

Hunting, Nature, and Metaphor: Political and Discursive Strategies in James Bay Cree Resistance and Autonomy

HARVEY A. FEIT

James Bay Cree representations of their hunting society, which were developed during the debates over the James Bay hydroelectric projects in northern Quebec, were shaped both by Cree cultural meanings and by the cultural patterns of non-Native North Americans. Cree elders and younger spokespersons sought effective means of communicating to non-Natives a sense of Cree relationships with the lands on which they live and with the animals they hunt. These intercultural discourses took place in the context of developing international alliances between Cree and environmentalists, as well as in the historical context of fur trade relations and of Christian missionization. The metaphors that were used by Cree and non-Natives to enrich these dialogues were exchanged back and forth, carrying earlier meanings as they took on new nuances. They were also vital to discourses building unity among Cree of different generations and of different “lifestyles.” In this paper I will explore the development and importance of several features of these political and discursive strategies for indigenous resistance and autonomy. At the center of these communications are dialogues on nature, production, spirituality, moral standing, and political action.

The Problematic of Discourse and Power

The Cree people's opposition to development of their lands without their consent acknowledges fundamental and enduring conflicts of interest and control with non-Native polities and economies, and it involves them in diverse forms of political action and complex forms of communication with sectors of non-Native North American society.¹ Current strategies of the Cree leadership depend on their already having developed a substantial political organization and regional government, on their having some monetary resources under their own control, and also on having developed rich understandings of the linkages and differences between Cree and non-Native North American cultural meanings and practices. The first two of these conditions are more frequently emphasized than the last.

Their representational strategies depend, in part, on their presenting Cree positions with frameworks and terms drawn from the encapsulating societies. One challenge the Cree leadership faces is to resist fighting the battles in forms the state or market institutions prescribe and, instead, to find ways to communicate and reassert Cree cultural meanings without extensively or simply remaking them in the image of the dominant cultures of North American institutions.

Social analysts have differed about whether the use by partly subordinated groups of the concepts, metaphors, and rhetorical strategies of dominant institutions and cultures entails an incorporation of dominant forms of knowing, representing, talking, valuing, acting, and self-restraint into their societies. Do such uses entail increased subordination or limitations on forms of resistance to dominant institutions?

One of the most original features of James C. Scott's seminal analyses of resistance was his emphasis on how everyday forms of resistance depend on the very categories and claims of dominant groups within a society.² By claiming to serve society-wide interests and not just class or group interests, ideologies of dominant groups create the conditions on which they can be challenged and critiqued. Resistance thus draws on dominant ideologies; it takes up their affirmation of values of common good and collective interest and reaffirms and reproduces those values as it critiques performances that do not achieve them. Resistance does so, even as those values are under erosion by dominant groups, and even though those values are

being simultaneously promoted and denied in the practices and legitimation strategies of dominant groups.

Many critics, however, have seen this as also limiting and subordinating resistance, and as channelling it into acceptable forms. This may be enhanced where the political action is not between village classes in daily face-to-face interaction, as in the case analysed by Scott, but between social groups or encapsulated societies and nation-states. Here, claims of serving the common good are distanced and may be more totally dependent on imagined commonalities and claims.³ In these cases many of the categories and values drawn from dominant discourses in the course of political action are not values of a daily shared community, but values of nation-building and economic institutions—including national histories, property and labor laws, public education, institutionalized technology and science, systems of public order, mass media news and entertainment, gender and ethnic differentiation, and consumerism. Critics are a lot less sanguine about what is gained and lost when political action takes up these dominant categories and values. Yet, Scott's emphasis on the particular role of tropes that reference past social relations is important, especially where those relations are still claimed as present and future possibilities.

In *Custom and Confrontation*, Roger Keesing examined the sphere of local autonomy within a colonial, and then developing, state and challenged too limited a reading of the possibilities for resistance.⁴ He argued that even where resistance to the state uses the categories, terminology, organizational structures, and semiotic patterns of colonial and neo-colonial authorities, this can lead to more effective resistance rather than increased subordination, as it did in the case of the Kwaio people in the Solomon Islands whose century-long struggles of resistance he recounts. Keesing argued that even though the Kwaio adopted discourses and practices from the state institutions asserting domination, this did not enhance domination because they used these practices oppositionally. Keesing's exploration of the Kwaio's sustained colonial resistance is, like Scott's, sensitive to the constraints on and limits of resistance.

Both these accounts of resistance leave open possibilities that need to be explored in other contexts, such as political action by indigenous peoples encapsulated in modern neoliberal states, where the oppositions as well as linkages richly connect the local-, regional-, and

national-level practices. These linkages make assessing “fourth world,” or indigenous, political action particularly complicated. For example, in *Labors Lot*, Elizabeth Povinelli, looking at indigenous resistance within Australia, noted how legal dominance was asserted without erasing indigenous discourses of resistance and autonomy, and also how these latter discourses were themselves used by and benefited the state.⁵ On the one hand, Aboriginal discourses and practices were richly reproduced, locally and regionally, as they were being re-shaped in changing contexts. But Aboriginal customary practices, on the other hand, she argued, also contribute to state projects—political, economic, and cultural—as in Australia’s tourist promotion and film and media industries and in legitimating both national identity and its asserted achievement of social progress. In each instance, she argues the state offers limited land-rights and self-determination in exchange for a form of Aboriginality useful to it. However, while Australian practices thereby shape the local, she also shows that Aboriginal political action and their relations with the land intrude in unanticipated ways on Australian understandings of self, knowledge, property, and nation through legal cases and daily practices of land use. Here, political action is both subordinated and sustained.⁶

In this paper I want to explore and elaborate on some elements of each of these analyses, by considering indigenous political action under conditions where the local group interacts beyond the state itself in international political, media, and market arenas, and where indigenous communities use strategies that seek alliances with other communities and organizations of opposition within the wider polities. I will argue that in these cases, and especially where indigenous political strategies do not depend solely or primarily on the central arenas for state control of diversity—including legal claims and the assertion of indigenous rights, political lobbying, or idealized ethnic traditionalism—political action need not necessarily lead to enhanced domination even though the resistance uses discursive resources of the dominant society. Furthermore, state uses of indigenes may also be thwarted, and indigenous resistance may limit the means of control at the disposal of state and market institutions, although without undermining these capacities in themselves.

The case of the James Bay Cree opposition to hydroelectric projects serves this purpose well, because here, indigenous groups move directly into the public spheres, engage internationally with markets

and media, and actively seek to remake the image not only of themselves as indigenes, but of the state as well. I draw on each of the contributions cited above in order to explore contemporary conditions for indigenous Cree political action. I do so more or less in the reverse order to that which I have just set out:

- First I explore some of the ways James Bay Cree challenge neoliberal state and market institutions, and in the process significantly limit the utility of their own indigenes to those who would govern them and develop their lands.
- Then I explore how this depends, in part, on a several-decades-long process of developing intercultural discursive strategies essential both to building alliances and to shaping media and wider public opinion.
- Last I explore how the potentially subordinating outcomes of using these political and discursive borrowings were limited by the capacity to sustain an indigenous dialogue among elder Cree, Cree spokespersons, and school-educated Cree youth about what it is to be and to remain Cree.

I will thus move from the story of political events, to cultural and intercultural practices, to the history of colonial relationships, and on to intergenerational discourses. In addition, I highlight three features of the semiotic practices the Cree develop that play key roles in their strategies:

- Cree sought concepts, terms, and metaphors from among the elements of an encapsulating culture which were not primarily used to legitimate and naturalize state power or economic interests, but which were commonly associated with social relations of domestic arenas, self-sufficient production, and collective moral responsibility.
- Thus, when these metaphors are taken up and used both by Cree and by non-Native institutions, they convey meanings that refer beyond central institutions and legitimations of state and market power to alternative social relations: in Cree usage conveying across cultures a sense of the Cree social universe to non-Native North Americans; and in state usage unwittingly reducing the state claims that opposition be restricted to acceptable forms.

- Cree elders use these same metaphors and discursive practices to build images among Cree of different generations of their relations to historical and contemporary “others,” both emphasizing spiritual and civilizational commonalities with non-Natives and highlighting cultural and social differences.

Background to the Cree Struggles and the Problem of Explaining Public Support

The approximately twelve thousand James Bay Cree Indians are a subarctic people living in nine separate communities east of James Bay in northern Quebec and Canada. Since the 1970s they have had modern housing, and they live in villages with schools and health services when they are not out hunting. A compromise agreement on the land claims of the James Bay Cree and the Inuit of Quebec,⁷ which resulted from the opposition to the first phase of the hydroelectric project, was signed in 1975. In the agreement the Cree were unable to prevent the completion of the first of three massive phases of hydroelectric development and the opening of the region to expanded resource developments, including forestry and mining. The agreement negotiations accelerated the development of a Cree regional society and political institutions; they formalized Cree regional and local governments, and recognized the distinctiveness of Cree society.⁸ From the point of view of Quebec and Canadian officials, the agreement clarified and formalized the place of the Cree as a collectivity within the Quebec and Canadian states, administratively and legally.⁹ Nevertheless, Cree political and self-government organizations now have over C\$200 million of investments and manage over C\$75 million per year of government funds for schools, health care, social benefits, community administration, and income support payments for full-time hunters. Their cultural, organizational, and financial resources provide a capacity for relatively autonomous political actions.

Today, about one-quarter of the adult population hunts full-time, spending an average of seven months of the year in small camps of one to five families located at sites in the “bush.” It is not widely recognized that the number of “full-time” hunters is as high as it has ever been, although it is a declining proportion of the growing Cree population. About one-third of the population have steady jobs, mostly in

the Cree governmental organizations which service the communities. The balance are underemployed and generally young. Hunting is highly valued and actively participated in on a part-time basis by nearly all workers and unemployed, who themselves spend an average of approximately two months a year hunting. Hunting therefore continues to be a key to Cree identities and extended domestic relations, and it provides a significant input to family and community diets, health, and well-being.

The Hudson’s Bay Company (H.B.C.) established its first fur trade post on James Bay in 1668, although French trade goods and traders had been in the region earlier than that. The early traders were dependent on Cree for food as well as furs, and both Cree stories of encounters with “whitemen,” the common term in Cree English for non-Natives, and European records suggest that the relationships between the isolated traders and Cree hunters involved slowly changing dependencies and opportunities for actualizing significant profits by traders and that Cree autonomy continued, waned, and was renewed.¹⁰

The Cree people were missionized initially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and more effectively and continuously since the middle of the nineteenth century. Most Cree were Christians by the mid-twentieth century, although some have maintained or returned to solely traditional spirituality. Earlier in the twentieth century, nearly all Cree were Anglicans, with a few Roman Catholic converts, but many have become adherents of Pentecostal denominations in the last four decades. Most of the Christian James Bay Cree hunters, whichever denomination they belong to, have incorporated Jesus at the head of a hierarchy of spirit beings and animal masters, all of whom have become his helpers. Adult Cree hunters still dream of animal spirits to learn where to look for the animals they will catch, and they often say that both dreams and Jesus are sources of their knowledge and power.

The cultural meanings and practices of the James Bay Cree people have thus gone through continuing changes and transformations, but they remain distinct from the surrounding cultures and societies by choice. There are, however, diverse Cree meanings and practices today.

The James Bay Cree have been involved for nearly three decades in a series of struggles against the massive hydroelectric and forestry developments being conducted on their lands. The challenges to date have been fought in large part by a formally educated Cree leadership

working closely with traditional leaders and hunting territory “owners.” The leadership has taken their message to centers of political and economic power in Canada, the United States, and Europe. They have had support from a variety of journalists, filmmakers, indigenous rights supporters and environmental organizations, lawyers and social scientists.

In 1989 when Hydro-Québec announced that it would start seeking approvals to build the second phase of the hydroelectric projects, there were diverse Cree views. Some Cree thought it was a chance to strengthen the 1975 agreement and get the additional funds needed to improve social and economic conditions in the villages. But when the community at the mouth of the main river to be developed, Whapmagoostui on the Great Whale River, said the hydroelectric project had to be stopped, other communities and leaders united behind them. The immediate goal was to prevent the start of construction, so that the Cree would not have to fight while the project was being built, as had been the case in the 1970s.

Cree leaders realized that Hydro-Québec was dependent on international capital markets to sell its bonds to investors in order to raise part of the C\$6 billion of funds it needed to continue building. To convince potential investors that this was a safe and profitable place for their capital, it sought an assured market for the sale of its electricity, partly by negotiating for large export contracts with Maine, Vermont, and New York State electric power utility companies in the northeast United States. The Cree leaders realized that if they could block these contracts, they would make it considerably harder for Hydro-Québec to borrow the capital it needed to go ahead at attractive rates.

Such a challenge did not just involve direct lobbying of decision-makers and investors in the United States and Europe; it involved mobilizing active sectors of the U.S. public whose opinions could not be as easily ignored by U.S. authorities and politicians, as could the Cree themselves. The Cree mounted a campaign based on contesting the economic and ecological arguments used to legitimate the proposed project and the contracts and also based on explaining to the public how their lives and the lands they hunted would be damaged by the project. The Cree argued that hydroelectric projects were not a “clean” source of power, as was being claimed: they flooded massive land areas, destroyed wildlife and habitats, threatened Cree society, and

ignored Cree rights. The Cree hired experts who showed that energy conservation could save more energy than the new project would produce, at less cost and with more employment benefits. These arguments showed that the “rationality” of the project could be questioned and that there were plausible alternatives. These arguments were used to stimulate political commentaries and expert opinion pieces in the media and in formal or legislative reviews of the contracts.

But, to mobilize a wider public opinion, the Cree had to convey a sense of how the Cree ties to the land could be damaged. A group of Cree, mainly from Whapmagoostui, paddled a unique combination canoe and kayak from James Bay through Vermont to New York City in 1990, stopping at small and large communities along the way to meet environmentalists and media and to ask for public support. A variety of environmental organizations helped the Cree at each daily stop during their travels.¹¹ In Vermont and upper New York State they met many small townspeople and people from farmsteads, with strong farming and rural traditions, who valued individual responsibility and direct involvement with the environment. This trip personalized the Cree to many local activists and to an interested public who saw the numerous local media pieces done about these unusual visitors.

But, in New York City and other urban areas they had to present themselves as a people tied to the land to audiences far removed from land-based livelihoods or lives, and in much less personalized contexts. For example, at a massive Earth Day rally in lower Manhattan, they were one of dozens of speakers and groups seeking support and media coverage.

The decisive political victory was won in New York State, where public opinion swung against the electricity supply contracts just as the campaign for election of a governor was underway. Cree leaders sensed they were having an impact as one U.S. environmental organization reported gaining five thousand new members from its James Bay campaign, and the offices of public officials were reportedly flooded with public expressions of concern. The Cree then commissioned a public opinion poll which showed politicians and their strategists that there was declining public support for the contracts. Just as some economists began to question the terms of the contracts because energy prices were declining, political support for the New York contract eroded, and the incumbent governor up for re-election refused to endorse it. It was cancelled by the state power utility in 1992.

A short time later, the premier of Quebec announced that the development of the second phase of the James Bay project was stopped and would be delayed indefinitely. This was nationally significant because Hydro-Québec was the foremost state and economic institution controlled by Quebecers, both in the views of Quebec officials and the Quebec public, and it was also prominent in the international reputation of Quebec. The victory by the Cree and their allies therefore deeply marked the international face, the self-image, and the assumed sense of secure development of the Quebec state administration, and to some degree the Canadian state as well, and it changed Cree relations to both.¹²

The Cree were successful in this challenge to development by combining diverse skills: a complex political strategy that identified economic and political structural weaknesses as it used opportune moments; a sophisticated use of economic and engineering analyses and media and polling techniques to influence opinion makers and strategists; and several rich discursive strategies for presenting Cree hunting as both a productive and protective activity, worthy of public concern and support. It is the last of these types of strategies that is not examined in many accounts of these events and that is the focus of this paper. How the Cree were able to generate broad public support for their cause needs analysis because it is not obvious that hunters and hunting, even indigenous hunters, would be supported by either environmental movement supporters or the general public. The link the Cree built here between indigenous hunters' struggles and environmental concerns was not the first time such a link had been made—it had been made before in the Amazon, for example—but this was the most elaborate linkage developed to date, and the most important for the future of both social movements. To see how it was achieved, it is necessary to look at Cree cultural symbols and at two decades of developing representational strategies that preceded these events.

Cree Symbols of Nature, Culture, and Sociality

Cree spokespersons often find it difficult to get more than a very simple image of themselves and their relationships to land and wild-life across to their non-Native audiences. This is an enduring problem, which governments and developers have exploited in responding to

the Cree campaigns and which Cree spokespersons and elders have sought to address by creating intercultural metaphors of land and hunting.

For Cree hunters, the concepts of “human” and “animal” are distinguished, but there is no radical division of nature from culture or society. The animal world is a part of the same kind of social world that humans inhabit, and in much conversation a social metaphor serves to talk about the whole world. Many phenomena we would call natural, such as clouds or snow, are also considered to embody person-like qualities or capabilities of action.¹³ Cree hunters say that many kinds of animals have distinct families, such as beaver colonies and geese mates, and are capable of willful action and responsibility for the things they do. This, the Cree say, is evidenced in the everyday experience of a hunter, who finds that many of the actions of animals are intelligible and predictable. The whole world is therefore a socially informed world, in which habit and learning rather than natural law explain the actions of animals and other nonhuman persons. As a result, communication between all beings is possible, and animals can in their turn interpret and understand the actions and needs of humans.

This is a world in which there is a unified, but not rigid, hierarchy of beings descending from God to spirit beings to humans to animals. The metaphor and value of social reciprocity, and the moral responsibility that it highlights in social relations, permeate this social universe. When asking why an animal went in a trap, or allowed itself to be caught, the Cree answer with similar kinds of reasons to those they would offer for why a human gives food away to another person. That is, because it appreciates the need of the other. The implication is that it is a responsible thing to do as a moral social being. The separation between humans and animals is thus one of degree, and continuities of humans and animals, culture and nature are therefore assumed in the Cree symbolic universe.

A critical feature of human-animal relations for the Cree is that animals are symbolically associated with non-kin. Cree hunters not only say animals are persons, they say they love the animals they hunt. This is expressed in the ways hunting is linked to sexual love, and Cree words for hunting often have dual meanings associated with sexual relations and pursuits. Colin Scott gives several examples of how hunting and sexuality share a common vocabulary: *mitwaaschaau* can refer to both “he shoots” and “he ejaculates”; *paaschikan* can

refer to both “shotgun” and “penis”; and *spichinaakin* to both “gun case” and “condom.”¹⁴ Recurrent themes in jokes and stories associate hunting with sexual pursuit.¹⁵

The Cree linking of love for animals and the hunting of animals can appear self-serving to an outsider, but in Cree cultural structures there is no radical separation of home and family from work or production groups. Therefore, love can and does permeate the Cree world in a way that on the surface seems false or impractical to non-Natives. This loving care is expressed in an elaborate ritualization of everyday hunting practices, from seeing signs of animal presence to hunting, retrieving, transporting, butchering, distributing, consuming, and disposing of the remains of animals.¹⁶

That animals love humans is implicit in the commonplace Cree statements that when a Cree hunter kills an animal properly and treats its body respectfully, its surviving soul will want to be reborn again. Thus, when hunters only take animals that are given, animals are reborn. Hunters note that if they do not take animals that are given, the health and survival of the animals clearly deteriorate, and the con-



Figure 1. A beaver dam, partly broken so that when beaver come to repair the dam overnight, one may be caught in a trap set nearby.
(Photograph Harvey Feit)

tinuing birth and survival of those animals are endangered. There is clear evidence that these understandings, in conjunction with the practices of the Cree hunting territory “owners,” do conserve and manage key game populations.¹⁷

Having constituted animals as part of a social world, it is the social collectivity that can survive the death of individual animals. This is manifest both in the survival of the souls of animals and in the survival of their offspring in whom those souls may be reborn. The idea for both humans and animals is to prepare for death when it comes and, in death, to bestow blessings on the living, so as to play a role in the continuity of family and community. When humans live in balanced reciprocity with animals, each creates the continued conditions for the survival of the other as members of a society.

Rhetorical Choices

A central problem for Cree hunters and spokespersons is how to convey these understandings of their own lives and of hunting to Quebecers, Canadians, and Americans in the context of the Cree struggles over what happens on their lands. It is a problem because none of the common Cree metaphors of hunting and of relations to the land—social reciprocity between humans and the animals they hunt, or conjugal partnerships that extend from death to the rebirth of hunted animals—facilitate easy comprehension across cultural differences.

One metaphor used by Cree leaders to mobilize public support for a changed and more respectful relationship between governments and the Cree has been the popular North American cultural image of the “Indians” as a noble and victimized people. These images have been critical in mobilizing significant support against hydroelectric developments, and they have played important roles in Cree campaigns. But they also have had definite practical and semiotic limits.

The image of the noble indigene is widely circulated among a broad public and it conveys sympathetic concerns, but at the same time it is also associated with a negative and disempowering set of images. “Indians” are alternatively a people who are noble, but who are also naïve and unchanging, or devastated by modernity, or inevitably becoming like “us.” These images of Indians are Euro-American creations, clustering positive with negative views, and long manipu-

lated to explain and justify claims of Euro-American and Canadian dominance.¹⁸ The Indian is either tied to the past, or caught in associations with the disappearing Indian who cannot be really traditional while obviously modern and changing.

Cree uses of the image of the Indian are powerful, but they also inevitably highlight supposed contradictions between the image of the Cree people as traditional hunting people and the complex technologies they use in contemporary hunting and in their sophisticated international political and public relations campaigns. Cree leaders and spokespersons have been challenged with these “contradictions” by politicians and corporate leaders eager to imply that the Cree are no longer tied to the land, but rather that they manipulate the image of tradition in the cause of enhancing wealth and power. For example, when Armand Couture, then vice president of Hydro-Québec and a negotiator to the Cree, says that the real issue in conflicts with the Cree is the “ownership of resources,” and that claims for territorial control and self-government are the strategy, he asserts that the Cree are just like other Quebecers and North Americans.¹⁹

The images of the Indian have been partly effective for the Cree, because even modern audiences are used to disjunctures in experience and between domains of knowledge. However, the images are also limited by the public’s susceptibility to perceiving disjuncture as inconsistency, and as a possible indication that images are being manipulated by those whose moral causes the public, politicians, investors, jurists, and environmentalists are being asked to support. The uses by the Cree of the images of the Indian have thus brought both support and subordination.

Claims based on distinctive indigenous legal rights, important as they are, are fraught with the same contradictions and weaknesses. They are necessary, but limited and limiting, strategies.

Gardens and Gardeners

In contrast to these widely used discourses, one of the most frequently cited of the rhetorical strategies that the Cree hunters themselves developed to communicate their relationship to the land has been the metaphor that hunting is like gardening and their hunting lands are like a garden.²⁰ It conveys complex meanings to non-Native North

Americans and additional signification to Cree. Cree hunters want to draw both similarities and difference between the whiteman’s concept of ownership and their own, as well as to claim ownership of land.²¹

This metaphor was the product of a complex Cree collective process, and many Cree elders used the metaphor of a garden to express this dual claim. When initial Cree mobilization developed against the hydroelectric project in 1971 and 1972, there were extensive discussions among elder and younger Cree leaders about how to respond, and they shared insights and phrasings.²² The pattern developed further in late 1972 and 1973 when communities sent people to testify in a Cree-initiated court case against the project that was heard in Montreal. Both what might be said to the judge in the court and what was said when one was in court were extensively discussed back in the communities. Cree elders often informally encouraged one another to take the role of spokesperson and speak to outsiders. Cree elders and spokespersons used the garden metaphor on many occasions throughout these encounters.

For example, Job Bearskin, from the community at the mouth of the main river dammed by the first phase of hydroelectric development, Fort George, later relocated to Chisasibi, used the metaphor in 1972 with journalist and filmmaker Boyce Richardson, who quoted him in his books and first film.²³ At key meetings in 1974 in the village at Fort George, where the possibility of negotiating an agreement between Cree and Hydro-Québec about the ongoing hydroelectric project construction was discussed, the garden metaphor was heard repeatedly as community members tried to explain to Quebec and Hydro-Québec negotiators why they opposed the project. An unidentified Cree speaker said:

Land is like a garden to the Indians, everything grows, life [is] sustained from the garden. Dam the river, and land is destroyed. No one has right to destroy land except the Creator.²⁴

Another said:

The river is our road, [he] does not want to see dams on it. Our people have lived from the river. Like a garden, we do not want our land destroyed. Want our demands met.²⁵

At a follow-up meeting two months later, Harry Matthew said:

We lived off the land since the beginning of time. Land is a garden - to us, we want to keep it that way like our forefathers have done.²⁶

Elder Daniel Rupert explained:

My father was a tallyman [a hunting territory “owner,” often called a “trapline boss”]. We put in beavers [that is, they relocated live beavers to their hunting territory from other areas] so they would reproduce. When he did not hunt anymore I became tallyman. He gave extensive care to the trapline, which is what I want to do too. When he made me tallyman, his last words were to look after what it would produce, like a garden, for all the children that would come. That’s why I want it to be productive. . . . What you own as an individual, its only natural that you fight [for] it. What you have you want to retain, it is like a white-man’s garden.²⁷

In these statements the garden metaphor refers to land ownership, to the productiveness of land, to Cree inheritance of land, and to the care that goes into using and protecting the land. The statements both call up common knowledge to help outsiders understand the Cree relationship to the land and extend that knowledge into unexpected areas. For example, recalling the relocation of beaver to areas where they had declined, sometimes called “replanting beaver,” is a claim that, for the Cree, hunting, like gardening, not only cares for but restores the land and renews its productivity. Cree elders knew that non-Native North Americans have gardens throughout Canada and the United States, and they were calling on the proprietorship and the personal caring and nurturing that Quebecers, Canadians, and Americans give to garden plots, and their sense that gardens can be used in perpetuity, to express the Cree relationship to the land as hunters. The rich metaphoric significance of the trope became clearer as it was picked up by some of those non-Natives who themselves actively sought richer dialogue with Cree elders.

Spreading the Word

The gardening metaphor played an important role in mobilizing support for the Cree opposition to hydroelectric development among the general public and especially those concerned about indigenous peoples.

It initially became known outside Cree communities as “Job’s garden,” an intercultural social creation. Boyce Richardson used “Job’s Garden” as both the name of a documentary film²⁸ and the title of a chapter in his second book on the Cree struggles against hydroelectric development.²⁹ “Job’s garden” was a partly fortuitous coincidence of a rhetorical strategy which had long roots in Cree discourse, the political context of the Cree opposition to hydroelectric development, the name of a Cree man with a gift for respected oratory, and the presence of a committed documentary journalist with a sense of the biblical proportions the Cree saw in their struggles.³⁰ But Job Bearskin himself noted that “I have heard many people call this land our garden.”³¹

In Boyce Richardson’s second book and first film on James Bay, Job Bearskin spoke of the Cree hunters’ relationship with the land while standing near the LaGrande River on his hunting lands in the summer of 1972. Gilbert Herodier, a young Cree filmmaker who worked with Boyce Richardson, translated for Job:

“It is really beautiful what he has been saying. He said this whole place is like a garden, because many things grow here, and the Indians are one of the things that grow here. He says that animals were given to the Indians so they could feed their children and old people, and everyone has always shared the food from this garden. He says everyone here will always share. It’s always been like that.”³²

Here, the use of the metaphor not only asserts a caring relationship, it also counters the view, often presented by the media and by Hydro-Québec and government spokespersons, that northern Quebec was an area of wilderness, unproductive and virtually uninhabited. The metaphor gains part of its significance from its opposition to images widely circulated in state ideologies and by mass media.

The metaphor responds directly to the public legitimization of the development by Quebec and by Robert Bourassa, the premier of Quebec who initiated the project. They used the discourses of nationalism, wilderness, and the histories of European occupation to claim legitimacy when they announced the project in 1971. In his 1973 book, Bourassa cited the lack of Quebecers’ control of their economy, and the resulting poverty and underdevelopment,³³ and his desire to modernize Quebec through hydroelectric energy development under Quebec control. He said the challenge was “the conquest of northern

Quebec. . . .”³⁴ Reporting on his visit to the James Bay construction sites, he wrote that when he looked at the young workers, “I cannot help but think of the first settlers of our land,” and he also wrote about “what a strange contrast it is to see modern machinery and equipment lined up in the wilderness and solitude of the north.”³⁵

The metaphor of the garden is a fundamental alternative to these linked metaphors of wilderness, European settlement, and nation. Gardening analogies deny that this is a wilderness, and, instead, assert that it is a place that sustains humans. The productivity of the land is highlighted, and it is made a place where people survived and belonged, not a barren land but a home to the Cree.

The garden also calls up images of divine creation, not nation. In Cree elders’ usage, the metaphor makes clear that the animals are given by God so the Cree may survive; the Cree are not masters of the game. In this view, the Cree themselves are “one of the things that grow here.” Thus, it is not just contemporary gardens they speak of; there are implicit references to the biblical Garden of Eden. It is divine creation, and there are sacred rights and obligations that also concern the Cree.

References to sharing thus refer both to Cree traditional values and practices of reciprocity and to the biblical commands to care for God’s creation and look after one another. In the garden metaphor, caring also extends beyond any boundaries between people and animals and beyond divisions between humans from different societies and nations, for all are God’s creatures. The elders thus seek to express from within Cree knowledge a common sacredness with the land, which they know can be shared by many non-Cree listeners. Here, the metaphor draws on Christian values that today are no longer uniquely dominant values in North American societies, albeit that these are still values often used to support dominant institutions and ideologies as well as alternative traditions and organizations.³⁶

Many non-Natives heard these discourses, and they helped to build public support for the Cree opposition to hydroelectric development. An early example of taking up and using the metaphor was the “Public Hearing on the James Bay Project,” organized by citizens groups in Montreal in April 1973, that united scientists, social and environmental activists, politicians, representatives of the labor movement, lawyers, and educators who opposed the project. The published proceedings of the forum included a section of papers on the Cree, titled

“Native Peoples” and a section of papers on the James Bay territory, called the “Garden of the Cree.”³⁷

Nearly two decades later, journalist Roy MacGregor’s account of the Cree struggle against the hydroelectric project and the negotiation of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement included an appreciation of the power of Cree metaphors. His 1989 book refers to the 1973 court ruling by Justice Albert Malouf in favor of the Cree, which forced the province of Quebec to negotiate with them, in these words:

This land, Malouf believed, had the status the old trappers had claimed it had: it was their garden, which had provided them with their livelihood for longer than history could record. That they pursued a traditional way of life on this land was, he believed, beyond dispute.³⁸

Note here the addition of a prehistory, and of a claim to traditional lives.

Metaphors and Alliances

In 1989, when the new and multistranded alliance of Cree with environmental movement organizations in Canada, the United States, and Europe was formed to fight against the new plans for hydroelectric development, the Cree gave the lead article in the tabloid they issued a banner headline, “Our land is like a garden to us,” quoting the author of the lead essay, Brian Georgekish, a sixth grade student from the community of Wemindji.³⁹

We don’t want our land to be flooded. You’ve killed a lot of animals and contaminated our fish and drinking water. Our land is just like a garden to us. We survive from it. Just like the people who grow vegetables, they survive from it selling their vegetables. We love our land and way of life. When I grow up, I would like to go hunting and trapping where my grandfather, great-grandfather and father hunted and trapped for years. . . . But now after the dams have been built there are not as many animals as there were before you built the dams and flooded our land. Stop destroying our land and our future, and our way of life.”⁴⁰

This statement echoes and amplifies elders’ usage, picking up

issues of contamination that come from wider environment movement campaigns and issues of the transmission of culture, as well as of the selling of the produce of hunting, that come from younger generations' concerns. The same theme was echoed by a new generation of Cree leaders, such as Robbie Dick, the middle-aged chief of Whapmagoostui, the Cree community on the Great Whale River: "Now they want to build the dam and to destroy that land. That's somebody's back yard. That's somebody's garden."⁴¹

In this new context, many environmentalists picked up and elaborated on the garden metaphor and gave it new emphases. In 1993 the Parisian quarterly newsletter *Message Amérindien International* reprinted three pieces on the Cree of James Bay, including a background paper by Farley Mowat, probably Canada's most prolific environmental essayist and author, and environmental lawyer and activist Elisabeth May,⁴² which began:

Depuis 1971, les étendues sauvages du Nord du Québec sont destinées à devenir le site de la plus grande entreprise hydro-électrique de la terre. Depuis de nombreuses générations, cette région est appelée le "Jardin" (*Kistikani*), par ses habitants: le peuple Cri.⁴³

In the United States, a thirty-two-page tabloid-format pamphlet published in 1991 by the Northeast Alliance to Protect James Bay in Cambridge, Massachusetts, highlighted the passage by Roy MacGregor cited above.⁴⁴ The Northeast Alliance was a major grouping of organizations opposing the Great Whale River developments and supporting the Cree. In Canada, the tabloid pamphlet of Earthroots, a leading Ontario environmental organization, headlined a report on the Cree in its spring 1991 issue "Aboriginal Genocide: Drowning of the Cree Garden." A series of new videos appeared, most of which contained statements by Cree using the garden metaphor, including one entitled "Flooding Job's Garden" by Boyce Richardson.⁴⁵

The frequent use of the garden metaphor in speeches, publications, and videos, and especially its use in the titles and headlines of major campaign communications, indicates the prominent place of the garden metaphor and signals the effective role it was sensed to be playing by Cree spokespersons and their supporters in mobilizing public understanding and support.⁴⁶ Its headline and title use also suggests that it was, or was becoming, a covering metaphor which itself

referred to the other rhetorical strategies and tropes. To understand these processes it is necessary to look more carefully at the complexities of this representation.

Transforming Metaphors across Cultures

Environmentalists' uses of the garden metaphor do not just convey the Cree usage, they also sometimes allude romantically to the connections of present Cree to ancient patterns and to the wisdom of time and of the elders. Here, "old trappers" pursue "traditions" maintained over "générations" in order to survive. Thus, the power and productivity of the garden metaphor used across cultures is broadened in ways that transform Cree elders' emphasis, although some of these themes are found in Cree usage as well.

For example, none of the new texts are fully spiritual, although allusions remain. Whether in Paris, Boston, or Toronto, the garden reference is to a largely secularized world in which the garden ideal is not quite Eden. Thus, Mowat and May can accuse Quebec of "sacrifier les territoires sauvages du Nord pour des dollars américains."⁴⁷ The reference to "territoires sauvages" contrasts sharply with Cree elders' typical socialization and domestication of land.

Mowat and May's usage, however, signals the importance of several other metaphorical meanings which come into prominence when the garden metaphor is used by contemporary environmentalists. Mowat has been a vocal defender of environments, animals, and indigenous peoples. He has described, for example, the ecstatic experiences with animals he witnessed while living with Inuit hunters and their enduring impact on him.⁴⁸ But, in another voice, he is also passionate to decry the "hideous results of five centuries of death-dealing [sport hunting] on the continent" that followed European settlement⁴⁹ and to share the experiences of his youth that convinced him never to hunt for sport again.⁵⁰

Mowat resolves the tensions between his commitments to indigenous hunters and those against hunting and for animals, not by learning the specifics of Inuit or Cree views, but by separating traditional indigenous people from modern societies and the latter's relations to animals. He creates a space for indigenous hunting by romanticizing

Cree and others, setting them apart from the brutality he associates with moderns by ignoring their modernity. Cree are given a place, by being tied to past generations and living in an unchanging traditional way. His usage is unlike the Cree, for it supports the view of the Cree as a people of the past, as noble indigenes.

Mowat is not alone in this conundrum. Many who supported the Cree in their struggle against the Great Whale project did so as urban environmentalists, wanting both to protect land and wildlife of northern Quebec and to support the Cree who hunt and use those very animals in ways that urbanites find uncomfortable, that they do not understand, and that they could easily oppose. They do not have the commitment to indigenous hunters that Mowat draws from experiences on the land. The garden metaphor came to play a special role in mediating this disjuncture during the 1990s campaigns, for it could open up possibilities for understanding Cree as hunters.

Plural Garden Images and Intercultural Dialogues

The metaphor of the Cree world as garden, in the environmentalist citations above, conveys images of gardens as both wilderness and as nurtured terrain. It is this plurality of meanings and ambiguities that make the Cree garden metaphor more effective than might have been anticipated. The metaphor opens rich possibilities for intercultural understandings partly because of the way it unites opposites among European and North American cultural symbols.

Historians Keith Thomas, Carolyn Merchant, and Leo Marx have indicated in their respective histories of changing attitudes to the “natural world” in sixteenth- to nineteenth-century England and America that the idea of gardens has gone through numerous variations during these centuries.⁵¹ Leo Marx, for example, notes in *The Machine in the Garden* that the idea of the garden appears both as “nature’s garden” and as “garden-in-fact.”⁵² Commenting on Robert Beverley’s *History and the Present State of Virginia* (1705) he notes:

When Beverley calls Virginia one of the “Gardens of the World,” . . . the garden stands for the original unity, the all-sufficing beauty and abundance of the creation. Virginia is an Edenic land of primitive splendor inhabited by noble savages. . . . But when Beverley says that

there are too few gardens in Virginia, he is speaking about actual, man-made, cultivated pieces of ground. This image also is an emblem of abundance, but it refers to abundance produced by work or, in Beverley’s idiom, improvement. The contradiction between the two meanings of “garden” is a perfect index of the larger difference between the primitive and the pastoral ideals.⁵³

The dual image of the garden as natural, sufficing abundance and as a product of civilizing labor cuts across major oppositions in North American thought. Gardens reunite nature and culture.⁵⁴ They bring together natural substance and reproductive potential with social labor and production. In the Cree world, where humans, animals, and God live in a spiritually and socially unified world, separations are not so radical and do not need to be so complexly bridged. For Quebecers, Canadians, and Americans the image of the garden offers the possibility of bridging the oppositions, and as such it does convey a sense of the Cree world, a world in which people are part of the landscape, a spiritual land that one can both work and love, and yet never fully possess. These ambiguities were significant for the rich usage the Cree developed.

Gardening and Environmentalists

For example, the image of the garden also has an ambiguity with respect to gender—an ambiguity that hunting does not. Gardening, depending on the variety and the time period, has associations with both genders. From decade to decade the loci can shift but, throughout much of the last century in Europe and America, there have often been gardening roles available to and associated with both women and men. The Cree world of work is clearly gendered, although either gender can easily take on almost all of the productive roles associated with the other. To render hunting as gardening is to take a predominantly male-associated image of hunting, in North American symbols as well as Cree meanings, and associate it with a more gender-neutral context. This opens up the possibility of non-Natives unlinking hunting from male sport and aggressivity. It thus obscures the male dominance in Cree society as in Cree hunting.

But it also echoes the subsistence, reproductive, and procreative

aspects of Cree hunting. It “fits” the structure of Cree subsistence activity insofar as Cree production depends on the mutuality of gendered tasks of predominantly male hunting with women’s butchering, distributing, and preparing foods in Cree hunting camp life.

Garden images also unite the domestic and the wider work worlds, for there are flower gardens and home vegetable gardens and market gardens. Gardens thus offer the possibility of combining the aesthetic and nurturing needs with the goals of provisioning and earning cash. In the Cree world aesthetic and loving values, nurturing and work are united across the range of spaces, activities, and time. Again, the image of the garden gives non-Natives the opportunity to appreciate a world in which people can be seeking to produce for exchange and reproduce themselves and their world in unison through work at home and in a homeland.

At a more specific level, the metaphor transforms the killing associated with hunting into a harvest that is closer to urban environmental sentiments. This association with harvesting also happens to echo the Cree world, where animals give themselves to needy and respectful hunters. The linkage of hunting to harvesting also emphasizes the renewal of the “crop” and that the harvest does not need to be a “depletion,” which is part of Cree images and practices.⁵⁵

Such refocusing is, I suspect, very important in building broad support within environmental movements, where support of Cree as hunters is often uncomfortable, but where protecting Cree productive and domestic life is a potentially strong motivation. The fact that women are often a majority of the membership in environmental organizations is a part of this response.

In these senses, then, the metaphors of gardening facilitate understanding and support of Cree concerns among non-Native North Americans. This occurs both by moderating the oppositions and contradictions of North America’s environmental concerns and by enriching the possibilities of new understandings that accord in part with Cree meanings and social relations. These meanings go beyond those that need to have been fully anticipated by Cree elders or by those non-Natives who have recontextualized the Cree elders’ messages, although the potentialities may have been sensed.

Yet, some of the richness of the metaphor and of the unanticipated semiotic parallels could have been anticipated, because the metaphor is itself the product of the long contact the Cree have had with both

Christian discourses and the civilizing mission of fur-trade and church institutions. This plurality of meanings not only makes gardens a useful metaphor for alliances of resistance but also for nation-states and economic institutions.

Gardens and States

Gardens can serve very diverse state interests as royal gardens, public gardens, botanical gardens, urban green belts, or national parks. Each expresses specific state ideologies, power, and identities. These developments were repeated in the contemporary period, during the LaGrande project at James Bay, where Hydro-Québec set up nurseries and where it has planted tens of thousands of shrubs and trees at the portals of the most accessible public sites and along public highways. Its dams are major Quebec tourist sites, and guides point out the landscaping to tourists and, where possible, take them to see the nurseries and biological research centers. These horticultural and landscaping activities are part of its public relations claim that hydroelectric projects are not destroying the land, and that they are even “improving” on the northern environment, not least by making it more productive.

But these gardening and horticultural claims are constrained by productive circumstances, for the main project is still industrial. Alongside the thousands of plantings, the tourist guides and brochures also recount the millions of tons of earth moved, the miles of dykes built, and the cubic miles of water impounded. These glorifications of industrial accomplishments serve to support the technological and nationalist legitimations of the project and the state, but they also serve as a limit on the credible uses of the garden metaphor by the state.

On a more distant economic frontier, Jean and John Comaroff have linked the exemplary gardens of nineteenth-century southern African church missionaries to their anticipated role in transforming Tswana society and economy in the direction of English yeomanry and an idealized peasant life.⁵⁶ They have also linked these gardens back to England, where gardening was promoted in the nineteenth century among the emerging working classes. Here, it was the loss of rural and feudal societies—as the growth of markets, industrialization, and

urbanization transformed social conditions for workers—which some churches sought to moderate as they evangelized.⁵⁷ Gardens and gardening were practices and metaphors mobilized in response to, or in the hope of, economic and social transformations. But, again, gardening was used by dominant institutions not simply or continuously as an expression of economic motors of change. Gardening was either to repair the ills of economic change, as in England, or to create a change different from that which could be expected as a result principally of economic forces, as in southern Africa.

Thus, gardening, even as mobilized by states and market institutions and for economic ends, carried a complex set of social meanings and evaluations that did not facilitate restricting its service to the narrower interests of those dominant institutions. It carried with it references to alternative pasts or to other possible futures, which supported forms of resistance not intentionally encouraged by the state. Christian missions and fur trade posts in the James Bay region echoed this pattern.

Colonial Gardens at James Bay

The image of the garden in the Cree world speaks directly to the relations between Cree and whitemen and to the problems arising in those relationships. Gardens and the garden metaphor raise questions about whitemen's claims to land ownership and their exclusionary claims to being civilized. In the James Bay Cree communities, garden metaphors recall specific experiences of colonial relations, where the H.B.C. and the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches all staked out and worked garden plots.

The mission and H.B.C. plots were mainly to produce vegetables, and especially potatoes that could serve the traders' households and the mission houses through the long winters in the settlement. The gardens required a lot of care to produce a worthwhile crop in these northern locations, and they were the focus of considerable attention in the small enclave of Euro-Canadians. Gardens were a symbol of difference, but Cree who worked closely with the church missions or the H.B.C. had plots of their own.⁵⁸

Gardens in the north often involved a rather particular transformation of foods, because many of the gardens were fertilized with locally

caught fish. The transformation of good fish into potatoes signalled the superiority given to gardening and its harvests by Euro-Canadians, in comparison with how Euro-Canadians valued Cree hunting and fishing products and bush foods.⁵⁹

How gardens symbolized civility for Europeans is indicated in the first widely circulated popular book on the James Bay region in the twentieth century, W. Tees Curran and H. A. Calkins' *In Canada's Wonderful Northland: A Story of Eight Months of Travel by Canoe, Motorboat, and Dog-Team on the Northern Rivers and along the New Quebec Coast of Hudson Bay* (1917).⁶⁰ Their account also suggests how they judged fellow Euro-Canadians, and how Cree had some access to colonial discourses as household servants.

Their account of each fur trade post visited on James Bay begins with a description of its gardens and includes photographs.⁶¹ The local and colonial meanings attached to the gardens as symbols for, and general means of, occupying northern lands and civilizing indigenous peoples was clear in their description of arriving at Fort George:

As soon as we could get the camp in order and don our town clothes, we repaired to the [H.B.C.] Factory to partake of a sumptuous repast in real civilized fashion, the first in nearly a month. What a pleasant experience it was to sit on a chair and eat appetizing food from china dishes, with silver cutlery, on a real table covered with snow-white linen.

. . . [Mr. Griffith, the H.B.C. Manager] did not fare so badly, having a number of servants to attend to his needs. He was particularly fortunate in having a good Indian cook, who had been practicing the art under the direction of Mrs. Griffith.

On entering the house, we were strongly reminded of our former visit. Mr. Gillies was the Factor [Managing Partner] at the time, and during the intervening five years we had never thought of Fort George without having recollections of him and his fine vegetable garden. It had been a great surprise to find so large a collection of vegetables in such a well kept garden. . . .⁶²

Curran and Calkins went on to visit the famous Anglican missionary W. G. Walton, whose work and influence they praised. They then turned their attention to the future of the region, noting that:

As has ever been the case where Indian people have encountered the advances of the white man's civilization, the result has been either an-

nihilation or their assimilation. If the former is not to be the case, . . . preventive measures should be taken.

Firstly educative: . . . for as the white man crowds the Indian from his natural means of livelihood, it certainly becomes the white man's duty to educate and fit him for the farm and workshop. . . .⁶³

As it turns out, agriculture proved to be an illusion for regions this far north, and white men "crowded" the Indian from his lands only later, as industrial resource developments became attractive. But colonial visions of civilizing influences and change were points of contention and dialogue between Euro-Canadians and an often hidden indigenous discourse.

The civilizing and educational value of gardening for Euro-Canadians was expressed in the protection they gave to garden plots, by putting up fences and by making clear that the harvests belonged to those who claimed the gardens. It was these features, among others, that were part of the historical roots of Cree elders' usage of the garden metaphor to convey specific meanings about the land to other Cree.

Critiques of Neo-Colonial Relations

By contrast to the published Canadian visitors' accounts, Cree elders' stories and messages about gardens convey partial disapproval. Some widely told stories in Cree villages recount instances of whitemen lecturing and punishing Cree children and adults who took crops from fenced garden plots. Others tell of incidents when some church representatives were not as generous with their crops as Cree thought that they should have been, especially when Cree who were in need came for help. These stories assert a Cree value of reciprocity with land and food in the face of whitemen's ideas of how the land and harvests should be owned and used.

Cree elders use stories of gardens to draw both analogies to whitemen and distinctions, for Cree hunters also insist that the way they share the land contrasts with some whitemen's gardens and land uses. This is explicit in the stories above as well as in another statement by Job Bearskin. While standing on a hill on the hunting lands he was steward of, and pointing out all the places he could see for miles around which were good for animals, he said to the filmmakers and to the young Cree translator:

That is why we call the whole place our garden. . . . Around here you do not see any fences preventing people from trespassing. We let others help themselves. I am happy when other Indians kill something because it helps me. And that is why we care for this place. This is the place where the animals and the plants reproduce every year. The whole place is a garden, and they have done well this year.⁶⁴

Here, the garden is not a private plot, but the whole land, which is used by those in need and cared for and shared by those who use it regularly. A critique of missionary resource use in very similar terms was debated in the community in the years immediately preceding Job's comments.⁶⁵ Thus, Job's and other elders' comments on Cree reciprocity can be set in the context not only of hydroelectric development, but of both the current general relations between Cree and whitemen, and of the longer term, critical Cree discourses—public and hidden—on colonial relations.⁶⁶

Job's emphasis on the reciprocity of Cree land use asserts and reasserts Cree understandings as the correct ones, as opposed to whitemen's views and practices. Here, the metaphor of the garden is also an example of Cree resistance to values of dominant social institutions. It distinguishes Cree culture from non-Native values, understandings, and practices. It is a representation intended to mobilize and empower, by affirming the civilized nature, the ultimate morality, and the value of Cree understandings and practices. It questions the inevitability of the demise of hunting, and of its subordination, and shares that vision with other Cree. It affirms Cree values partly as a means to limiting the spread among Cree of values from non-Native society.

Intergenerational Alliance and Consensus

When Cree elders spoke out about the dangers of adopting whiteman values within Cree society, they often addressed Cree youth. When Job spoke to Boyce Richardson on film, he spoke to and through Gilbert Herodier, the young Cree filmmaker recently returned from schooling and from living outside the village, who was impressed by the beauty of Job's speech. Job and other elders were generally concerned about the youth. During his preparation for appearing in the Cree court case in 1972–1973, Job said:

Since education started for our children, our children are not the same. Our children and grandchildren do not think of the future like we old people think of the future. . . . The white school teaches you not to think like an Indian but only like a whiteman. Children are no longer Indian minded today

. . . The people are not the same since the whiteman came, everyone is becoming strangers. The whiteman is trying to throw their culture, if they have any, on us. They are trying to make us become like the whiteman. Our children are affected and their future is uncertain.⁶⁷

Many of the statements of Cree elders were addressed to Cree youth, and the message of Cree hunting as gardening has circulated throughout the Cree communities over the last three decades, both as oral history and in diverse contemporary media. It has served Cree of several generations who have found it a felicitous way to express their concerns to each other.

For example, elder John Petagumscum from Whapmagoostui used the metaphor to address Cree and non-Cree audiences. Petagumscum's comments in 1990 were quoted in the Annual Report of the Grand Council of the Crees, a document circulated mainly among young and middle-aged Cree in administrative and political positions within Cree organizations: "The land and the rivers where the people hunt and fish are a garden, a gift from the Creator. It has to be treated with love and respect to ensure that its spirit lives forever."⁶⁸

An extended and personal use of the metaphor by a middle-aged adult is exemplified in Chisasibi resident Margaret Sam-Cromarty's poems in her volume *James Bay Memoirs*. Her poem "Garden" speaks of the garden "hidden from many men," which nurtured Cree youth. "Seven Steps" recalls hunters' own understandings of land as gardens in the midst of destructive transformations of the land, such as the massive stepped overflow sluice at the LG-2 dam:

. . .
The trappers watch
the massive hydro dam
Out of rock, seven steps.
In their tongue they spoke of the cunning of the white man.

No one hears
the lowly trappers'
whisper there was a garden.

The big corporations
said Indian land was worthless.

. . .
The trappers seldom spoke.
To learn the other man's ways
would not be wise.
They move on
with their beaver traps.
(1988)⁶⁹

A felicitous and playfully familiar use of the metaphor was the naming of the new hockey arena for Chisasibi youth, many of which are ardent hockey players and followers of professional hockey on television, as Job's Memorial Gardens.⁷⁰

These uses help to educate and mobilize Cree of different generations and lifestyles about how to see relations with whitemen and how to support the hunters to resist transformations of the land. They have played a role in the political mobilization among Cree and in the building of critical alliances in villages between Cree elders, hunters, administrators, political leaders, and youth. Those alliances are foundations of the broad consensus that the Cree "garden," and the hunters' "way of life" should be defended by Cree leaders and organizations for the benefit of all generations of Cree.

A recent usage that makes these connections comes from a middle-aged hunter and leader who offered support and encouragement to fellow Cree to continue hunting and trapping the land. He started by talking of the loss of elders and the need to learn from them while they were alive, and he went on to talk about the threats to the Cree hunters from animal rights activists whose efforts to ban fur pelt sales were negatively affecting the ability of Cree to continue to hunt. In between he said:

Next thing I would like to say, to all of you who are still hunting and living off the land: it's very important that you carry on this tradition. . . . I truly believe what it says in the book of Genesis 11: 7-8. In verse 7 it says that God gave people different languages. . . . In verse 8, it says "He scattered them." He gave them different languages and made them different nations, and that's you and me. We might ask two things, where were our ancestors placed and why were they placed there? He placed our ancestors in a middle of a garden from where they could benefit from the land. Land and nature we call it. This is where



Figure 2. Three seated Cree youth (l. to r.: Flora [Saganash] Gilpin, William Saganash, Jr., and Jacob Otter) displaying ducks shot by Paul Ottereyes, standing in the background. Display composed by Cree elders for Harvey Feit to photograph as a sign of respect for the animals.

you trappers who are still hunting to survive from the land are right now. A place that was given to us to benefit from in the beginning of creation. Why did He place the Crees amongst the beauty of his creation when He scattered the nations of the world. This is why we should benefit from this garden, just like Adam and Eve when God placed them in the Garden of Eden, but our garden is the land and nature. He put berries in Adam and Eve's garden and He also put berries in our garden but not the same kind. The fruits in our garden are the animals, all kinds of animals, birds, fish and also different kinds of fruits, from which we can benefit and make our living. These are the fruits He created for us in the garden that He placed us to live in. I'm sure that all of you are getting anxious now, that September is getting near, and preparing to go to your traplines. I'm like that too, I'm anxious that I'll be able to go to my trapline for three weeks next month, and to find out what blessings God has in store for me.⁷¹

Jean-Elizabeth Meskino, a secondary student from Nemaska, echoed many of these themes, as well as themes from environmentalist interpretations of hunting, in her 1991 essay for the Cree School Board's James Bay Day publication:

Many young children, such as young boys that are 7–12 years old, enjoy hunting with their fathers and grandfathers. The children believe in what they fight for. They tell their parents 'Once I am old enough to go do things on my own, I want to be a hunter or a fisherman and share or sell an animal I killed!' But phase II and Hydro Quebec will destroy what they believe.

Many elders stand up against Hydro Quebec. . . .

Many young native girls enjoy sewing. They make moccasins, mittens, gloves, lampshades and other things out of caribou or moose hide. If phase II does happen there will be less moose and caribou to eat and use the hide for sewing with. I don't know many cultural traditions, but I still care for them. . . .

Once hydro finishes planning phase II and tells . . . what they are going to do, then they will tell the Crees. Now the Crees are fighting for the land. But so far the Crees are not winning yet. If the young natives want phase II stopped, they too have to stand up against Hydro Quebec. They can't just complain to their peers. Once all the phases are done with, where will the Crees live? Where will our sons and grandsons hunt?

What do you think would happen if you were in Ottawa and saw a garden with a lot of roses and other flowers and you started to pick

them? Or if you walked on someone's lawn? You'd get a fine of course, maybe we should give Hydro Quebec a fine too. They've destroyed a lot of trees and land.

I enjoy going to old Nemiscau with my family, it is very peaceful. There are no loud machines. People could go hunting and fishing anywhere they wanted to.⁷²

Conclusions

Cree use of the garden metaphor not only instructs Cree youth, it invites Quebecers, Canadians, and Americans to understand the Cree, to see them as civilized and moral. It is intended to encourage whitemen to learn from the Cree about proper relations. The colonial and local cultural context for understanding some of the meanings that are conveyed in these discourses are not available to many Quebecers, Canadians, and Americans. Yet, the basic call to generosity and respect is conveyed in the domestic, Christian, and moral references, if not by the colonial contexts. These communications depend both on coincidental parallels and on quiet echoes of historical relations and discourses from the partially shared histories of missionization and trade which leave traces of connections in some of the mutualities between Cree and Quebecer, Canadian and American understandings.

The metaphor of the garden is an example of Cree cultural production, which uses symbols from an encapsulating culture, in combination with Cree discourses, to communicate with and oppose white man development. It is also a means to enrich Cree resistance and autonomy by conveying Cree understandings that limit the spread of the values of the encapsulating society among Cree themselves. The Cree are able to direct their political actions toward both these goals in complex ways.

They use metaphors derived not only from the institutions that assert dominance over them and their lands, but from historical and ongoing experiences of relations and communications between Cree and nondominant non-Native institutions. They use these discursive strategies not only to oppose dominant institutions but to build understandings and international alliances with groups opposing those institutions within non-Native societies, as well as to mobilize public opinion in jurisdictions where decisions are taken that affect

Cree lands and lives. They use complex and ambiguous metaphors in ways that highlight the values of sociality, productiveness, and morality in non-Native society, emphasizing, for example, the domestic and self-sufficient aspects of their lives as well as those spiritual aspects that they share or that echo with wider Christian understandings. These rhetorical strategies help us to understand how broad public support for Cree, and against the impacts of development, can be mobilized in urban centers at considerable physical and interpretive distance from the Cree and their lands.

Cree spokespersons build these understandings with non-Natives without sole reliance on more conventional strategies of claiming an idealized traditionality or religiosity, or solely on indigenous legal rights, or solely on political lobbying as citizens or ethnic groups. They thus limit the marginalization, subordination, and constraint that are inherent in focusing solely on being Indian, or on legal rights, or in accepting the political system as it is.

While specific metaphors are used to highlight commonalities, these same metaphors have a long colonial history of oppositional use within Cree society, where they highlight differences between Cree and non-Native values and practices for new generations of Cree.

Gardening draws on, reproduces, and modifies Cree symbols of land, sociality, autonomy, reciprocity, and spirituality. By joining meanings from both cultures, Cree elders show that we can understand representations of environment most effectively at the intersection of cultures, but that we have to attend to the histories and uses of political and discursive strategies. The partially successful campaign by Cree against the second phase of hydroelectric development exemplifies these complex practices, linking Cree and non-Cree supporters in dialogues which build bridges while strengthening commitments to differences and enhancing long-term autonomy.

Notes

A version of this paper was delivered as the Harry Hawthorn Lecture at the Canadian Anthropology Society annual meetings, May 2000. In the course of developing this paper, I have drawn insights from discussions with many people, and at the risk of omitting some, let me thank: Philip Awashish, Mario Blaser, James Bobbish, Brian Craik, Rick Cuciurean, Paul Dixon, Christian Feest, Jasmin Habib, Glenn McRae, Marie Mauzé, Toby Morantz, Douglas Nakashima, Bill Namagoose, Alan Penn, Richard Preston, Boyce Richardson, Marie Roué, Wendy Russell, Diom Saganash, Cory Silverstein, Colin Scott, Bill Simeone, Chris Trott, and Jeremy Webber. The research on which this paper is based was funded through grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC Grants 410-99-1208, 410-96-0946, 410-93-0505, 410-90-0802, and 803-91-0035), and from the Arts Research Board of McMaster University.

1. I will refer to non-Native North American societies also as Quebecers, Canadians, or Americans, or occasionally as Euro-Canadians or Euro-Americans, depending on the context.

2. James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

3. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2d ed. (New York: Verso, 1991).

4. Roger M. Keesing, *Custom and Confrontation: The Kwaio Struggle for Cultural Autonomy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

5. Elizabeth A. Povinelli, *Labor's Lot: The Power, History, and Culture of Aboriginal Action* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 242.

6. Barri Cohen makes a partly similar argument for Canada, and especially for James Bay, although I only read his piece after I had finished this article ("Technological Colonialism and the Politics of Water," *Cultural Studies* 8, no. 1 [1994]: 32–55). While Cohen notes how indigenism is constructed by and to serve nation-states, he also stresses that it has unintended effects and becomes a tool in oppositional politics (p. 38). His argument complements some of the analysis of the Cree presented in this paper, albeit with different materials. I am indebted to Suzie O'Brien for pointing his work out to me.

7. The Inuit of Canada were formerly called Eskimos by Euro-Americans.

8. See Richard F. Salisbury, *A Homeland for the Cree* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 1986).

9. Cohen ("Technological Colonialism") makes a similar point, but he implies that the state sought this construction of Cree collectivities. In the initial years of the Cree opposition to the James Bay projects, from 1971 until the court ruling at the end of 1973, recognizing that the Cree had rights, it was the Cree who claimed indigenous legal rights and political status and it was state officials that denied any role for the Cree other than as citizens or townships. The court recognition of the rights claimed by the Cree forced other state institutions to use a strategy founded in part on the distinct indigenism of the Cree.

10. I will use the term "whitemen" to refer to Cree ideas of non-Natives, as distinct from how non-Natives see themselves. On fur trade history, see: Daniel Francis and Toby Morantz, *Partners in Furs: A History of the Fur Trade in Eastern James Bay,*

1600–1870 (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983); also Harvey A. Feit, "The Enduring Pursuit: Land, Time and Social Relationships in Anthropological Models of Hunter-Gatherers and in Hunters' Images," in *Key Issues in Hunter-Gatherer Research*, ed. E. S. Burch, Jr., and L. J. Ellanna (Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1991), 421–39.

11. For accounts of these trips and of the campaign, see Michael Posluns, *Voices from the Odeyak* (Toronto: NC Press, 1993); Michael Posluns, "The James Bay Story So Far," electronic text circulated through web.native, 3 March 1993; and Sean McCutcheon, *Electric Rivers: The Story of the James Bay Project* (Montreal: Black Rose, 1991).

12. The clearest evidence of these impacts has been the alienation of the Cree within Quebec political life, a shift that was articulated by the minister of energy at the time, and that has cost the Cree much in workable relations since. At the time the minister said:

Yes, I blame them [the Cree] for what they've been doing. I blame them for discrediting Quebec all over the world. Do you think a Quebecer can accept that? I don't think so.

Are they Quebecers or not? They live in our territory. They live with us, they work with us and they're penalizing Quebecers. That's what I cannot accept and I will never accept. (*The Gazette*, Montreal, 4/1/92. The minister's statement also appears, in part, in the documentary film *Power*, directed by Magnus Isacson, Cineflix Productions in association with the National Film Board of Canada [distributor] and TVOntario, 1996).

The minister's anger reveals the inutility of the Cree to the state at this moment. Subsequent confrontations between Cree and later separatist Quebec governments have entrenched this division, although the issue remains complex. In the case of Quebec separation, the Cree claim a right to decide which state they would ally with, and they assert that their lands would go with them (ca. 140,000 sq. mi.). This has become a major problem for Quebec's assertion of a right to separate from Canada, because the integrity of its boundaries would enhance chances of international legitimation and recognition. But it has also made the Cree useful to the Canadian state in its fights against Quebec separation, and therefore also made it easy for separatists to portray Cree in Quebec as tools of the Canadian state.

13. See A. Irving Hallowell, for his pioneering work on the related views of the Ojibwa, *Culture and Experience* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), and *Contributions to Anthropology: Selected Papers of A. Irving Hallowell* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976).

14. Colin H. Scott, "Science for the West, Myth for the Rest? The Case of James Bay Cree Knowledge Construction," in *Naked Science: Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power, and Knowledge*, ed. Laura Nader (New York: Routledge, 1996), 75.

15. Richard J. Preston, *Cree Narrative: Expressing the Personal Meanings of Events*, Canadian Ethnology Service, no. 30 (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975); and Scott, "Science."

16. See, for example, Adrian Tanner, *Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the Mistassini Cree* (London: Hurst), 1979.

17. Harvey A. Feit, "Hunting and the Quest for Power: The James Bay Cree and Whitemen in the Twentieth Century," in *Native Peoples: The Canadian Experience*, ed. R. B. Morrison and C. R. Wilson, 2d ed. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1995), 181–223.

18. See Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

19. Couture's statement appears on film in *Power*, directed by Magnus Isacsson. Also see other statements in that film by Couture and by Hydro-Québec President Richard Drouin, as well as statements by Hydro-Québec spokespersons in the documentary *Power of the North*, directed by Catherine Bainbridge and Anna Vander Wee (Wild Heart Productions in association with MTV, CityTV, MuchMusic [Canadian distribution by Kaleidoscope Entertainment], 1994).

20. For discussions of other discursive strategies, see Donna Patrick, "Language, Power and Resistance: Discourses on Hydroelectric Development in Great Whale River, Quebec" (unpublished manuscript, University of Toronto, OISE, [1992]); and Cohen, "Technological Colonialism."

21. See Colin H. Scott, "Property, Practice and Aboriginal Rights among Quebec Hunters," in *Hunters and Gatherers*, vol. 2, ed. Tim Ingold, David Riches, and James Woodburn (New York: Berg, 1988), 35–51.

22. See Harvey A. Feit, "Legitimation and Autonomy in James Bay Cree Responses to Hydro-Electric Development," in *Indigenous Peoples and the Nation-State*, ed. Noel Dyck (St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1985), 27–66.

23. Boyce Richardson, *James Bay: The Plot to Drown the North Woods* (San Francisco: Sierra Club; and Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company, 1972), 184; Richardson, *Strangers Devour the Land* (New York: Alfred Knopf; Toronto: Macmillan, 1975; reprint, Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 1991); and, Richardson, *Job's Garden* (Toronto: Tamarack Productions, 1974), film.

24. Fieldnotes, Fort George, 9 April 1974, translated from the Cree at the meeting.

25. Ibid.

26. Fieldnotes, Fort George, 19 June 1974, translated from the Cree at the meeting.

27. Ibid.

28. Richardson, *Job's Garden*.

29. Richardson, *Strangers*.

30. Richardson has written about how he met Job Bearskin in 1971 on a trip to write some freelance pieces on James Bay:

On that trip, I met a number of people in Fort George, including a man called Job Bearskin who was one of the many hunters brought to my hotel to discuss with me what they thought about the hydro-electric development. I was very impressed by the dignity of this man—he's a wonderful, tall, proud man (Boyce Richardson, "A Return to Job's Garden," in *On the Land: Confronting the Challenges to Aboriginal Self-Determination in Northern Quebec and*

Labrador; ed. Bruce W. Hodgins and Kerry A. Cannon [Toronto: Betelgeuse Books, 1995], 150).

31. Richardson, *James Bay: The Plot*, 184. A parallel usage that was widespread in an earlier period in the regions to the south of the James Bay Cree area was the related metaphor of indigenous hunting territories practices as farming. Its use was common among indigenous spokespersons for communities whose lands were experiencing expanded colonization by non-Natives early in this century, as well as among anthropologists who discussed the Algonquian family hunting territory system with them. See Harvey A. Feit, "The Construction of Algonquian Hunting Territories: Private Property as Moral Lesson, Policy Advocacy and Ethnographic Error," in *Colonial Situations: Essays in the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*, ed. George Stocking, Jr., History of Anthropology Series, vol. 7 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 120–21.

32. Recorded on film, Richardson, *Job's Garden*, and in print, Richardson, *Strangers*, 151.

33. Robert Bourassa, *James Bay* (Montreal: Harvest House), 7–8.

34. Ibid., 10.

35. Ibid., 117 and 120.

36. Job and other elders were active Christians, and Job had served for many years as an active lay reader at St. Philip's Anglican Church (Nellie Pashagumiskum, "In Memory of Joab Bearskin," *Northland* 46 [winter, 1989–90]: 7), which often lacked a resident minister. The Cree elders were well familiar with biblical texts and references, and their speeches frequently refer to the sacredness of the land. One anonymous reviewer of an earlier version of this paper noted that there was no direct evidence and only an inference that Job Bearskin was influenced by Judeo-Christian ideas of "Eden," ideas which the reader pointed out do not correspond to Cree usage, for example, with respect to whether animals are subjected to human authority. I have inferred that Cree elders' use of the garden metaphor referred in part to ideas of Eden and biblical references based on the way Christian ideas and ideals informed the lives and speech of so many of that generation of Cree elders. In conversations at this time, there was also frequent reference by Job and others elders not only to gardens but to the flooding the project would cause. I should, however, also be clear that I am not saying that Cree are referring to authoritative Judeo-Christian ideas of "Eden." I think they are referring to Cree-Judeo-Christian ideas that emphasize the harmonious relations between all divinely created creatures in the garden. (See below for other instances of Cree perceptions of differences as well as similarities between Cree and some non-Native Christians' ideas of Christianity.)

37. *James Bay Forum: Public Hearings on the James Bay Project Held in Montreal, April, 1973*, ed. Fikret Berkes (Montreal: James Bay Committee, 1973), 83, 65.

38. Roy MacGregor, *Chief: The Fearless Vision of Billy Diamond* (Markham: Viking Penguin, 1989), 104.

39. Wemindji, directly south of Chisasibi, had significant flooding of its lands during the first phase of the project. This statement was also published, along with texts from many other Cree youth opposing the hydroelectric developments, in *James*

Bay Day (Mistassini: Cree School Board, 1991). Brian Georgekish's text is on page 5.

40. Grand Council of the Crees (of Quebec), *Fighting for Our Future* (pamphlet, "Supplement to the Hill Times, August 1, 1991"), 1.

41. Posluns, *Voices from the Odeyak*, 74. For parallel uses at this period, see Sanders Wiestchie's talk at the Northeast Regional James Bay Action Conference at Cornell University, quoted in Glen Cooper et al., "Cree Stories," *Northeast Indian Quarterly* 8 (winter 1991): 31; and, Charles Cheezo's statement to Hydro-Québec, quoted in Laurent Lepage and François Blanchard, "Analyse de contenu des audiences publiques 'Grande-Baleine': étude exploratoire," ([Montreal]: unpublished report presented to the V.P. Communication et Relations publiques, Hydro-Québec, 1992), 90.

42. Elisabeth May had been the director of Indigenous Survival Canada. She had worked with the Sierra Club Canada and with the Grand Council of the Crees (of Quebec) on its campaign against the Great Whale River hydroelectric development.

43. Farley Mowat and Elisabeth May, "James Bay: le plus grand projet hydro-électrique d'Amérique du Nord," *Message Amérindien International* 1 (spring 1993): 22. First published in *Wild Earth*, 1991.

44. Jamie Sayen and Michael Posluns, *A History of James Bay Development* (pamphlet; Cambridge, Mass.: Northeast Alliance to Protest James Bay, 1991), 5.

45. Boyce Richardson, *Flooding Job's Garden* (Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Company and the National Film Board of Canada, 1991). Also see Isacson, *Power*; and Bainbridge and Vander Wee, *Power of the North*.

46. Despite the widespread use of the garden metaphor by Cree and activists, there is little independent evidence of public responses to it, especially in the larger urban centers where its impact would be expected to be most significant. However, for an important analysis of other specific forms of rhetorical, experiential, and organizational connections that did develop between Cree and environmental supporters in Vermont, see Glenn McRae, "Fighting the Distant Battle: Multi-faceted Mirrors of Vermont Solidarity with James Bay Cree" (Ph.D. diss., The Union Institute, Cincinnati, Ohio, forthcoming).

47. Mowat and May, "James Bay," 22.

48. "During the rest of that Arctic sojourn I abandoned the blinkers of scientific attitudes and struggled instead to fathom the nature of the inter-species empathy and understanding which existed between the Inuit and other creatures of the Barrenlands." Farley Mowat, *Rescue the Earth! Conversations with the Green Crusaders* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1990), 17.

49. Mowat, *Rescue*, 25.

50. *Ibid.*, 15.

51. Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England, 1500–1800* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984); Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989); Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964).

52. Marx, *Machine*, 84.

53. *Ibid.*, 85.

54. On this cultural duality, see David M. Schneider, *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

55. Some animal rights activists have attacked the rhetoric of calling hunted animals "harvests" on precisely these grounds: it confuses and obscures that hunting is killing. See John Livingston, symposium presentation in *A Question of Rights: Northern Wildlife Management and the Anti-Harvest Movement—National Symposium on the North*, ed. Robert F. Keith and Alan Saunders (Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, 1989), 118.

56. John L. Comaroff and Jean Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*, vol. 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 121.

57. Jean Comaroff, *Body of Power: Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa*, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff, *Ethnography and the Colonial Imagination* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1992).

58. Cree were also sometimes employed to do work in the gardens of fur traders and missionaries.

59. I am indebted to Ignatius LaRusic, who pointed this out to me.

60. W. Tees Curran and H. A. Calkins, *In Canada's Wonderful Northland: A Story of Eight Months of Travel by Canoe, Motorboat, and Dog-Team on the Northern Rivers and along the New Quebec Coast of Hudson Bay* (New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1917).

61. The trip was motivated by the building of the new transcontinental railway, some 150 miles south of the foot of James Bay, and the conviction that new transportation routes and agricultural settlement would follow around the Bay gave gardening a particular role in their accounts of the future potential of the region (Curran and Calkins, *In Canada's Wonderful Northland*, vi and 120).

62. *Ibid.*, 115–16. Note their opposition of "Indian" and "white man."

63. *Ibid.*, 120.

64. Richardson, *Strangers*, 167.

65. The specific point of conflict in 1969 was over reciprocity. The new Anglican missionary had tried to make the parish self-supporting, in keeping with an Anglican Church vision statement that parishes be localized. To do so, he had shifted the focus from the church as giver and had dramatically increased demands for collections and for volunteer labor to create parish self-sufficiency. Jacqueline Hyman, a McGill graduate student in anthropology, did fieldwork at Fort George in the summer of 1969, focusing on the conflict between the minister and the Cree parishioners. The minister told her that the church should be run like a business, and indeed he was a retired businessman. He offended Cree with regular and direct demands, which Cree said implied that they never give enough, and he failed to meet Cree standards of generosity himself, paying wages to volunteer labor from the south but not compensating or reciprocating local parishioners for their work. Jacqueline Hyman, "Conflicting Perceptions of Exchange in Indian-Missionary Contact" (master's thesis, McGill University, 1971).

66. For a fuller analysis of the elders' views at this period, see Feit, "Legitimation and Autonomy."

67. Job Bearskin, "Dialogue with Job Bearskin" (legal briefing notes, copy in the possession of the author, two pages typescript, [1972 or 1973]).

68. John Petagumscum, quoted in the Grand Council of the Crees (of Quebec), *Annual Report*, 1989/90. 23.

69. Margaret Sam-Cromarty, *James Bay Memoirs: A Cree Woman's Ode to Her Homeland* (Lakefield, Ont.: Waapoone Publishing, 1992). I am indebted to Margaret Sam-Cromarty and her publisher for permission to quote from her poem. I am indebted to Cory Silverstein for bringing these poems to my attention.

70. I am indebted to Marie Roué and Douglas Nakashima for this example.

71. Transcript of a presentation by Thomas Coon of the Cree Trappers Association (C.T.A.) to the C.T.A. Waswanipi Assembly, 25 August 1998.

72. Cree School Board, *James Bay Day*, 11. See also the quotes from Cree of several generations in Cooper et al., "Cree Stories."

Indigenous Traditions and Ecology

The Interbeing of Cosmology and Community

edited by

JOHN A. GRIM

distributed by

Harvard University Press

for the

Center for the Study of World Religions

Harvard Divinity School

Copyright © 2001