from its European origins or contemporary counterparts.

A breakdown of the interaction or contact reveals an ideological framework capable of incorporating and maintaining fundamentally disparate ways of ordering knowledge and behaviour. In other words, there exists a dual cultural logic that allows the First Nations to subsist within the individualistic, modern (now post-modern) milieu and still retain elements of a traditional past. The model of nationalism created by Lithman (1988), featuring a comparison between collectively and individually centred nations, allows a close look at the ability of First Nations to articulate within two worlds. But as we later observe in the work

of Grinde and Johansen, the relationship has also created a special North American political reality.

By the mid-twentieth century, the Western empires had colonized three-quarters of the global surface. The West granted itself an Archimedian point of privilege and measured all societies against its own institutions, structures, and nations. By virtue of its hegemony, Western terms continue to be used as intellectual currency and, despite the bi-directional influence discussed throughout this thesis, we have all come to understand *us* and *them* or *we* and *they*, Western and non-Western in the language (usually English) or Western epistemology. But the movement of deconstruction, initiated and supported by marginalized social critics and academics, has questioned the integrity and authority of Western knowledge. The discipline of anthropology has also been challenged. Alternate channels of authority have guided sociocultural inquiry away from exclusive images of Otherness and toward more inclusive, reflexive presentation and re-presentation.

Largely forged through ethnohistory, anthropology has established a meaningful method for studying the changes that have occurred in aboriginal societies since European contact by combining historical documents, archaeological findings, and oral traditions. Ethnohistory has provided a more inclusive, less exclusive avenue for the study of history and change in aboriginal societies because it unites the written history of the West with the oral tradition of indigenous people.

The narrative or myth of Western Civilization has generally accorded the Indian a secondary role in the official history of Canada. Following the war of 1812, the Indian almost entirely disappears from the pages of Canadian historical text. The collapse of the meta-narrative, of the exclusionary histories of Western Civilization, largely fashioned by critical and non-Western historians and scholars, has created a new, more inclusive shared writing and telling of history. Within anthropology, the theory and practice of ethnohistory extended the borders of conventional history and is helping to uncover the rightful place of the Aboriginal in history, while denouncing fanciful images of noble savagery and the Other.

Grinde and Johansen's *Exemplar of Liberty* (1991) is an excellent argument upon which to base a re-interpretation of official history because it acknowledges the influence that

the First Nations had on the European ones and argues for an understanding of our shared past which accurately reflects our shared present. In North America, there is a healthy skepticism surrounding the assumptions, beliefs and values of the West. People no longer believe in the modern age; its utopian character has been ruptured and new ways of experiencing and interpreting experience have taken hold. The effects of modern warfare, the threat of nuclear annihilation or terrorism, the scourge of world hunger and new plagues, like AIDS, have created an age of individual responsibility and personal impotence.

The collapse of empire around the world has nurtured a rejection of the myths of Western Civilization. The citizens of former colonies questioned the ideology and epistemology of Western knowledge as the experience of decolonization created a new, political and economic reality, a post-modern age, incapable of cohesively binding together the master-narratives of Western Civilization. Whether post-modernity is defined as an aesthetic condition, the culture of late-capitalism, or a body of theory, it rests on the assumption that there is no Archimedean point of view firmly entrenched in a referent narrative. The critique of colonialism questioned Western authority and representation, facilitating radical change in almost all Western disciplines.

In anthropology, post-modernity has initiated a reconception of the culture concept, an appreciation of cultural meanings entrenched in practice, and a study of culture and history in a global universe. Anthropology no longer overlooks the differences within cultures to augment the differences between cultures. Instead, it has acknowledged the overlapping realities, histories and zones of experience such as age, sex, race, gender and class. The task for anthropology, in this post-modern age, is to catch the Others within the margins.

Oka is a post-modern crisis because it not only exposes the absence of Western meta-narratives, but it reveals the complexity and heterogeneity of the Mohawk. The heterogeneous reality of Mohawk society was revealed to both conservatives and critics. We must continuously be accepting of usually invisible human groups, allowing them to speak for and represent themselves in milieus (both internal and external) which generally exclude them. Furthermore, and ironically in this case, the Iroquois Confederacy was initially created both to accommodate difference and promote unity. Using the language of post-modernity, the

crisis could ultimately be described as a struggle between those who still accept the tattered meta-narratives of Canada as a land of peace, order, and good government and those who do not.

6.2 COMING FULL CIRCLE

Through contact between civilizations, the traditional societies of the Western Hemisphere became modern, able to distinguish their members from the surrounding collectivity, capable of forming nations in the modern sense, and able to articulate in the Western world. But we have come full circle. Following the argument of George Sioui, Bruce Johansen, Donald Grinde, or any academic who argues that the aboriginal societies of the New World have tempered the often brutal humanity of the transplanted European guests, we may enter into a precarious discussion of the post-modern. The strongest critic of Orientalism, Edward Said, informs us that it is in the cries and through the insight of the colonized, of the Other, that our master-narratives have been denigrated, fraudulently exposed, or constructively contextualized.

The cycle of contact has come full circle. Yes, we have influenced them, but they have also influenced us. The relationship is symbiotic, bi-directional and processual; it is not parasitic, uni-directional or as static as the school texts and propaganda would have us believe.

The master-narratives of Canadian social history are collapsing in on themselves. The institutions of the British are no longer unequivocally accepted as the Canadian established order. We now admit that the First Nations were always here; that the British may have won on the Plains of Abraham but the French in Quebec are still shouting sovereignty and separation; that Chinese men built the railroad; that Ukrainians developed the Prairies; that Italians and Portuguese gave hard labour; that new immigrants from Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America continue to toil in garment and industrial factories and that Aboriginals were here all along, contributing to the industry of the nation state (see Rolf Knight's *Indians at Work*). The new Canadian myth is more inclusive and more accommodating; it is seriously

attacking the old master-narratives of British institutionalism, bi-lingualism and bi-culturalism, and peace, order, and good government.

What can be said when we have witnessed the recent dismantling of the 1st Commando Airborne and the video-taped aftermath of civilian beating and death in Somalia during peace-keeping and participated in a referendum on national unity; and watched, five years ago, as tanks rolled over the pines?

Indeed we have come full circle. We have seen into our own existence. We have come to see that our own exceptional (formerly modern, now post-modern) development is just that – exceptional, not superior. Contextualized, we admit that our own way of life is not apical, nor Archimedian, just different, more or less the same as other ways of life.

REFERENCES

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AND FILMS

Fraser, Graham. "Pent-up Feelings from Summer Explode in House". *The Globe and Mail* 25 September 1990:A6.

Kanesatake: 270 Years of Resistance. Videocassette. Dir. Alanis Obsomsawin. Prod. National Film Board of Canada. Dist. NFB. 1991. 119 min.

McDonald, Neil. "Avoiding a Short Cut to Disaster". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A17.

"Mohawks Refuse to End Blockade". *The Globe and Mail* 9 July 1990:A5.

"Mohawks to Receive Visit from Jesse Jackson". *The Globe and Mail* 24 August 1990:A1.

Moon, Peter. "Mohawks Bear Emotional Wound". *The Globe and Mail* 21 March 1994:A2.

"Most Involved in Mohawk Crisis Given Low Marks – Poll". *Chronicle-Herald* 2 January 1991:A11.

Norris, Alexander. "At Least Seven Main Political Factions Make Up Mohawk Band at Kanesatake". *Montreal Gazette* 16 October 1990:A2.

_____. "Kahnawake Group Challenges Power of Warriors". *Montreal Gazette* 13 July 1991:A5.

_____. "Kanesatake and Kahnawake: One Year Later". *Montreal Gazette* 6 July 1991:A5.

_____. "76-Year-Old Chief Blames Ottawa for Crisis". *Montreal Gazette* 11 July 1991:A1.

"Oka a Misuse of Political Power, Public Purse". *Windspeaker* 28 February - 13 March 1994:5.

Okanada. Videocassette. Dirs. Albert Nerenberg and Catherine Bainbridge. Prod. Ina Fichman. Maximage Productions Snap TV. 1991. 33 mins.

Picard, Andre. "Mood Turning Ugly Among Residents of Oka". *The Globe and Mail* 16 July 1990:A1.

_____. "Police Will Attack Again, Mohawks Say". *The Globe and Mail* 26 July 1990:A1.

_____. "Quebec Ready to Resume Talks with Mohawks, Minister Says". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A4.

- ____. "75-Day Mohawk Siege has Longer Precendents". *The Globe and Mail* 24 September 1990:A5.
- ____. "Standoff at Oka Increases Tension Over Language". *The Globe and Mail* 14 September 1990.
- ____. "UN Considers Probe of Oka Situation". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A1.
- Picard, Andre and Geoffrey York. "Barricade Removal Halted". *The Globe and Mail* 31 August 1990:A1.
- Picard, Andre, Geoffrey York and Rudy Platiel. "Hope Growing that Oka Deal Near". *The Globe and Mail* 25 July 1990:A4.
- Picard, Andre and Patricia Poirier. "Talks Fail to Resolve Standoff in Quebec". *The Globe and Mail* 14 July 1990:A1.
- ____. "Talks Progress in Oka Standoff". *The Globe and Mail* 16 July 1990:A1.
- Platiel, Rudy. "Natives Deny Violence Growing". *The Globe and Mail* 14 July 1990.
- ____. "Native Factions United by Crisis". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A4.
- Poirier, Patricia. "Broadbent Assails Use of Food as Weapon in Oka Dispute". *The Globe and Mail*. 24 July 1990:A4.
- ____. "Chateauguay Mayor Defends Community". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990.
- ____. "Media Asked to Help Identify Rock Throwers". *The Globe and Mail* 31 August 1990:A3.
- Sheppard, Robert. "Gun Butt Diplomacy Not Enough for Natives". *The Globe and Mail* 16 July 1990:A21.
- "Soldier in Oka Photo Discharged". *The Globe and Mail*. 10 December 1993:A6.
- Valpy, Michael. "Chateauguay Resembles Alabama in the 1960s". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A5.
- ____. "Mohawk Struggle in Quebec an Old One". *The Globe and Mail* 26 July 1990:A5.
- Velk, Tom. "Who Really Owns the Land in Oka?" *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A17.
- Wilson, Deborah. "B.C. Indians Step Up Roadblock Tactics". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990.
- ____. "Tension Mounts at B.C. Logging Blockade". *The Globe and Mail* 30 October 1990:A4.
- Wagamese, Richard. "Warriors Ideas Blasted but Barricade Backed". *Calgary Herald* 20 July 1990.

- York, Geoffrey. "Federal Minister Calls Warriors Criminals". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A1.
- _____. "Oka Warriors Closer to Surrender". *The Globe and Mail* 10 August 1990:A1.
- York, Geoffrey and Andre Picard. "No Land Deal While Barriers Up in Quebec, Siddon Says". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A1.

BOOKS AND JOURNAL ARTICLES

- Anderson and Chock, Eds. 1986. "Ethnographic Realities/Authorial Ambiguities". *Anthropological Quarterly*, April 1986, Vol. 59(2):52-87.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1988. "Putting Hierarchy in Its Place". *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 3(1):36-49.
- Augé, Marc. 1979. *The Anthropological Circle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1993. "The Fall of the Legislator". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Berkhofer, Robert Jr. 1979. *The White Man's Indian*. New York: Vintage Books, a Division of Random House.
- Beteille, Andre. 1986. "Individualism and Equality". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 27(2):127-134.
- Blanchard, David S. 1980. *Kahnawake: A Historical Sketch*. Kahnawake: Kanien' Kehaka Raotitiohkwa Press
- _____. 1980. *Seven Generations: A History of Kanienkehaka*. Kahnawake: Kahnawake Survival School.
- Boldt, Menno. 1993. *Surviving as Indians: The Challenge of Self-Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Boldt, Menno and J. Anthony Long. 1985. *The Quest for Justice: Aboriginal Peoples and Aboriginal Rights*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Boon, James A. 1990. *Other Tribes, Other Scribes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borofsky, Robert, Ed. 1994. *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- _____. 1994. "Assessing the Field". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

- Breton, Raymond. 1984. "The Production and Allocation of Symbolic Resources: An Analysis of the Linguistic and Ethnocultural Fields in Canada". *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* Vol. 21(2):123-143.
- Campbell and Pal. 1991. "Feather and Gun: Confrontation at Oka/Kahnesatake". *The Real World of Canadian Politics*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Carrier, James G. 1992. "Orientalism: The World Turned Upside Down". *American Ethnologist*, May 1992 Vol. 19(2):
- Carrithers, Collins and Lukes, eds. 1985. *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clifford, James. 1986. "Introduction: Partial Truths" *Writing Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- _____. 1986. "On Ethnographic Allegory". *Writing Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Clifford, James and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Cockcroft, James D., Andre Gunder Frank and Dale L. Johnson. 1972. *Development and Underdevelopment*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Colden, Cadwallader. *The History of the Five Nations of Canada*. T. Osborne [1747] Toronto: Reprinted by Coles Publishing Company, 1972.
- Connor, Walker. 1990. "When is a Nation?". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 13(1):92-103
- Crapanzano, Vincent. 1992. "The Postmodern Crisis: Discourse, Parody, Memory". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Cross, Ronald and Hélène Sévigny. 1994. *Lasagna: The Man Behind the Mask*. Vancouver: Talonbooks.
- DaMatta, Roberto. 1994. "Some Biased Remarks on Interpretivism: A View from Brazil". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Das, Veena. 1994. "The Anthropological Discourse on India". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Deloria, Vine. 1970. "Some Criticisms and a Number of Suggestions". *Anthropology and the American Indian*. A Symposium of the American Anthropological Association, 20 November 1970.
- _____. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman & London: University of Oklahoma Press.

- _____. 1973. "Custer Died for Your Sins". *To See Ourselves: Anthropology and Modern Social Issues*. Thomas Weaver, Ed. Scott Foresman and Company.
- Deloria and Lytle. 1984. *The Nations Within*. N.p.: Pantheon Books.
- De Walt, Billie R. and Pertti J. Pelto, Eds. 1985. *Micro and Macro Levels of Analysis in Anthropology*. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Dickinson and Wotherspoon. 1992. *Deconstructing a Nation*. Vic Satzewich, Ed. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Docherty, Thomas. 1993. *Postmodernism: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Drabek, Mileti & Haas. 1975. *Human Systems in Extreme Environments*. Institute of Behavioural Science [Boulder]. University of Colorado.
- Dumont, Louis. 1985. "A Modified View of Our Origins: The Christian Beginnings of Modern Individualism". *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, and History*. Eds. Carrithers, Collins and Lukes. N.p.: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1986. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1977. *From Mandeville to Marx: The Genesis and Triumph of Economic Ideology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1980. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1980. *On Value*. Radcliffe-Brown Lecture in Social Anthropology.
- _____. 1970. "Religion, Politics and Society in the Individualistic Universe". The Henry Myers Lecture 1970. Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.
- Dumont, Louis. 1987. "Discussion and Criticism: On Individualism and Equality". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 28(5):669-677
- Dyck, Noel. 1990. "Cultures, Communities and Claims: Anthropology and Native Studies in Canada". *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXII(3).
- Eco, Umberto. 1992. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Falk Moore, Sally. 1994. "The Ethnography of the Present and the Analysis of the Process". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

- Feit, Harvey. 1985. "Legitimation and Autonomy in James Bay Cree Responses to Hydro-Electric Development". *Indigenous Peoples of the Nation State*. Noel Dyck, Ed. St. John's Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Francis, Daniel. 1992. *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Frideres, J.S. 1974. *Canada's Indians: Contemporary Conflicts*. Prentice-Hall of Canada.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1994. "The Uses of Diversity". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1982. *Nationalism and the Two Forms of Cohesion in Complex Societies*. Radcliffe-Brown Lecture in Social Anthropology.
- _____. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. 1987. "The Social Roots of Egalitarianism". *Culture, Identity and Politics*.
- Ginsburg, Faye. 1992. "Indigenous Media: Faustian Contract or Global Village?". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith, Eds. New York: International Publishers.
- Greenhouse, Carol J. 1992. "Signs of Equality: Individualism and Hierarchy in American Culture". *American Ethnologist* Vol. 19(2).
- Grinde, Donald A. and Bruce E. Johansen. 1991. *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*. American Indian Studies Centre. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Hale, Horatio. 1883. *The Iroquois Book of Rites*. Philadelphia: D.G. Brinton.
- Hall, Tony. 1991. "Indian Summer, Canadian Winter". *Nacla Report on the Americas* Vol. XXV(3).
- Handler, Richard. 1984. "On Social Discontinuity: Nationalism and Cultural Objectification In Quebec". *Current Anthropology* Vol.25(1).
- Harris, Marvin. 1968. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*. New York: Thomas Crowell.
- Hassan, Ihab. 1993. "Toward a Concept of Postmodernism". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Heller, T.C., M. Sosna and D.E. Wellbery. 1986. *Reconstructing Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*. N.p.: Stanford University Press.
- Helvacioğlu, Banu. 1992. "The Thrills and Chills of Postmodernism: the Western Intellectual Vertigo". *Studies in Political Economy* 38, Summer 1992.

- Hinsley, Curtis M. Jr. 1991. *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology 1846-1910*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Hughes, E.C. 1943. *French Canada in Transition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hughes, Ken. M.P. 1991. *The Summer of 1990: Fifth Report on the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs*. Ottawa: House of Commons.
- Hunt, George T. 1967. *The Wars of the Iroquois: A Study in Intertribal Relations*. N.p.: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 1991. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Huyssen, Andreas. 1993. "The Search for Tradition: Avant Garde and Postmodernism in the 1970s" *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- The Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues. 1987. *Indigenous Peoples: A Global Quest for Justice*. London and New Jersey: Zed Books Limited.
- Innis, Harold, A. 1970. *The Fur Trade in Canada*. [1936] Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jameson, Frederic. 1992. *Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jennings, Francis. 1976. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Katzer, B. 1988. "The Caughnawaga Mohawks: the Other Side of Ironwork". *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 15, Winter 1988:39-55.
- Kapferer, Bruce. 1988. *Legends of People, Myths of State*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.
- Keesing, Roger M. 1981. *Cultural Anthropology: A Contemporary Perspective*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- _____. 1994. "Theories of Culture Revisited". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Klippenstein, Norman L. 1991. *The Haida Struggle for Autonomy on the Haida Gwaii*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Department of Anthropology, University of Manitoba.
- Knight, Rolf. 1978. *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Indian Labour in British Columbia*. Vancouver: New Star Books.

- La Fontaine, J.S. 1985. "Person and Individual: Some Anthropological Reflections". Carrithers, Collins and Lukes, Eds. *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, S. and N. Lurie. 1971. *The American Indian Today*. New World Book Manufacturing.
- Lithman, Y. Georg. 1987. *A Community Apart*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- _____. 1988. "Cultural Dimensions of Development and Underdevelopment: Issues of Nation and Person In Indian-White Relationships". University of Toronto Conference.
- Little, Bear, Leroy, Menno Boldt, J. Anthony Long. 1990. *Pathways to Self-Determination: Canadian Indians and the Canadian State*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lydekker, John Wolfe. 1938. *The Faithful Mohawks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacLaine, Craig and Baxendale. 1990. *This Land is Our Land: The Mohawk Revolt at Oka*. Montreal: Optimum.
- Mander, Jerry. 1991. *In the Absence of the Sacred: The Failure of Technology and the Survival of Indian Nations*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Marcella, A.J., G.A. DeVos, F.L.K. Hsu. *Culture and Self: Asian and Western Perspectives*. New York and London: Tavistock Books.
- Marcus, George E. 1986. "Afterword: Ethnographic Writing and Anthropological Careers". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- _____. 1986. "Contemporary Problems of Ethnography in the Modern World System". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- _____. 1992. "A Broad(er) Side to the Canon, Being a Partial Account of a Year of Travel Among Textual Communities in the Realm of Humanities Centers and Including a Collection of Artificial Curiosities". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*". George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- _____. 1992. *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Matthiasson, John S. 1992. *Living on the Land: Change Among the Inuit of Baffin Island*. Toronto: Broadview Press.
- _____. 1994. "Lived Experience and the Present: New Directions in Anthropological Writing". *Reviews in Anthropology* Vol. 23:269-280.

- McCall, Christopher. 1990. *Class, Ethnicity, and Social Inequality*. N.p.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- McMaster, Gerald and Lee-Ann Martin, eds. 1992. *Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives*. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- McMillan, Alan D. 1988. *Native Peoples and Cultures of Canada: An Anthropological Overview*. N.p.: Douglas and McIntyre.
- McRoberts, K. 1988. *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*. N.p.: McClelland and Stewart.
- Mealing, S.R. 1967. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*. N.p.: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Miller, J.R. 1989. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Minogue, K.R. 1967. *Nationalism*. University Paperbacks. London: Methuen.
- Morgan, Lewis, Henry. 1954. *League of the Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.
- Morris, Desmond. 1969. *The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal*. Toronto: Bantam.
- Olalquiaga, Celeste. 1992. *Megalopolis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ortiz, Sutti, ed. 1983. *Economic Anthropology: Topics and Theories*. Lanham, New York, and London: University Press of America.
- O'Sullivan See, K. 1986. *First World Nationalisms: Class and Ethnic Politics in Northern Ireland and Quebec*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Paine, Robert. 1990. "Our Authorial Authority". *Culture* IX(2).
- Ponting, J. Rick. ed. 1986. *Arduous Journey*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc.
- _____. 1990. "Internalization: Perspectives on an Emerging Direction in Aboriginal Affairs". *Canadian Ethnic Studies* Vol. XXII(3).
- Portoghesi, Paolo. 1993. "Postmodern". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1986. "Fieldwork in Common Places". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George Marcus. Eds. University of California Press.
- Rabinow, Paul. 1986. "Representations are Social Facts: Modernity and Postmodernity in Anthropology". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.

- Rahman, Aminur. 1987. "Nationalism and Nation Formation: An Anthropological Discussion in Relation to Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflict in the Third World". *Bangladesh Sociological Review* Vol. 2(2):
- Reaman, G. Elmore. 1967. *The Trail of the Iroquois Indians*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Limited.
- Richard, Nelly. 1993. "Periphery and Postmodernism: Postmodernism and Periphery". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ritcher, Daniel K. 1992. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization*. Institute of Early American History and Culture. University of North Carolina Press.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1986. "From the Door of his Tent: The Fieldworker and the Inquisitor". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- Russell, John. 1992. "Race and Reflexivity: The Black Other in Contemporary Japanese Black Culture". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Russell, Peter. 1966. *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company of Canada Limited.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1994. "Goodbye to Tristes Tropes: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- _____. 1977. *Orientalism*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London & Henley.
- _____. 1989. "Presenting the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors". *Critical Inquiry*. Vol.15 (Winter 1989).
- Satzewich, Vic. 1992. *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and Racism in '90s Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Schechter, Stephen. 1992. *Zen and the Art of Postmodern Canada*. Robert Davies Publishing.
- Schneider, R.A. and R.A. Levine. 1985. *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schultz, Emily A. and Robert H. Lavenda. 1990. *Cultural Anthropology: A Perspective on the Human Condition*. West Publishing Company.
- Seton-Watson. 1977. *Nations and States*. London: Methuen.

- Shaffir and Haas. 1978. *Shaping Identity in Canadian Society*. Prentice-Hall of Canada.
- Stedman, Raymond William. 1982. *Shadows of the Indian: Stereotypes in American Culture*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Shively, J. 1992. "Cowboys and Indians: Perceptions of Western Films Among American Indians and Anglos". *American Sociological Review* Vol. 57 December 1992:725-34.
- Sioui, Georges E. 1992. *For an Amerindian Autohistory: An Essay on the Foundations of a Social Ethic*. N.p.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Stewart, Kathleen. 1992. "Nostalgia: A Polemic". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Stewart, Susan. 1989. "Antipodal Expectations: Notes on the Formosan Ethnography of George Psalmanazar". *Romantic Motives: Essays on Anthropological Sensibility*. George W. Stocking Jr., Ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stocking, George W., ed. 1989. *Romantic Motives: Essays on Anthropological Sensibility*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stymeist, David. 1975. *Ethnics and Indians: Social Relations in a Northwestern Ontario Town*. Toronto: Peter Martin and Associates.
- Tambiah, Stanley J. 1985. *Culture, Thought and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1994. "The Politics of Ethnicity". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Tanner, A. 1983. "Introduction: Canadian Indians and the Politics of Dependency". *The Politics of Indianness*. Institute of Social and Economic Research. St. John's: Memorial University.
- Tiger, Lionel. 1969. *Men In Groups*. London: Nelson.
- Tooker, Elisabeth. 1990. "The United States Constitution and the Iroquois League". *Ethnohistory* Vol. 35 Fall 1988:305-36; Discussion: Vol. 37 Summer 1990:279-97.
- Torry, William A. 1979. "Anthropological Studies In Hazardous Environments: Past Trends and New Horizons". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 20(3) September:
- Trigger, Bruce. 1985. *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's Heroic Age Considered*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University.
- Tucker, D.F.B. 1980. *Marxism and Individualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Tyler, Stephen A. 1992. "On Being Out of Words". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Duke University Press.
- _____. 1986. "Post-Modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- Wade, M. 1964. *The French Canadian Outlook*. N.p.: McClelland and Stewart.
- _____. 1968. *The French Canadians*. N.p.: Macmillan Company of Canada.
- Walker, James. 1971. "The Indian in Canadian Historical Writing". *Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers*. 1971:21-47.
- Weatherford, Jack. 1988. *Indian Givers*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Weaver, Sally. 1990. "A New Paradigm in Canadian Indian Policy for the 1990s". *Canadian Ethnic Studies* Vol. XXII(3).
- White, Hayden. 1978. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.
- Wilson, Edmund. 1960. *Apologies to the Iroquois*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Cudahy.
- Wolf, Eric. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1994. "Facing Power: Old Insights, New Questions". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Woodcroft, George. 1992. *The Monk and his Message: Undermining the Myth of History*. Vancouver; Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Wright, Ronald. 1993. *Stolen Continents: The 'New World Indian Eyes*. N.p.: Penguin Books.
- York, Geoffrey and Loreen Pinder. 1991. *People of the Pines: The Warriors and the Legacy of Oka*. N.p.: Little Brown and Company (Canada).
- Yun, Ma Shu. 1990. "Ethnonationalism, Ethnic Nationalism and Mini-Nationalism: A Comparison of Connor, Smith and Snyder". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 13(1):525-541.