Anthropology and Ethnicity's Interplay among First Nations in Canada: The case of Quebec[1]

Cristhian Teófilo da Silva
CEPPAC - UnB

Canadian Studies have been offering comparative insights regarding anthropological advocacy issues toward indigenous or aboriginal societies among national states facing major development projects. This research project (for which this is only a brief description) consists in a scientific investigation of official politics designed for native, aboriginal or indigenous populations situated under the wardship or tutelage of nation-states. Its main concern consists in the anthropological analysis of the remaking of ethnic identities of social groups involved by these politics. In this sense, the main theoretical problem of this paper relates to the constitution of the public ethnicity of First Nations in Canada (Weaver 1984) and its impact over the formation of styles of ethnology in this country.

The attempt to understand how native populations have been maintaining their ethnic identity and cultural diversity within national states such as Brazil and Canada has not been new. Nevertheless, the cross-cultural approach between Brazilian and Canadian politics regarding its minorities has not been done as often as it could. For these reasons the theoretical problems traditionally faced by Ethnology in Brazil are comparable to the theoretical problems faced by Ethnology in Canada (which implies a redefinition of both ethnological traditions in wider terms).

The overall problem is to identify how different sectors of society and government define the "Indian problem" (Dyck 1996) in both national contexts. To put it in another words we might say that the main question is how indigenous, aboriginal or native claims are transformed into "problems" in order to be dealt with by public policies of the State or by advocacy projects created by anthropologists as consultants or by the Indians themselves. How it happens and how it has been anthropologically thought in the Canadian context are the two major questions to be initially treated under this faculty research program.

The comparative exercise between Brazil and Canada will contribute theoretically to a better understanding of how Ethnology as a scientific discipline

has been applied in different national contexts towards its native minorities. The four-week experience in Canada offered by the "Faculty Research Program" helped as an empirical starting point to notice emerging questions and redefine common problems to both nations and First Nations. This contributes specifically to current investigations held in Brazil by anthropologists interested in the impact of their works and researches on the lives of those they study. "Canadian Studies" are an important point of departure to new research questions, methodologies and comparative investigations that have to critically elucidate ethnic, political and ethical aspects of both national states' official policies towards indigenous, aboriginal or native minorities.

To be acquainted with the Canadian recent literature on the theme at the same time that we intend to sociologically consider the relation between Ethnology and Ethnic Politics in both countries (Brazil and Canada) has been positively contributing to the advancement of comparative studies between them. Brazilian anthropologists have been choosing Canada as a privileged country to test their theoretical concepts or to begin their research carriers not only because of the increasing scientific literature produced in this country but also because of common features related to both countries as nations formed over previous native territories (Baines 1996). The present research proposal implicit in this paper aims at enhancing this increasing comparative perspective, which has been gaining a reading public.

Unfortunately, the data collected during the brief research period in Vancouver-British Columbia (two weeks) is still under analysis and shall be used properly in a different article.[2]

* * *

Now I would like to present in this paper the province of Quebec as a resourceful case study for the investigation of "styles of ethnology formation processes" in Canada. Some general information will be presented in advance in order to provide some elements that will help us apprehend ethnic aspects of the Quebecois and Anglophone ways of practicing indigenous ethnology in this Canadian province. This preliminary information is of three different types: political chronology, interethnic relations situation and collective demands. Following this introduction it is my expectation to provide a fairly clear overview of Quebec's uniqueness as an ethnographic field for the study of how styles of anthropology in general and styles of ethnology in particular emerge and develop.[3]

I shall begin at the beginnings of Quebec as a province in order to provide a short narrative of the complexity of being francophone within an Anglophone America and of being Amerindian, Indian or a First-Nation within a francophone province. This has to be done in order to deal with the complexity of doing anthropology across a multicultural Canada.

I

The foundation of the city of Quebec dates back to 1608. It was the early days of French colonization in America once named New France. That name did not stop the conquest of the city 150 years later by the British conquerors leaving France with no other option besides handling Eastern Canada to England through the "Paris Treaty". The hegemonic bicultural character of Quebec has been henceforth-established two and a half centuries ago despite the indigenous presence in the region since immemorial times.[4] The political, cultural, linguistic polarization of Canada, and of Quebec in particular, between Anglophones and Francophones was established ever since and has to be held responsible for the narrowing of very old political disputes over the province that has now acquired moral overtones amidst the multicultural population of Quebec.

It is worth mentioning that in 1774 Quebec Francophone administrators earned from the British permission to keep their Catholic faith, their legal tradition (the Napoleonic Code) and their own language as an official language establishing an almost one hundred years' period of "consideration" of French institutions by English Canada. However, the creation in 1867 of the "Canadian Dominion" by the British Crown, uniting High Canada (Ontario) and Low Canada (Quebec) under the same government, established four provinces in order to put an end to Francophone and Anglophone disputes over the national building of the country and of the Canadian State.

It was during this period that the British government implemented an assimilation policy towards the population of French heritage and in so doing put French institutions under a series of repressive acts. In 1871, a tendency to restrict the use of French language in public schools was formed at the same time that Catholic schools were reduced and virtually extinguished in number. This tendency lasted for almost one hundred years.[5]

During the following period if we compare the situation of the Francophone population outside Quebec with the situation of the Anglophone population inside Quebec we will find a remarkable difference: the Anglophones in Quebec could carry on with their lives almost entirely in English while the Francophones outside Quebec could not. In the words of a Brazilian Anthropologist dedicated to analyze the situation of Quebec in the Canadian context, Luís R. Cardoso de Oliveira: "The lack of reciprocity in this sense is viewed as an offence by Quebec. As it is not a legitimate example of direct discrimination, it is at least an unacceptable act of inconsideration" (1999:17). This inconsideration must be understood as the moral and political antinomy of the cultural Other.

In the midst of such complicated political environment created between Anglophones and Francophones, aboriginal or indigenous peoples (from now on called "First Nations") had to learn how to deal with different agents, agencies and colonial settings created by Europeans and Canadians alike: Hudson Bay Company, North-West Territories Council, Newfoundland Colony, Low Canada Administration, United Province of Canada and the Province of Quebec. From 60.000 settlers estimated in the beginning of the European colonization there are now over six million non-Indians living in Quebec (Savard 1992:4).

Always facing the delicate problem of defining its political and economic alliances with the settlers, First-Nations leaderships adopted the slogan: "the enemies of our enemies are our friends" and that meant in 1763 that the English were their friends since they were enemies of their former friends and actual enemies, the French (:5).

This much-summarized political chronology of Quebec does not intend by any means to depict the interethnic conditions of the province sociologically. On the contrary, it aims at elucidating how former alliances and grievances among ethnic groups of First Nations and European ancestry has to be taken into account if we want to understand the present historic situation in its whole and full complexity. The nationalistic claims in Quebec appear under this perspective less as a phenomena of "spontaneous combustion" and more like a gradual heating resulting from interethnic friction.[6]

It is a major paradox that such disputes for the political control of Quebec have received the name of "Quiet Revolution" since the very core of this revolution is the self-identification of the Francophone population as Quebecois instead of "Franco-Canadian" or Canadien implying therefore a certain amount of "separatism" from the "rest of Canada".[7] This self-identification redefined the assimilation problem of the Francophone by a hegemonic Anglophone Canada into a recognition problem (see Taylor et al. 1994) for the Anglophone to solve.

It is at critical moments such as these that we find the best opportunities to capture the nation-building conflicts and contradictions that entail them. In 1962, the negotiations regarding the Canadian Constitution began. Quebec's representatives rejected the terms proposed in 1964. Thirteen years later, in 1977, the Law 101 was created in order to regulate the teaching of English and French languages in Canada: 1) limiting the access of immigrants to Anglophone schools; 2) promoting the Francophonization of companies that employed over 40 workers; and 3) prohibiting the use of English in the advertisements of the mass media. Before the promulgation of Law 101, the dominant view was that the English language was overtaking the French language forcing it to disappear in Montreal and all over the province after it. English was not only the official business idiom but it was also immigrant's first choice in order to integrate Quebec's society.[8]

The rest of Canada's population took the Salvationist spirit of the Law 101 rather negatively and in 1988 the third aspect of the law was taken to be unconstitutional. In the words of Cardoso de Oliveira (1999:6):

> "Como tem sido apontado por vários autores as diversas posições políticas em defesa dos interesses do Quebec na federação Canadense têm como ponto comum a preocupação com a sobrevivência do 'fato francês' na América do Norte, e os conflitos com *anglófonos* (dentro e fora do Quebec) e *alófonos* (os imigrantes não identificados imediatamente com nenhum dos dois grupos lingüísticos dominantes do Canadá) têm encontrado no chamado debate lingüístico seu principal canal de expressão".[9]

In a context where the language is converted in the main source of self-identification for a particular population (namely, it is converted in a symbol for the Quebecois identity) it becomes possible to observe the social production of an "Identity Project" (Castells 1999:24) by the majority of the Francophone population. Meanwhile it is important to realize that if (from the Francophone point of view) such an identity can be seen as a collective project, such project can also be seen (from the Anglophone, Allophone and First Nations point of view) as a legitimizing identity, an identity imposed by the dominant institutions of society over the individuals in order to expand and rationalize its forms of domination (Castells 1999:24). This has to be said to overcome dichotomist models of interpretation of the facts related to Quebec's nationalism that tend to make it all seem like a matter of bilingualism.

In this context of unquestionable pragmatism reached by the exercise of linguistic autonomy (to paraphrase Cardoso de Oliveira in his discussion about the Catalan *seny*, 1995) we can notice how strong the "Francophonicity" ideology can be in order to shape a Quebecois national identity far beyond the influences of Catholicism or Napoleonic juridical practices.[10] Cardoso de Oliveira (1999:17) found the efficacy of the "Francophonicity" in its articulation of a "resented rhetoric" towards the rest of Canada inconsideration of its "cultural difference" as some sort of "moral insult".

Before we go any further with the political chronology that guides this paper I consider relevant to question how, by whom and with what purpose does a national identity come to exist. These seem to be crucial questions for our understanding of Quebec's political and social movements in the late XXth century. I do not aim to deal with them right now. My purpose in posing these questions is restricted to the objective of presenting Quebec's political issues as a complex context for the ethnographic research of the emergence of styles of ethnology in a particular nation-state.

To keep Castells' ideas in mind it is important to follow the explosion of nationalist movements in this *fin de siècle* because some of them are responsible for the deconstruction of multinational states, others for the construction of plurinational entities and yet others for perfecting models of federalism like the Canadian case and Quebec's quasi-state claims (Castells 1999:48-49).

On May 20 1980, the first referendum about Quebec's sovereignty was issued. The Federalists – or those who do not share the idea of an autonomous Quebec – won with 59,6% of the votes. It is worth reminding that the process of negotiation of the Canadian Constitution, which had begun in the sixties, was reassured in the eighties and was once again rejected by the oppositionist Quebecois representatives. It happened after two years of the Federalist victory in the referendum. These political events updated the secular dilemma of keeping Quebec integrated in political and economic terms but subjugated in moral terms.

It is important to keep in mind that the Quebecois did not claim their independence from the federation but claimed instead specific conditions to guarantee its civic survival as a cultural entity (an issue very poorly understood by fellow Anglophone Canadians). This demand for such conditions generated the Meech Lake agreement signed on April 30 1987 and had as a counterpart the subscription of Quebec in the repatriated Constitution. In 1990, Manitoba and Newfoundland refused to ratify the Meech Lake Agreement raising protests in Quebec. What happened was that:

> "Além de considerar a nova carta de direitos uma ameaça para sua sobrevivência cultural, a população franco-quebequense tende a interpretar a rejeição dos acordos do Lago Meech e de Charlottetown como uma negação de sua identidade e, portanto, como atos de desconsideração ou como um insulto moral" (Cardoso de Oliveira 1999:13).[11]

Five years later, in 1995, the score of this game of articulation of moral and political realms of debate in the second referendum was that the proposal of handling to Quebec's government a mandate to negotiate with Canada a new political and economic partnership was rejected by (only) 50,6% to 49,4% of the votes (Cardoso de Oliveira

1999:12). The voters were composed of 82% of Francophones (61% of whom voted *yes* for the shared sovereignty) and 18% of Anglophones and Allophones (90% of whom voted *no*). It shows the different perceptions of the parts involved regarding the ethnic issues implied in the shared sovereignty claim.

If we decide to skip 30 years of updated information in order to retain John Porter's (1975) ideas on the ethnic segmentation of Canada we will be able to capture some long standing issues behind the referendum results. Porter assumed a comparative perspective between Canada and the United States. Such perspective allowed him to notice the fact that both countries have very visible national minorities like the Afro-American population in the US and the French-speaking population in Canada. Both minorities have suffered from unequal access to the economic welfare of the country and suffered stigmatization and moral depreciation to a considerable extent. However, unlike the Afro-Americans, the symbolic power of the French-speaking population to influence national decisions in Canada is much greater than their neighbors in the US who does not have to deal with language barrier problems.

As we have seen so forth it is pretty much clear that the future of Francophone and Anglophone relations in Canada depends heavily on the system of interethnic relations inside the provinces where the immigrant and First-Nations' participation can and actually does play a strong influence in the national consciousness. Such participation was determinant for the definition of the last referendum results but what do they think about the nationalist protests of the Quebecois? Perhaps we should formulate this question departing from Canadian anthropologists reflections on the matter. Rémi Savard, for example, as a Quebecois anthropologist, assumes the following position toward his colleagues at the University of British Columbia (UBC) in the West of Canada:

> "Le résultat de tout cette histoire, c'est que le Québec est devenu la partie la plus à vif d'un pays dont le malaise généralisé tient à ce que a culture politique séculaire le rend inapte à concevoir le pluralisme, et qu'il semble avoir perdu tout dynamisme susceptible d'irriguer à nouveau un imaginaire politique créateur don't nous avons de plus en plus besoin pour sortir de cette crise qui n'en fini plus de finir" (Savard 1992:6).

The imposing dilemma was noticed by Porter and refers to the difficult task of situating multiculturalism within a bilingual power structure. It elucidates the fact that the polarization between Francophones and Anglophones in Canada, and in Quebec, promotes a hierarchy of inequalities or an asymmetry lived by Allophone and First-Nations from within. These latter segments of society (who can also be seen as societies inside a nation) cannot avoid grasping this ethnic stratification as a situation of domination or pure colonialism. The contrastive character of Quebecois ethnic identity (which tends to oppose and deny ethnocentrically the Anglophone character) is perceived negatively by the non-Francophones of Quebec.

Therefore, the protectionist measures to save the "French Fact" in Canada ends up in a dialogical deficit among the non-Francophones in Quebec who perceive it as a privilege of an already privileged population. This is responsible for the failure of the recognition of cultural symbols valued across the ethnic segments of Quebec society as a common basis for a more cohesive social movement towards the rest of Canada and it also raises some suspicion among the non-Francophones about the equal redistribution of political and economic benefits that could come from Quebec's sovereignty.

Anthropologists and Anthropology cannot escape being caught inside this political arena specially those anthropologists who happen to work and to do research among non-Francophone communities and First-Nations. It is my opinion that such political encirclement of Anthropology in Quebec has to be taken into account if we want to explain how the dilemmas of involvement faced by anthropologists are formed and (unre)solved in this Canadian province.[12] That is the subject that I would like to discuss next.

II

There is a common theme arising from the literature concerned with the forms of relationship generated when anthropologists and natives come together. This theme consists in the entanglement between emotional involvement and political activity (or activism) of the anthropologists with the native's political agenda. The Quebec case as we have seen in the later pages reveals itself an interesting scenario for the participant observation of styles of anthropology (and of indigenous ethnology) that can and do take place when national demands are at stake. In sum Quebec is a revealing context of the kind of "politization" that takes place in Anthropology when anthropologists are "ethnicized" by their subjects of study.

Before taking a hasty glance at the particular case of Quebec I suggest to follow Noel Dyck's (1990) arguments on the kind of ethnology that has been practiced in Canada. Departing from a time sequence beginning in the early seventies until the early nineties (of the XXth century) Dyck develops some ideas about the increasing number of publications (scientific or not) related to the First Nations in Canada. The predominance of the anthropological interest and concern for them has been challenged by different social agents and agencies and most significantly by the Indians themselves. Once this statement was made, Dyck proposed a classification of the studies carried on with or by First Nations researchers in Canada. This classification consists in three major categories: traditional ethnology, acculturation studies and interethnic relations.[13]

Under the first two categories Dyck points the influence of the style of Anthropology practiced almost simultaneously in the United States where the traditional ethnological studies were built around Franz Boas' ideas on the "salvage anthropology" of vanishing Indian cultures. Notions and concepts assembled in the US scientific field also oriented acculturation studies and were responsible for the basis that supported ethnohistoric studies in a second moment of ethnology in Canada. The third category departed from a local field, it recognized the existing tensions, frictions and problems lived by First Nations under the dominance, tutelage or wardship of the Canadian state.

Dyck asserts that in the seventies most of the anthropological work being done about First Nations was held by anthropologists hired by universities, museums and government agencies and therefore it was no surprise that the "self-awareness" of the anthropologists towards the Indians problems aroused from the observation of the state and companies aggressiveness to shape and determine the future of entire villages, communities and peoples.

The White Paper controversy in 1969-70 meant during this period: "(...) uma espécie de 'Decreto de Emancipação', que visava revogar a Ata Indígena e declarar o fim da responsabilidade do governo federal com

relação aos povos indígenas, assim passando a administração de suas áreas às províncias" (Baines 1996:10)[14]. This controversy – as well as the James Bay controversy in Quebec – gave some social and political visibility to the asymmetric situation lived by First Nations within the Canadian nation. It revealed the critical dimension that surrounded native leaderships, state representatives and development interests over native lands.

In the words of Noel Dyck:

"(…) anthropological fieldworkers suddenly found themselves obliged to take account of political issues and relationships which stretched far beyond traditional ethnographic locales such as traplines into new settings such as parliamentary committee hearings, courtrooms and corporate offices in Ottawa, Montreal, Vancouver and New York, and back again to local native communities (Salisbury 1986). To comprehend what has been happening at the local level anthropologists have had to move beyond the analytical framework and assumptions of both traditional ethnology and acculturation studies and to grapple with issues and institutions that, in turn, lead us into fields and arenas better known to practioners of other disciplines" (1990:42).

Or to use the words of Stephen Baines:

"Vários dos entrevistados salientaram a controvérsia do 'White Paper', de 1969-70, como o ponto de mudanças fundamentais na etnologia indígena realizada no Canadá, de uma 'etnografia de resgate' ou etnologia tradicional, estudos de aculturação, e estudos sobre as relações entre os povos aborígenes e a sociedade canadense, para uma antropologia que tem que levar em consideração vários fatores novos. Por exemplo, as definições nativas a respeito de assuntos nativos, a necessidade do antropólogo negociar com os povos os termos de realização das pesquisas, situações que envolvem projetos de desenvolvimento econômico de grande escala e que envolvem as comunidades locais em eventos mundiais, o crescimento enorme do número de consultores antropológicos, processos de reivindicação territorial, política indígena, e um clima de críticas dirigidas à antropologia pelos povos nativos e por diversos agentes da sociedade nacional" (Baines 1996:14).[15]

The result of this new moral (rather than merely epistemological) demand was the creation of new fieldwork conditions for anthropologists where many turned themselves into "Janus-faced" consultants or experts working simultaneously for the Nation State and to First Nations. According to Dyck it consisted on a transformation of the nature of the field of study (1990:43), nevertheless I would like to ask if this really reflected a substantial change of the field or rather a substantial change of the way of perceiving the field. If my hypothesis is correct we would have to recognize that anthropologists' self-awareness to native problems came very late in comparison to the readiness of the government and companies to take decisions concerning the fate of First Nations. The field has always been changing and anthropological awareness for change and transformation has never been its strongest contribution to the comprehension of social processes. As Baines points out:

"O 'White Paper' foi fortemente criticado pelos povos aborígenes, que divulgaram seu 'Red Paper', passando a exigir uma reforma, e não a revogação, da Ata Indígena, e um reconhecimento mais explícito dos direitos indígenas na legislação canadense, o que foi parcialmente alcançado com a Ata Constitucional de 1982. Em 1969, agentes indigenistas foram retirados das reservas indígenas, numa tentativa de acabar com o paternalismo governamental, e, a partir de 1970, o governo passou a financiar organizações indígenas" (Baines 1996:10).[16]

If we turn our attention back to the ethnological practice in Canada, returning to the typology formulated by Dyck, we will deal with four remaining sub-categories: ethnohistory, ethnology, community studies and indigenous-

state relations. I would add a fifth sub-category, namely: native studies accomplished by the Indians themselves. In the midst of these fields of anthropology, Dyck identifies important accomplishments of the discipline, among them the inclusion of the moral dimension as a crucial aspect of interethnic relations. The apprehension of this dimension by anthropologists came as a consequence of the White Paper controversy that exposed every kind of study mentioned above to a politization process that forced them to become more and more critically concerned with the future of indigenous persons, villages and the consequences of social policies.

Taking this point as a starting point I think it would be interesting to approach at this moment some aspects of the political involvement of anthropologists in First Nations matters in order to interpret this involvement as an ingredient of the increasing reflexivity in Canadian anthropology. I would like to suggest hypothetically that social bonds of ethnic and national nature play a strong role in the conditioning of the forms of involvement that can take place during, before and after anthropological fieldwork. This is not a new problem.

The Egyptian anthropologist Hussein Fahim (1977) revealed and commented the symbolic importance of the national dimension in the evaluation of his own practice in Sudan. He was concerned with the exchanging identifications of the anthropologist's purpose in favor or against native claims in relation to his identification with national interests. This led Fahim to name the research conducted by anthropologists within the national boundaries of their countries "indigenous" and under the phrase "indigenous anthropology", both "ethnicity and nationality" are implied (Fahim 1977:81).

On the other hand, the anthropologist Kirin Narayan (1993) pointed that this questions should not be taken so categorically. Instead of establishing a clear distinction between "native" and "non-native" anthropologists she prefers to think every anthropological work in terms of ever changing identifications negotiated within an interethnic field where communities and persons interpenetrate (Narayan 1993:671). Her proposal consists in: "Rather than try to sort out who is authentically a 'native' anthropologist and who is not, surely it is more rewarding to examine the ways in which each one of us is situated in relation to the people we study" (:678).

Considering these arguments the situation of the indigenous/native ethnology practiced in Quebec does note constitute a novelty in terms of anthropological questioning. However, it surely presents itself as a resourceful field of study for the achievement of some answers. In his preliminary study on the styles of ethnology in Canada Baines (1996) comments that few anthropologists, in the sixties decade, practiced and applied anthropology[17]:

> "Contudo, na década de 70, a questão do nacionalismo quebequense e o controle da economia de Quebec preocupou muitos antropólogos. Assim, conforme Hedican (1995:17-18), a controvérsia em volta do projeto hidrelétrico da Baía de James enfocou menos o contexto da questão indígena e dos direitos aborígenes e mais o contexto do nacionalismo quebequense e a independência econômica do Quebec do Canadá anglófono" (Baines 1996:16).[18]

Projects in "applied anthropology" started to appear after this situation particularly among Anglophone anthropologists in Quebec who aimed at working with First Nations (Inglis 1982). It was also observable that studies focused on political domination were also scarce under this scenario. Immersed on a politically delicate context such as Quebec Anglophone anthropologists seem to be developing a style of short fieldwork periods alternated with consultant work in the city that allows only an intermittent following of indigenous lives in their villages. In the

meanwhile, Francophone anthropologists in Quebec appear to have avoided the First Nations as a research topic in Quebec moving themselves toward different fields, provinces and countries (see Baines 1996:21).

These very brief information and comments on the ethnology in Quebec does not aim at presenting the complex relationships emerged from ethnographic research in Quebec but they do help us to question the erroneous idea of a single style of ethnology (not to say anthropology) being practiced in national contexts as well as to indicate how local nationalist perspectives come into play contradicting and tensioning the universalistic claims of Anthropology. What seems particularly interesting to me consists in observing the different strategies developed by anthropologists to manage the level of involvement required by the subjects of their studies in these contexts. In the words of Dyck and Waldram:

> "Because of its distinctive fieldwork methods and analytical approach (…), anthropology has had to confront a difficult methodological problem that other disciplines interested in public policy have largely ignored: the management of the operating distance created between a discipline and the people, practices, and processes it studies. Anthropologists have long struggles with the implications of two quite different ways of dealing with this problem. As a first option, anthropologists could seek to maintain the traditional conceptual distance between themselves above their subjects by a variety of means, including the use of non-reflexive concepts and measures, thereby placing themselves above their subjects, in a position of epistemological superiority. (…) The second option is to acknowledge these problems of distance and representation and to confront the impact of our investigations and writings on those whom we study (…). This approach recognizes the 'interested' nature of all knowledge in such a manner as to assist the people we study (or with whom we work) to exercise greater control over managing their lives and social arrangements" (1993:13-14)[19].

To these two options seem to correspond forms (qua styles) of self-positioning based on moral distance or proximity by Francophone and Anglophone anthropologists, respectively, in Quebec towards First Nations. Both types of positioning are conditioned by the ethnonationalist processes carried on in the province by the Quebecois. The political identification of the social agents and of the social scientists with the political claims in Quebec seems to organize in contrastive identities (Anglophone *x* Francophone; Federalists *x* Nationalists; Applied Anthropologists *x* Traditional Ethnologists and so on) that will shape different forms of involvement and styles of ethnology in this province. To say it differently, the Quebec case provides an ethnic background for the creation of different styles of ethnology that will affect the Canadian style of anthropology at large and its universal status as an anthropological discipline. What will come after that only time can say and ethnography can describe.

Cristhian Teófilo da Silva é doutor em Antropologia pela Universidade de Brasília e pesquisador do Centro de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação sobre as Américas (CEPPAC), da mesma instituição.

NOTAS / ENDNOTES

1   This paper is presented here as a preliminary result of a four weeks survey (September-October 2004) in Vancouver-BC and Montreal-QB. This survey was financed by the Faculty Research Program provided by the Canadian Embassy in Brazil and in order to attend the Program's requirements it had to be written originally in English. I would like to specially thank Silvia Reis (Public Diplomacy and Education Officer at the Canadian Embassy) for her kind support helping me prepare my paperwork and trip to Canada, Prof. PhD. Stephen Grant Baines and Prof. PhD. Luís Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira for recommending my project and myself to the program. I would also like to thank Prof. PhD. Noel Dyck (SFU), Prof. PhD. Dara Culhane (SFU) and Prof. PhD. Bruce Miller (UBC) for their collaboration and insightful conversations about my research project and curiosity about Canadian anthropology. Finally, I would like to thank the anonymous reader of this article for his/her suggestions and the Graduate Program and Center of Research of the Americas (CEPPAC) at the University of Brasilia (UnB) for the PRODOC/CAPES scholarship that created the proper conditions for the elaboration of this article. The ideas presented here are, as usual, entirely of my personal responsibility.

2   I would like to thank Don Bain (Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs) and Melvin Henry (street artist) for kindly receiving and presenting to me a preliminary overview of how local politics affect First Nations lives in Vancouver and in British Columbia. Your opinions certainly constitute my first impressions, which shall influence all my further reflections on the theme.

3   See Savard (1992) and Baines (1996) for an introduction to the problematic relationship of Indians and anthropologists in Quebec and in Canada as well as an introduction to the field of Comparative Anthropology focused on Indigenous Ethnology.

4   At least 40 indigenous villages are recognized nowadays by the Canadian government in Quebec, most of them Cree, Mohawk, Micmac and Inuit.

5   New Brunswick (the second larger Francophone population in Canada) suffered such measures by the Common School Act, followed by the province of Prince Edward, in 1877.

6   On the "heroic era" of Canada and of Quebec in particular see Bruce Trigger (1985).

7   See Gerald Gold and Marc-Adélard Tremblay (1982) about the quiet revolution in Quebec.

8   The majority of immigrants to Canada in the XXth century came from Eastern Europe, Middle East and Southeast Asia, particularly from India.

9   "It has been pointed out by several authors that the political positions to defend Quebec's interests in the Canadian federation has the common concern with the survival of the "French Fact" in North America and the conflicts with the Anglophones (inside or outside Quebec) and with the Allophones (immigrants not immediately identified with any of the two linguistically dominant groups of Canada) has found in the linguistic debate its main channel of expression" (translation CTS).

10 I can not say to what extent the "Francophonicity" of the Quebecois could generate a way of being in the same sense that the "seny" does for the Catalan.

11 "Beyond the consideration of the new bill of rights as a threat to their cultural survival the French-Quebecois population had an inclination to interpret the rejection of the Meech Lake and of the Charlottetown agreements as a denial of their identity and therefore took it as inconsideration acts or moral insults" (translation CTS).

12 I call "dilemmas" the epistemological, political, moral and emotional issues regarding the anthropological involvement with First-Nations because they are delicate problems for the local practiners of a human science that claims itself to be universal (see Peirano 1992).

13 In Brazil, this type of study has been combined with "acculturation studies" under the name of "contact studies".

14 "(…) some 'kind of Emancipation Act' that aimed to derogate the Indian Act and declare the end of federal government responsibility for indigenous peoples after handling them over to provincial governments" (translation CTS).

15 "Many (anthropologists interviewed in Canada) asserted that the 'White Paper', 1969-70, was the turning point of fundamental changes in the indigenous ethnology practiced in Canada from a "salvage ethnography" or traditional ethnology, acculturation studies

and interethnic studies between Indians and fragments of Canadian society to an Anthropology that had to take into consideration several new factors. For example, the native definitions about native issues, the necessity of the anthropologist to negotiate with the people he/she wants to work with the terms of his/her research activity, situations that are shaped by large development projects which encompasses local communities and places them in the core of global concerns and events, the increasing number of anthropological advocacy practioners, land claims, indigenous politics and an attitude of criticism towards anthropology by native peoples and several other agents of the national society" (translation CTS).

16 "The 'White Paper' was strongly criticized by aborigines who presented their 'Red Paper' to claim a reform, if not the derogation, of the Indian Act and a more explicit recognition of their rights in the Canadian legislation what was partially achieved with the Constitutional Act in 1982. In 1969 indigenist agents were taken away from indigenous reservations in order to attempt to put an end on government paternalism and on 1970 the government started to finance indigenous organizations (…)" (translation CTS).

17 See also Gold and Tremblay (1983).

18 "Nevertheless, in the seventies decade, the Quebec nationalist question and the control of Quebec's economy concerned many anthropologists. Therefore, according to Hedican (1995:17-18) the James Bay hydroelectric project controversy focused less on the indigenous question and their rights and more on the Quebecois nationalism and the economic independence of Quebec by the Anglophone Canada" (translation CTS). In September 1997, according to the *Vancouver Sun*, Cree and Inuit leaderships residing near James Bay claimed that Quebec was planning and "ethnic occupation" of their lands through the settlement of 2000 non-indigenous families to word for the electric sector.

19 As we can see this is a matter worth exploring to advance some reflections on the topic of native participation in the generation of anthropological knowledge (I would like to thank Prof. Bruce Miller for calling my attention to this research topic).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAINES, S. G. 1996. "Etnologia Indígena no Canadá: Primeiras impressões". *Série Antropologia* 196. Brasília: UnB/ Departamento de Antropologia.

CARDOSO DE OLIVEIRA, L. R. 1999. "Dois Pequenos Ensaios sobre Cultura, Política e Demandas de Reconhecimento no Quebec". *Série Antropologia* 250. Brasília: UnB/ Departamento de Antropologia.

CARDOSO DE OLIVEIRA, R. 1988. *Sobre o Pensamento Antropológico*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.

_____ . 1995. "Identidade Catalã e Ideologia Étnica". *Mana* 1(1).

CASTELLS, M. 1999. *O Poder da Identidade*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

DYCK, N. 1990. "Cultures, Communities and Claims: Anthropology and Native Studies in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXII, 3.

_____ . 1996. *What is the Indian 'Problem': Tutelage and Resistance in Canadian Indian Administration*. St John: ISER.

DYCK, N. & J. Waldram. 1993. *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada*. Montreal: McGill University Press.

FAHIM, H. 1977. "Foreign and Indigenous Anthropology: The Perspectives of an Indigenous Anthropologist". *Journal of the Society for Applied Anthropology* 36(20. Washington.

GOLD, G. & M-A. Tremblay. 1982. "After the Quiet Revolution: Quebec Anthropology and the Study of Quebec". *Ethnos* 47(I-II):103-132.

_____ . 1983. "Steps toward an Anthropology of Quebec 1960-1980". In Frank Manning (ed.) *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada.

INGLIS, G. 1982. "In Bed with the Elephant: Anthropology in Anglophone Canada". *Ethnos* 47(I-II):81-102.

NARAYAN, K. 1993. "How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist?" *American Anthropologist* 95(3).

PEIRANO, M. 1992. *Uma Antropologia no Plural: Três experiências contemporâneas*. Brasília: Ed. UnB.

PORTER, J. 1975. "Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective". In N. Glazer & D. Moynihan (eds.) *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

SAVARD, R. 1992. "Les Autochtones du Québec dans la Crise Politique Canadienne". *Culture* XII(1).

TAYLOR, C.; K. A. Appiah; J. Habermas; S. Rockeffeller; M. Walzer & S. Wolf (eds.). 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

TRIGGER, B. 1985. *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" reconsidered*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

WEAVER, S. 1984. "Struggles of the Nation-State to Define Aboriginal Ethnicity: Canada and Australia". In R. Paine (ed.) *Minorities and Mother-Country Imagery*. St. John: ISER.

Cristhian Teófilo da Silva

A Antropologia e o Jogo da Etnicidade entre Povos Originários no Canadá: O caso de Quebec

R E S U M O

Este artigo apresentará o Quebec como uma província multicultural, a qual se encontra etnicamente polarizada de tal modo a afetar os processos de formação de estilos de etnologia indígena. Os dados apresentados aqui são de três tipos: cronologia política, relações interétnicas e demandas coletivas. Espera-se promover com esta breve apresentação a especificidade do Quebec como um estudo de caso etnográfico para a pesquisa sobre o desenvolvimento de estilos de etnologia em contextos nacionais.
PALAVRAS-CHAVE: etnicidade – estilos de etnologia indígena – Quebec

Anthropology and Ethnicity's Interplay among First Nations in Canada: The case of Quebec

A B S T R A C T

This article presents Quebec as a multicultural province, which is ethnically polarized in such a way as to affect the processes of formation of different styles of ethnology. The data presented here are of three kinds: political chronology, interethnic relations and collective demands. It is our expectation to promote with this brief presentation Quebec's uniqueness as an ethnographic case study for the research of the development of styles of ethnology in national contexts.
KEY WORDS: ethnicity – styles of ethnology - Quebec