

Indigenous Governance in the Arctic

**A Report for the Arctic Governance Project
(Prepared for the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation)**

Gail Fondahl & Stephanie Irlbacher-Fox

November 2009

Indigenous Governance in the Arctic

(A Report for the Arctic Governance Project)

The purpose of this report is to survey of the main forms of governance developed and practiced among the indigenous peoples of the North American and the Russian Norths (Figure 1). Through an examination of governance forms, we identify key principles of Arctic¹ indigenous governance. We have also considered how indigenous governance principles and practices have produced sustainable human-environment relations, whether they have produced resilient social systems capable of adapting to non-linear and rapid changes in the relevant marine or terrestrial biophysical settings, and to what extent they have been able to withstand the impacts of external pressures.

The Arctic is a cultural diverse region. The Russian North is home to at least 33 indigenous peoples, spanning a huge geography of some 10 time zones across Europe and Asia. North America's North, with its similarly vast spaces, also accommodates over a dozen distinct linguistic groups, with many more self-identifying nations (Table 1). The peoples of the Arctic historically depended on hunting and gathering, and on reindeer pastoralism in some areas of the Russian north. These land- and sea- based subsistence activities remain important for most of these people, for cultural, social and spiritual reasons as well as for economic security (ADHR 2004).

What is Governance? What is Indigenous Governance?

For the purpose of this report *governance* is understood as the exercise of legitimate authority within a group to make decisions regarding the allocation of resources and the coordination and management of communal and, to some extent, individual activities. The term refers to the principles, institutions and practices that a collective employs to regulate relations among its members, and between its members and the external world. Governance stipulates how resources are shared and managed; it guides social relations. It is informed by endogenous norms and practices mediating such relations.

Governance in Arctic indigenous societies occurs within what is known as communicative "high-context" cultural approaches (Hall, 1976). In other words, among Arctic and Subarctic hunter-gatherers and pastoralists, oral cultures required socio-cultural fluency or knowing as the basis for the conduct of what outsiders would recognize as governance. This contrasts to Western/European-based or settler societies' own tendencies toward "low-context" communicative

¹ As is commonly done elsewhere (e.g. AHDR 2004), the term 'Arctic' is used as a gloss for, and somewhat interchangeably with, the term 'North', to encompass both the arctic and subarctic regions.

approaches, which employ written rules, contracts, and systems predicated on a hierarchy and delegation of authority. In such systems knowing can be derived from reading and written rules rather than through relationships and cultural knowledge. This fundamental difference in approaches to the basis of governance is the key basis for difference between western and Indigenous governance: Indigenous governance is consistent with beliefs, values, practices, and worldviews of Indigenous cultures. Principles of indigenous governance are elaborated further in the next section of this paper. The nature of Indigenous governance is documented in the extensive literature on hunter gatherer-societies and social organization, from the 1800's to the present (see for example Rogers, 1984; and literatures included in Gurvich & Dolgich 1970, and Krech 1980). The inherent logic of indigenous governance is radically different from that of 'Western' governance; it is useful to try to identify some of the common values and principles that inform such indigenous governance systems in the Arctic, while recognizing that Arctic indigenous peoples and their forms of governance vary widely.

Traditional versus Modern Governance; Formal versus Informal Governance

Often distinctions between indigenous and non-indigenous cultures are drawn in terms that function to obfuscate relevant sources of difference. Two such problematic dichotomies are those of *traditional* versus *modern*, and *informal* versus *formal*, in characterizing governance approaches. In the first instance, "traditional" is frequently misused as a gloss to denote distinctively indigenous cultural practice. Even when intended to underscore the continuity of an Indigenous practice from a pre-contact era, the label "traditional" frequently has the effect of historicizing practices in ways that undermine their relevance for contemporary purposes. As a result, "traditional" practices are often set against notions of modernity, establishing a conflict which is both temporal and firmly Eurocentric: Indigenous principles and practices are framed as being in conflict with Western ones as a result of literally being from a different time (e.g. Neolithic) rather than being from a different culture (Morrow & Hensel 1992; Nadasdy 1999; Pika 1999).² The danger of this is that such practices may be dismissed or undermined as being irrelevant to present-day governance systems, rather than appreciated as a device for better understanding both the political culture and worldviews of Indigenous peoples. Such principles and practices are thus ignored, rather than applied as important elements for incorporation into current political arrangements with the state. For the sake of clarity and precision, this dichotomy might be more accurately conceived as *indigenous* versus '*western*' rather than *traditional* versus *modern* (Irlbacher-Fox, 2009). In this report we seek to identify long-standing principles of indigenous governance that have informed and continue to inform local governance practices (to the extent allowed by external constraints), recognizing that the practices have changed with context, but the underlying principles have evolved more gradually, representative as they are of core cultural values.

² The Russian term for 'traditional,' *traditsionnoe* is commonly opposed to *sovremennoe* – 'modern', but also 'progressive' (Habeck 2005:182). It is also worth noting that such binary oppositions are characteristic of Western, but not Indigenous, thinking (Willerslev 2007:182).

As to the informal/formal dichotomy, indigenous governance practices, developed through high-context communicative circumstances, are practices viewed as informal or legally “unrecognized” by the state. So for example, the *Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act* would constitute a “formal” arrangement, whereas a Sahtu Dene leader’s practice of consulting with Elders before appointing representatives to a co-management board would be “informal”. Yet such “informal” practices among Indigenous peoples relating to leadership selection are based on indigenous governance principles of critical importance and have had significant durability despite the changing circumstances traversed by Indigenous peoples. The cultural norms and practices associated with leadership selection are uniformly applied across changing contexts and result in selection of what are known as “situational leaders”, whose authority, while determined through specific and stringent cultural protocols, may be highly contingent upon specific task requirements and circumstances.³

Principles of Indigenous Governance

The term “indigenous governance” denotes forms of social and political organization, and decision-making of indigenous peoples informed by the imperatives of their unique cultures and worldviews. Among Arctic indigenous peoples, culturally informed notions of authority differ greatly from that of Europeans and settlers, as captured by anthropologist Hugh Brody, who bears quoting at length:

Systems of authority based on egalitarianism and forms of ownership based on sharing are so different from the hierarchical and competitive systems of Euro-Canadian culture that they tend to be invisible to newcomers. We cannot see, and find it very hard to believe in, jurisdictions that exist in the mind of a people. We need some form of political tourism; we need to be able to visit an office, to watch a debate, to make a journey that is guided by the language of hierarchical authority. We need to ask questions. The hunting and trapping peoples of the north, on the contrary, need to be able to vest their authority in themselves as individuals and to share both the knowledge and produce that the knowledge generates to ensure that their system, their families and individuals, will survive into the future. They need to be able to move freely, in tune with the world about them and their ideas of the world within themselves. They need and respect knowledge, but use it without subordinacy. Their collectivity is vital to them. As are their lands and beliefs. But the richness of the their lands, the efficacy of their beliefs and the health of the collective all depend on the absence of formal, limiting, confusing

³ For an excellent discussion of the nature of authority among Subarctic Athapaskans see Rushforth (1994); for Inuit see Brody (1987).

institutions. For northern peoples, egalitarian individualism is at the heart of social integrity and wellbeing. (Brody 1987: 133)

Brody, fluent in Inuktitut as a result of years among the Inuit of what is today Nunavut, and recognized for his extensive fieldwork among several other Arctic and Subarctic peoples, articulates the impossibility of coherent articulation between indigenous notions of authority and “governance arrangements” as conceived in the manner of those structuring nation states in the European tradition.

Broadly speaking, general principles of Indigenous governance may be distilled from the various ethnographic descriptions of decision-making among different Indigenous peoples. Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred, a leading Indigenous scholar on Indigenous governance, has delineated widely accepted essential characteristics of how Indigenous peoples tend to approach decision-making:

Governance in an indigenist sense can be practiced only in a decentralized, small-scale environment among people who share a culture. It centers on the achievement of consensus and the creation of collective power, bounded by six principles, [where governance]:

- depends on the active participation of individuals
- balances many layers of equal power
- is dispersed
- is situational
- is non-coercive
- respects diversity (Alfred, 2009: 50-51)

A similar set of governance principles is identified by the Inuit of Nunavut, and explicitly employed in the Government of Nunavut’s programs and services (Wihak 2004:30-31; Appendix 1). While the various peoples of the Circumpolar North live in diverse environments, have experienced different colonial histories, and express a wide diversity of cultures, all of which have encouraged the development of governance systems diverse in their details and specific practices within the Arctic and Subarctic regions, we observe that the elements identified by Alfred and the Nunavut Inuit are shared as key principles that underpin the ‘good governance’ of most of these groups.⁴ These defining elements of governance include:

- ***Knowing through experience***
- ***Merit as a source of authority***
- ***Decision-making by consensus***
- ***Being part of the environment***
- ***Using resources wisely for the common good***
- ***Respecting diversity***

⁴ Our report does not encompass the ‘traditional’ governance systems of the Sami (other than in passing, for the Kola Sami), nor that of the Greenland Inuit.

We have organized our discussion around these principles, attempting to illustrate some of the ways in which they are effected through governance practices among the Arctic's diverse peoples. We also note the intertwined nature of these principles in their practices: using resources wisely depends on knowing through experience, knowing through experience is a source of merit-based authority, and so forth (Zoe 2007).

Knowing through Experiencing

Indigenous knowledge is defined as “knowledge and values that have been acquired through experience and observation, from the land or from spiritual teachings and handed down from one generation to another” (Abele 1997:iii). Indigenous knowledge, entitlement to resources, and authority are intertwined in many Arctic cultures. The ability to govern — to make authoritative decisions about uses of resources and about social activities — depends on the knowledge of one's environment, and the demonstration of this knowledge through skilled practices.

Historically, leaders of the small family groupings that characterized Inuit social-ecological systems emerged through demonstrating knowledge and skill in hunting and survival. Among the Inuvialuit for example, leaders known as “umialik”, through their success commanded the respect of those in their camps (Edge & Irlbacher-Fox, 2002). Survival in Arctic environments required the daily application of indigenous knowledge among all Northern peoples.

Knowledge of the environment served as a key indicator of the cultural level of a person among the Nenets (Golovnev & Zaytsev 1992). Leaders for hunting or fishing groups were chosen due to their expertise, their knowledge of the habits and habitats of the animals they hunted, and the skills necessary to succeed in the hunt. Elders' wider ecological knowledge, based on the deep and detailed knowledge gained through longitudinal experience unique to longevity, was often a reason for respect, if not recognition as a leader. Position within indigenous social structures commonly depends on demonstrated competence in subsistence activities. It is the competent practices of subsistence activities, based on a profound knowledge of one's environment (‘knowing the land’) that entitle Evenks to use their territories – usufruct rights, to employ a Western concept, are intimately linked to proficiency in performing subsistence activities (Anderson 2000). Likewise, in Dolgan communities, ‘masters’ are those who have accumulated broad knowledge of their environments, have demonstrated strong emotional relationships to the land, know and understand the human and animal persons who co-inhabit it, and thus enjoy the trust of their local community to appropriately guide respectful decisions regarding activities in this place (Venstel 2005).

A corollary to this principle of experiential knowledge motivating legitimate authority is the reported discomfort experienced by those having to make decisions beyond the (spatial) scope of their authority. Ethnographers have noted that indigenous peoples often feel somewhat uncomfortable traveling outside of their

own territories (e.g. Sirina 2006); and 'knowing the land' is "in practice is applied along discrete routes, at specific pastures in the spring and in different pastures in the autumn." (Anderson 2000:133). Leaders indeed operated on a local scale, empowered to speak to political matters in the areas, figuratively and literally, under their (situational) purview.

Merit as a Source of Authority (Leadership)

Among most Arctic indigenous peoples, leadership tends to be 'situational' (Brody, 1987). Qualities of knowledge, skill, experience and wisdom, fairness, morality, and forethought are cited as key attributes for leadership. Thus authority in northern societies stems less often from heredity than merit. Leaders emerged through demonstrating knowledge and skill in hunting, harvesting, reindeer pastoralism – and in contributing to their community's⁵ survival. As historian Keith Crowe observes for the North American North, indigenous governance requires that situation influence the choice of leader, and the leader changes given the function necessary to fulfill:

In general, leaders were men or women of proven wisdom and skill, and the group followed their decisions. Often one man would be the leader during a communal hunt, another during a fight with enemies, and still another during a long sledge or canoe journey. Some people were all-around leaders who stood out because of their strength, wisdom, and skill in magic [sic]. Such a person might become the main chief of a band or whole tribe, but even then his followers could disagree or just move away to live elsewhere. (Crowe 1974: 34)

An analogous description of leadership among the Nenets underscores the flexibility and provisionality of leadership characteristic of many northern peoples:

Military leadership among the Nenets historically had a democratic character and might pass quite easily according to the nature of the activity (war or revolt). Likewise, leadership in economic activities might rotate among those skilled in a particular field. Nenets leaders are not confined to a particular gender; they shift with the economic fortunes of herders and flex in the face of obstacles." (Golovnev & Osherenko 1999:143)⁶

Once the need of the community for a particular leader's set of skills shifted, or a leader's successes waned, a new leader would be chosen (Golovnev 1997).

⁵ 'Communities' in this report refer to small, mobile social units (e.g. hunting groups, herding 'camps', family communes [*obshchiny*]), usually but not necessarily composed of relatives, as well as fixed settlements.

⁶ See also Kurshanova (1987) on traditional flexibility of leadership, and autonomy of the individual, for the Chukchi – the development of 'big leaders' evolved in the 18th century under the influence of Russian interventions.

Among many Arctic peoples, a contributing factor to the role of leader appears to be seniority-in-place. For instance, among the Chukchi, the leader of an indigenous settlement was usually the longest resident of that place. This person had the right to lead the hunt and enjoy the largest portion of the harvest (Vdovin 1965). Given depth of continuous experience that longevity-in-place engenders, coupled with the entitlement this begets, seniority as a criterion for leadership is consistent with an emphasis on merit as a underlying facet of authority. Relied upon for their knowledge gained through experience, Elders in many communities are considered to have views requiring serious consideration in decision-making, particularly for decisions relating to the land. The respect accorded to Elders flows from their experiences on the land. Among the Tlicho, to engage in decision-making Dene must have a vital relationship with and knowledge of their lands (Zoe, 2007).

Transfer of leadership positions by inheritance was observed among some northern peoples – for instance among the Khanty and Mansi of western Siberia, leadership positions were for a time were passed from father to son, in a rank-based, dynastic system (Khomich 1966). However much more common was a loosely based inheritance of leadership role from father to son in cases only where the father had maintained his reputation throughout his life, *and* where the son was seen as a worthy heir (Golovnev 1997; Golovnev & Zaytsev 1992). The ‘dynastic’ system of the Western Siberian groups appears to have arisen shortly before the beginning of the colonial (Russian) period (1500s), was likely preceded by a more merit-based leadership system. It waned by the 19th century. In contrast, within hunter-gatherer societies of North America’s Arctic and Subarctic, such hereditary leadership was unknown.

Wealth/ assets play a paradoxical role in the determination of authority in indigenous Arctic societies. Ability to generate greater wealth may earn one the role of ‘head’ of a group of families or a clan. Among the Nenets, the richest reindeer herder often held the position of leader, exercising the right to determine the order of movements of the different reindeer herds of his clan, and playing a central role in overseeing the resolution of arguments among the camp’s members (Golovnev & Zaytsev 1992). Rich Chukchi herders or *baydar* (whaling boat) captains were acknowledged as leaders, and approached for advice – yet their ability to require their kinspeople to follow their recommendations was very limited (Vdovin 1965). Material wealth, in reindeer, whaling boat, or in other assets, generally indicated aptitude and expertise, which in turn were founded in a profound knowledge of the territory. Thus, again we see entitlement to legitimate authority intimately integrated with knowledge, skill and proficiency — underpinnings of merit-based authority (Gurvich & Doglikh 1970; Alunik, Kolousok, and Morrison 2003).

Paradoxically, then, for a number of groups, such as the Yukagir, the “authority of leadership rests not in acquiring and holding personal wealth, but in giving it away. A leader must give away everything to preserve his popularity, and is therefore among the poorest people in the community” (Willerslev 2007:42). Another

criterion of leadership among many northern peoples was that of willingness to sacrifice for the community, and support of all its members' well-being, sometimes to the detriment of one's own material wealth. In the Yukagir community of Nelemnoe, for instance, a recent leader was much berated by regional officials due to his 'squandering' of the property that he received control over as a head of a local commune, upon dissolution of the local state farm and transfer of property to the commune. Yet by Yukagir tradition he was obliged to give away whatever he 'owned' to his kinspeople, both real and fictive, upon their requests. It was precisely his situation – of having property to distribute, and of showing willingness to follow this tradition of giving– that ensured his (transitory) recognition by the community as leader (Willerslev 2007). And once his situation changed, in that he had no wealth to distribute – his authority waned. It is possible that his knowledge, experience and skill might again bolster his material means, and thus his ability to give, in the future, producing another phase of 'situational' leadership for him.

Merit also interlinks with territoriality. If more important than one's own material wealth, are the skills to ensure the production and distribution of resources for the well-being of one's community, a leader nevertheless needs a level of control over territory to perform these skills to access the resources. The loss of control over territory reduces social status, as the individual losing such control can no longer show leadership through proficiency in providing for the community.

A corollary of merit-based situational authority is that a number of individuals in a given indigenous community may serve as leaders of different types, each drawing on their mastery of a distinct subset of local knowledge, experience and skills, to take responsibility for their community's well being in a given context (e.g. hunt, war). This provides an ideal preparation for 'democratic' citizenship, where members of a community with relatively similar skill sets and experiences may "take turns" holding different leadership positions. This ensures both that opportunities to develop and enhance knowledge and skills are spread out among different individuals. This practice in turn promotes a sense of participation and ownership of community affairs and decision-making.

Decision-Making by Consensus

Consensus decision-making is an essential element of many northern people's governance. Consensus, according to the Dene (e.g., Dene Nation 1984) does not mean unanimous agreement. Rather it is a relational, process oriented description of reaching decisions through the open and respectful sharing of views. This transparent form of interest sharing reveals a direction which should be taken that would be in the best interests of the collective, not only in the present but in the future.

Chukchi discussed measures connected with external relations with neighboring peoples in large groups (Vdovin 1965), and among the Nenets, it was/is the respected elders of the clan who collectively guided decisions regarding the use of

the tundra's resources, most notably its pastures, based on their knowledge of past usage, current environmental and animal conditions, and future demands on the pastures from their own herds, neighboring herds and other users (Golovnev 1997; Golovnev & Osherenko 1999; see also Stammler 2005). Among the Evens, decision-making regarding the duties of different camp members involved the whole camp (Gurvich 2005). Among the Evenks, territorial disputes between neighboring family groups, including trespassing charges and reallocation of hunting territories, were resolved by the community as a whole at semi-annual gatherings (*suglany*) for this purpose (Vasilevich 1969; Turov 1990). Elders collectively weighed competing needs for territory, considering family size, composition, and resources (e.g. size of reindeer herds) in their deliberations regarding reassignment. Annual summer assemblies among Dene peoples of Canada's Northwest Territories function to provide a forum for member communities to gather and share views toward affirming and making decisions about major political, economic, and resource initiatives (Kulchyski, 2005, Dene Nation, 1984).

An example of this principle of consensus decision-making informing legal agreements that structure Indigenous-state relations can be seen in the way the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation is set up. Under the Inuvialuit Final Agreement, the corporation was created to reflect a capitalist corporate orientation toward land ownership and control of resources. Nevertheless, the regional corporation is controlled by a series of community corporations, one for each of the six Inuvialuit communities, which in turn report to their member "shareholders", Inuvialuit 18 years of age or older who are voting members of each corporation. This echoes the approach used to create the Alaska Native Corporations created under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The process ensures that a wide range of interests are voiced, and all affected communities have the opportunity for input into decision making. As such it coheres with Alfred's characteristic of indigenous governance as involving the active participation of individuals (see p.4, above).

Being A Part of the Environment

The Yukagir hunter, when out hunting, is both hunter and animal, and within the human community he is not simply himself but also a reincarnated deceased relative. (Willerslev 2007:186)

Seeing oneself as part of the environment, as not living outside of nature but as a constituent of it — as an integral and not superior part of a larger ecological community — is common to Arctic peoples. Indigenous peoples see themselves as part of an animate, en-souled ecosystem, with which peoples, animals and other beings and spirits must co-exist in a relationship of respect and sharing. (Adaev 2007; Blondin 1990, 1997, 2006; Krupnik & Vakhtin 1997; Mazin 1984].

To 'ensure a friendly co-existence' (Krupnik & Vakhtin 1997) entails the following of protocols and their related rituals. Such activities recurrently demonstrate respect for one's fellow beings and serve to remind oneself of such interconnections. Feeding the fire is commonly practiced among the peoples of the Eurasian Arctic (e.g. Vasilevich 1969; Willerslev 2007), and is also a practice that is evident among subarctic indigenous peoples of North America (Helm, 1994; Irlbacher-Fox 2009), a practice of transforming objects (food, tobacco) through fire to a form pleasing to the land. For the Dene, another manifestation of such respect is in the practice of "paying the water": making an offering to lakes or rivers being traveled:

The Tlicho landscape is infused with the presence of innumerable entities, or "powers", both benevolent and malevolent. In traveling across the landscape, one must constantly mitigate the impact of personal actions by appeasing these entities with votive offerings, and by observing strict rules of behavior. For example, at each new water body encountered en route, offerings are left." (Zoe 2007: 23)

This practice is also observed in northern Eurasia; other proper behaviour near rivers and lakes included not shouting and not spitting in the waters. (Vinokurova & Shadrin 2006). Similarly, the Evenks, among others, stop to offer gifts along their routes, at high points (e.g. mountain passes), and at other sites of importance. Traveling on the land, paying respect, listening to and telling stories about the places, and reading the landscape for signs of change, is a fundamental aspect of living respectfully as part of the land.

Within land-based indigenous cosmologies, humans are active participants in the reincarnation of the animals they hunt, and personhood is not a state monopolised by humans. Following protocols based on respect for the animal spirit ensures the return of the game. Among the Siberian Yupik, for instance, the bones of marine mammals killed by hunters underwent special treatment to ensure reincarnation – animals treated appropriately and consumed with respect would be reborn, to once again provide for the hunter (Krupnik & Vakhtin 1997). Similar practice were and are observed for ungulates and other animals – bones are hung in trees or elevated on structures for that purpose, in both North American and Eurasian indigenous peoples (e.g. Mazin 1984; Vinokurova & Shadrin 2006). Among the Misstasini Cree of Northern Quebec, the human form is believed to be but one expression of personhood: animals and humans share in personhood, and engage in social relations, which include practices of respect in the receiving of an animal that has given itself to a hunter for food (Tanner 1979; Ingold 2000). Yukaghir hunters employ techniques likened to seduction and/or shifting states of personhood from human to animal by the hunter (Willerslev 2007). Killing of domestic reindeer for household consumption also require appropriate techniques, ones that differ from those used for the commercial kill, to emphasize the special relation of interdependence (e.g. Vasilevich 1969; Stammer 2005).

Such an understanding of connectedness with the environment and the non-human persons who share it with indigenous peoples contributes to protocols regarding stewardship. To ensure sustainability of tundra resources hunters are known to spare the last of the game or wild reindeer (Alekseev 1993; Ventsel 2005), and fishers voluntarily limited take to a level they felt as sustainable (Vinokurova & Shadrin 2006). Killing a pregnant wild cow reindeer or moose is avoided by some groups, for instance the Yukagir and Evenks, (Vinokurova & Shadrin 2006; GF-field observations). Indigenous 'hunting seasons' were observed for some species in some areas (Adaev 2007:181-183). In the community of Deline, Elders caution against hunting caribou newly arrived in the local hunting territory: the caribou are understood to remember significant events and will vary their routes to avoid re-experiencing such assaults (SF – personal communication with Deline resident).

The marking of time in numerous Arctic societies underscores the environmental knowledge of the people – names of months or seasons reflect the availability of different resources and the pulse of subsistence activities (e.g. Alekseenko 1974; Adaev 2007). The Gwich'in peoples of the North American Arctic refer to seasons in accordance with a combination of weather patterns, animal location and availability, and state of the environment within given weather conditions. So for example the season Khaii (winter), is further delineated by terms indicating "darkest days", "ice frozen deep", "caribou hunted when needed", and "fishing through the ice" (Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board, 2001). It is interesting to note that among the Nenets the names of the months changed as reindeer husbandry replaced hunting as the main subsistence activity – the new names more reflective of reindeer activities during the course of the year (Golovnev & Zaytsev 1992)

This profound, intimate and vital physical and spiritual interconnectedness with the environment also informs aboriginal governance in ways not recognized nor accommodated for in overarching Western governance systems. In the words of Dene National Chief Bill Erasmus, "to assert that the Crown [Canada] owns Dene lands is to assert that it has divided Dene from themselves. That makes no sense" (quoted in Irlbacher-Fox 2009: xi). Interactions between humans and the environment were, and continue to be, intimately intertwined.

Using Resources Wisely

The close relationship between beings, human, animal and other is pervaded by an ethic of reciprocity. Anthropological studies note the absence of ritual and rhetoric correlating with European notions of thanks (thank you) or acknowledgement (hello, good-bye), which is instead replaced with an ethic of sharing and intimacy (cf. Brody 1987; Helm 2000). This ethic has been shown to extend not only to other humans and animals (Willerslev 2007), but also to other entities, such as mining companies being expected to share their profits through Impact Benefit Agreements, as shown in the work of Ginger Gibson among the Tlicho Dene (Gibson 2007).

Observers of Arctic peoples often note the pervasive 'law of the tundra': Arctic peoples help all in need, sharing food, labour, equipment and services without expectation of immediate recompense (e.g. Khomich 1974; Ventsel 2005). Historically, caches of food, clothing, sleds, sometimes even furs, which dotted the taiga and tundra, could be used by whoever needed such, with the expectation that the person would replenish the supplies at a later date (Vasilevich 1969; Brody 1987; Wiget & Balalaeva 1997). Sharing was critical to survival in the harsh environment. Sharing was a code of conduct: indeed, the Yukagir "differentiate themselves from neighboring Russians and Sakha primarily by contrasting their own enthusiasm for sharing against the individualistic greed of these outsiders, who are said to be stingy and unwilling to share" (Willerslev 2007:36), and have an "ethos of unconditional sharing" (Willerslev 2007:39). Protocols for the division of the harvest are common among Arctic peoples in the Russian and North American norths, with rigorous prescriptions for the distribution of different cuts of meat, and the skin, in some situations (see Vdovin 1965 on Chukchi; Stammler 2005 on Nenets; for Innu see Bouchard 2004; for Cree see Tanner 1973; and on Gwich'ya Gwich'in, Heine *et al.* 2001).

Whereas the product of the hunt was shared, hunting territories and reindeer pastures involved limitations on access among many Northern peoples. What we conceive of in western terminology as customary tenure systems defined who could access the resources of an area, and under what conditions. Protocols regulated access both within communities and between regional groups and nations (e.g. peoples) (Gurvich & Dolgikh 1970). Husbanding of reindeer pasture to protect lichen resources and ensure their regeneration, through controlled access, rotation of pastures and timing of herd migrations, and/or the limiting of herd size is observed, for instance among the Nenets (Krupnik 1993; Golovnev & Zaytsev 1992;). Rights to control access to hunting territories and fishing grounds is common for the Evenks (Turov 1990), Khanty (Wiget & Balalaeva 1997), Nenets (Khomich 1966), and Nganasan (Ventsel 2005), among others — though temporary use could be negotiated with the family who used and was responsible for stewarding the area. Evenks were known for their care their hunting grounds, to protect these for future generations (Suslov, cited in Sirina 2006) A Nenets saying, "the land remains after us", indicates the need to steward a highly valuable and valued resource (Golovnev & Zaytsev 1992:45). During their land claim Land Use and Occupancy Study during the 1970s, the Dene Nation recorded hundreds of trails used by individuals and pairs of hunters and trappers recognized as belonging to specific families (Dene Nation 1984). According to former Grand Chief of the Dehcho First Nations, Gerry Antoine, in the Dehcho, certain families are recognized as being stewards of specific territories, which requires that those families must be consulted if others (individuals, companies, governments) want to undertake activities on those lands (Benoit, 2008).

The foundation for 'control' over territory among Arctic peoples has also been interrogated by some Arctic ethnographers. While it appears that within some Arctic groups, people respected the rights of their neighbors to limit access to hunting areas, fishing sites and pastures, flexibility was common. The expectation was that permission would be sought from the family or clan intimately connected to that territory. Refusal of such requests, however, was considered inappropriate (GF - Interviews - Nelemnoe, 1997; Gogolev et al. 1995). Among the Yukagir, "group's association with a particular territory and river seems to provide a means of identifying oneself and others, a way of mapping out social relations spatially, rather than identifying exclusive rights to resources" (Willerslev 2007:36). Among the Dolgan "the ancestors were real people whose past activities made the landscape 'ours' and excluded other people... parents did not transmit the land to next generation, but instilled social and emotional bonds to it." (Ventsel 2005:130). Socio-spatial entitlement is asserted and maintained by knowing, being emotionally invested in, using, and stewarding the resources, of one's territory. Entitlement is however moderated by others' need for territory's resources, especially in times of scarcity.

Respecting Diversity

Many points in the discussion of the preceding five principles also speak to the principle of respect for diversity. The principle of being part of the environment entails respect for one's co-inhabitants, be they human, animal, or other form.. The principle of consensus-based decision-making implies a respect for considering the views of others in governance, tolerance to a diversity of views, and forbearance when one disagrees. Situational authority implicates a respect for different sets of skills held by different individuals, and their critical contribution to the well-being of the community at different points in time and space.

Avoidance of conflict may be seen as a corollary of such respect. When differences in views are irresolvable, and consensus unattainable, some Arctic groups respond by physical removal – a community or camp will split and part will relocate (e.g. Tanner . 2001, on Innu). Thus, through non-coercive means, diversity can still be accommodated.

Indigenous Governance Informing Contemporary Governance Arrangements

The above principles capture essential parameters for the exercise of authority and power among Arctic peoples. The previous discussion also conveys how these principles fit within the broader cultures and cosmologies of Arctic and Subarctic indigenous peoples. Today, these principles manifest as practices informing ways in which agreements structuring legal relations between the state and Indigenous peoples, and associated governance arrangements of Indigenous peoples, are implemented throughout the Arctic.

In the Inuit context these principles of governance are derived from the foundational elements of what is known as *Inuit Qaujimanituqangit* (IQ) (Wihak 2004). The application of IQ within the Government of Nunavut's programs and services provides a compelling example of traditional Inuit governance approaches currently being used in the Arctic today. IQ approximates what is understood as indigenous knowledge (previously defined cf. Abele): the cultural knowledge inherent to Indigenous peoples as a result of their living in and practicing and basing their cultures in a certain geographic area since time immemorial. Through this distillation of the six principles above, the Inuit have provided the basis for bureaucrats to examine their approach to implementing governance, with a view to how programs and services might be made more consistent with the worldview and associated practices of Inuit culture. The use of IQ pervades all aspects of government programs and services. This is notable in that it has been adopted by a public government that serves all citizens in the territory (where the population of about 30,000 is about 85% Inuit). It is included in decision making over resource use, for example in setting polar bear hunting quotas.

Ten years after the creation of Nunavut, the use of IQ has become commonly accepted and supported by co-management boards and government agencies operating in Nunavut. It has not been without controversy: for example, in the determination of hunting quotas for polar bears (Watson 2009). While Inuit climate change activists point to the receding Arctic ice pack endangering polar bears, Inuit hunters argue that hunting quotas should not be restricted despite a perception that impacted bear populations are already shrinking. Hunters claim that IQ or indigenous knowledge holders dispute population reductions.

Other indigenous peoples have attempted to imbue legal and political institutional arrangements between themselves and the state with such principles, developing a variety of methods to creatively incorporate Indigenous political culture into often capitalist (e.g. Native Corporations in Alaska and the Inuvialuit Settlement Region) and western democratic based governance arrangements (e.g. Comprehensive Land Claim organizations of the James Bay and Northern Quebec agreements; and co-management arrangements created under those agreements). In the Sakha Republic, a law explicitly recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples to govern themselves "according to the traditional way of life" (O pravovom...1997), through local meetings, referendums, and 'direct democracy' – a clause that theoretically empowers such institutions as the Evenk *suglan* (see above, p.9).

Even when the process of establishing 'self-government' has been dictated from above, such as in many of the native villages in Sakha Republic in the late 1990s, indigenous peoples have co-opted the process to realize such principles. For instance, in the Even village of Berezovka, villagers, required to appoint a 'self-government' under the new law in 1998, and within its constraints (e.g. democratic election), chose to elect as 'chief' (a term they debated and adopted) an elder who was also the leader of the most successful reindeer herding enterprise, whose

formal education was limited but who had grown up on the land, who spoke his own language, whose culture competence and environmental knowledge were possibly unmatched in the village, who descended from a former Even leader famous for his consensual decision-making practices (Popova 1976), and who had good working relations with the district-level administration (GF- Fieldnotes, 1998). Several of the above principles – of knowing through experience, merit as a source of authority, consensual decision-making, being part of the environment, using resources wisely and respecting others – seemed to underpin this choice. Similarly, in negotiating its self government agreement in Canada, the people of Deline have opted for a model of government which combines all forms of government currently operating in the community – municipality, Indian Act Band Council, and land claim created Land Corporation, along with additional law making powers currently held by the territorial government – into one entity, despite significant initial objections from Canada. This move to combining diverse types of governments into one organization reflects the cultural principal championed by the Elders that for this particular community, one strong government will be the best way for the community to work together cohesively toward self-determination (Irlbacher-Fox 2009).

Indigenous peoples have also worked to reinvigorate the principle of knowledge through experience by re-establishing land-based education programs, in an attempt to guarantee that younger members of their society will have the skills needed to contribute to future good governance. In Siberia, numerous indigenous communities have established ‘national schools’ as well as after school programs, to re-introduce reindeer herding, hunting and trapping skills. Such programs, whether ‘immersive’ or supplementary, focus on building an understanding of ecological processes of the local environment, as well as appropriate behaviour when engaging in ‘traditional’ activities (e.g. Fondahl 1998; Vinokurova & Shadrin 2006). In the Northwest Territories, the Tlicho government has established the *Trails of Our Ancestors* program, which supports yearly canoe trips of Tlicho, including youth and Elders, on the traditional trails of the people throughout the territory. This enactment of cultural knowledge and being is as transformative for Tlicho as it is for the land itself, reinforcing the fundamental relationship underpinning Dene governance: profound connection to land and to oneself through being part of that land, in relationship and in community with other Dene. The program has been prioritized as essential to building the governance capacity of the Tlicho. The Tlicho Government motto, inspired by Elders Jimmy Bruneau and Elizabeth Mackenzie is “Strong Like Two People”, indicative of the importance for Tlicho to be fluent in both non-Indigenous and Indigenous ways. For the Tlicho to survive as an indigenous people, the Tlicho Government has recognized the importance of providing the opportunity to ensure that Tlicho may maintain vibrant and vital knowledge of their lands. In this way, they will be able to acquire the knowledge and competencies necessary to take part in decision making from a place of knowledge and confidence.

The *Trails of Our Ancestors* program embodies Indigenous governance principles with respect to ensuring the ability of Tlicho people to participate meaningfully and positively in governance decisions. An interesting flip-side of this concern is seen in

the concerns expressed by Evenk teachers Victor Ganyugin and Darya Mironova to ensure that the local non-indigenous children are involved in their programming alongside their Evenk peers: introducing these children early to Evenk cultural values through their participation in the field schools and culture camps will hopefully contribute to a future generation of non-native decision-makers versed in, and open to the incorporation of, indigenous principles and practices in local governance (Fondahl 1998).

Indigenous peoples are also integrating consensus-based decision-making into governance practices recognized through agreements and legislation of the state. An examples of internal consultation and consensus built into governance of the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation was noted above (p. 9, above). Similarly, under Dene land claim agreements in Canada, co-management arrangements, where Canada and Dene peoples have guaranteed representation on boards responsible for managing lands and resources, Dene land claim governments develop their own methods for appointing members to the boards. The boards are public government, quasi-governmental agencies staffed with technical experts and function in accordance with western European bureaucratic organizational norms. In a community such as Deline, which is a signatory to the *Sahtu Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement* with Canada, the land corporation of that community selects representatives from among the land-users in the community based on indigenous criteria of merit, choosing individuals recognized for their expertise on the land to sit as representatives on the co-management board.

Resource management challenges are also invoking indigenous governance principles. Recently, the Dene have had to grapple with declining caribou herds, and have used the Dene Nation as a key forum to discuss the situation and to make decisions about Dene harvesting levels. During 2007, the Dene Nation passed a resolution to make caribou protection a priority and has worked with government and industry to monitor caribou numbers and determine how to better protect the herds. As signatories to land claim agreements, Dene in the Northwest Territories are not subject to hunting restrictions being instituted by the Government of the Northwest Territories intended to protect the declining herds. The Dene Nation provides a forum for information sharing and discussion, providing all Dene Chiefs with a sense of how the situation is impacting communities. However, true to Dene governance values, communities have autonomy in determining their own actions in the matter. For example, during September 2009 the Yellowknives Dene announced that they were canceling their annual community caribou hunt out of concern for the preservation of the Beverly-Qaminuriaq herd on which they rely as one of their main sources of food.

In western Siberia, we see one example of using resources wisely for the common good: an indigenous commune, *Karym*, petitioned for land as allowed by for a new regional law, and established a small commercial meat- and fish-processing plant to handle locally harvested resources. The leader, Yevgeniy Vakhruoshev, pursued the development of this facility as much to ensure that his children are able to pursue

the traditional activities — hunting and fishing — of his ancestors and their ancestral land, as to make a profit. Notably, Vakhruoshev, while using earnings to build housing for the members of the commune (the construction was carried out collectively by these members), continued to reside in a tent. His status as a respected elder appeared to contribute to his ability to establish his role as a community leader; and his role as provider of new opportunities through harnessing local resources for the collective good enhanced his authority and strengthened the legitimacy of his leadership (Novikova 2002).

Institutional arrangements mandated by governance imperatives of nation-states, which reflecting a fundamentally Western-European orientation, can still be influenced by Indigenous cultural norms, at least to the extent that Indigenous peoples have freedom to do so. The examples above demonstrate important findings:

- Indigenous peoples retain important aspects of their cultural governance practices;
- Indigenous peoples wish to incorporate their political culture within their governance practices; and,
- Indigenous and Western European based forms of governance are not mutually exclusive and may be effectively influenced by each other.

Evidence suggests that the frequency and utility of distinctively Indigenous governance practices are not issues of organizational integration, but rather political in nature: to what extent do Indigenous peoples have the freedom, in terms of their relationship *vis a vis* the nation-state, to determine how their culture shapes the decision-making processes undertaken within institutions recognized through agreements with and legislation of the nation-state?

Indigenous Governance: Sustainability, Resilience, Survival

We turn at the end of this report to three questions posed in the introduction, reviewing the role indigenous governance principles and practices have played in producing sustainable human-environment relations, and in producing resilient social systems, and to what extent these principles and practices have withstood the impact of external pressures. The above examples illustrate how indigenous governance principles and practices are observed and perpetuated.

Have indigenous governance systems produced sustainable human-environment relations?

Implicated so closely with indigenous cosmologies remarkable in part for their traditions of ascribing personhood to both humans and animals, and an imperative of reciprocity and respect in living as part of the land, Indigenous governance principles mirror key elements of sustainable human-environment relations. Sustainable human-environment relations can be defined as ones that ensure the continued ability of a human population to maintain and improve its well-being

without degrading the environment — in terms of ecosystem diversity, productivity, and carrying capacity — that it depends on. Sustainable human-environment relations in almost all cases rely on humans managing their own activities.

The widespread concept of an inseparability of the people from the land, and a need for each individual to maintain proper relations with the environment's other inhabitants has been at the core of sustainable relations. Many indigenous practices and prohibitions stem from this belief of appropriate behavior toward, and respectful co-existence with one's fellow inhabitants. Indigenous governance acknowledges complex and animate environments that require continual attending to, through prescriptions and proscriptions regarding proper conduct, many of which serve to protect the diversity and productivity of the environment. In Canada, land claim agreements with peoples such as the Inuit, Cree, Innu, and Dene have introduced structures such as co-management boards that provide opportunities for Indigenous peoples to share their knowledge with decision makers, and for their own land and resource experts to sit on boards making resource management decisions. This in turn influences the conduct of activities supporting evidence-based scientific decision making, including intensive and culturally vitalizing research such as that culminating in the three volume compendium of information about Gwich'in resource use and land relationship in *Gwich'in Words About the Land* (2001).

The scale of indigenous governance – localized, territorially circumscribed – contributes to its sustainability. Competent stewardship of resources rests on an in-depth knowledge of the ecosystem, gained through on-the-land experience. Skills honed through such experience, and the wisdom gained, are frequently critical criteria for authority. Persons assuming leadership roles are often those most knowledgeable about the environment – the changing spatial distribution of resources, the changes in ecosystems productivity (for instance conditions of lichen pastures).

Have indigenous governance systems produced resilient social systems capable of adapting to non-linear and rapid changes in terrestrial /marine biophysical settings?

Resilience refers to the capacity to adapt to change within a social ecological system. Diversity and variability contribute to a system's resilience or adaptive capacity (Gunderson & Hollings 2002). Indigenous governance systems incorporate elements that encourage adaptive capacity. Governance based on knowing through experience equips leaders with a wide array of practical life skills and exposures to many challenges, which facilitate flexible and adept responses when new conditions present themselves. Profound local knowledge of ecosystems allows rapid identification of changing conditions, a first step toward quick response. Fundamentally, the cultural and ecological literacy required of high-context communicative styles of indigenous cultures are arguably as adaptive, if not more quickly adaptive, than low-context western cultures that may be slower to change in

the face of indisputable evidence. Climate change and its effects on animals such as caribou and polar bears provide examples where communities have identified methods of reliable monitoring (e.g. hunters and land users' reports of conditions) and are able to take measures to respond to those changes (such as the Yellowknives Dene deciding not to undertake a Fall 2009 community caribou hunt, see above, p. 16). Meanwhile, federal governments continue to struggle to craft wide-ranging laws and regulations to address climate change issues and promote more ecologically sustainable lifeways among their citizens.

Merit-based, situational leadership models that characterize indigenous governance systems in the Arctic help ensure that decision-makers have the necessary insights and experience, as well as the improvisational skills to cope with changing conditions — and that they can be replaced when different skills, wisdom and experience are needed. Localized situational leadership is multifunctional and plastic in contrast to 'Western' governance systems, which tend toward centralization and greater rigidity and their attendant problems (Scott 1998). The scale of governance itself, being localized, provides adaptability lacking in larger systems.

Have indigenous governance systems been able to withstand the impacts of external pressures?

Several of principles underlying indigenous governance systems are sensitive to scale. Knowledge based on experience in spatial terms equates with depth of environmental knowledge across a limited spatial extent. Leaders of indigenous peoples prior to sustained contact and development of capitalist (or 'socialist') socio-economic norms, were always profoundly knowledgeable about local ecosystems. Today, that type of knowledge on its own may be less transportable when decision-making is such that it requires a shallower but spatially more extensive understanding of the context of changing ecological processes, such as those caused by large-scale development projects. However, this is not to say that fundamental principles informing processes of decision-making or ethics of cultural norms are irrelevant in contemporary circumstances.

Indigenous people's ability to acquire knowledge through observation and experiential learning has been compromised by compulsory 'formal' education, often at residential schools which removed children from their families and environments for extended periods of the year (and in some cases for years). In addition, in the Soviet context, elders who might have served as key guides for learning on the land, such as shamans, were repressed, and numerous practices, seen as 'backward' rituals, were prohibited. More drastically, in early years of colonization, many groups experienced a significant loss of traditional knowledge, through decimation of their populations, via introduced disease, and in some cases, warfare. More recently, indigenous leaders are challenged by the duality of needing to achieve both literacy on Western terms (including knowledge of Western legal

institutions and protocols) and knowledge of their own people's governance norms and practices.

Practices of using resources wisely to benefit the community, based again on an intimate knowledge of those resources, are compromised by external activities. Competing cultural logics of sharing versus profits have intersected in the North, with the indigenous logic often subordinated. Uncertainties over jurisdictions complicate the practices of indigenous governance in many cases. So does the lack of recognition of its legitimacy and its contributions to sustainability and resilience by state governments. We have seen progress in this area, with the collaboration of indigenous groups in co-management situations, and the development, in some very modest way, of self-governing indigenous communes in the Russian North. The question here is in large part a political one: to what extent can indigenous peoples realize their governance practices in relationship with external actors. The Inuvailuit, for example, extracted an agreement from Canada that they would benefit from development in the lands through Participation Agreements, as described in their land claim agreement. The Tlicho on the other hand, have negotiated directly with mining companies to reach Impact Benefit Agreements that provide training, education, and cash compensation for land access. In 2006, the Tlicho signed an agreement with Rio Tinto (then Diavik) for an Impact Benefit Agreement designed solely to support Tlicho to develop Tlicho culture and land-based way of life, eschewing usual components of such agreements that function to draw Tlicho further into a wage-based capitalist economy. This was possible because the Tlicho Government, whose motto "Strong Like Two People" has committed itself to a course that provides opportunities of both Tlicho and western societies to its citizens. More common, however, is a continued rejection of plural, co-existing systems of governance in practice, even when such is allowed by state laws and regulations.

Transnational movements of commerce, capitalism, socialism, and democracy have penetrated the Circumpolar areas more gradually in both time and intensity than other areas of the globe, allowing indigenous governance systems to persist. Indigenous governance systems have best withstood external pressures when these have been limited and/or intermittent – that is, when the indigenous group's territory remains peripheral to state interest. But as activities of nation-states increase in northern peripheries, they are regularly accompanied by the creation of new 'elites' empowered to govern – often appointed, and usually equipped with a different set of skills and knowledge than those venerated for indigenous governance, governance predicated on a largely land-based hunter-gatherer or pastoralist way of life. Western governance practices have regularly been forced upon indigenous peoples – voting rather than consensus decision-making, set terms for leaders, etc. The destruction of cultural confidence in indigenous governance has been one result of imposed system; a corollary is political passivity or conscious non-participation of indigenous peoples in imposed governing systems (e.g. Dene Nation 1984).

In northern North America, indigenous peoples' decision making has been extensively regulated by treaties and comprehensive land claim agreements, and in some cases Interim Measures Agreements. In this context, decisions, particularly decisions relating to natural resource use, are already highly regulated, leaving little room for indigenous peoples to institute their own governance arrangements in ways that robustly reflect their relationships with their lands and resources in the full expanse of the lands they have occupied since time immemorial. In the Russian North, the situation is more restrictive: only in the last decade has there been consideration of indigenous rights to self-government, and the consideration has mainly remained theoretical: laws that in principle allow a greater practice of self-government for the most part remain unrealized and ineffective.

What we observe, then, is an erosion of indigenous governance systems — they have not been able to entirely withstand the impacts of external pressures. Yet, as described above, we also observe the adaptation of indigenous governance systems to the constraints (and opportunities) of external pressures. Indigenous peoples, when possible, have developed governance mechanisms based on common Indigenous governance principles and reflecting their unique cultures. These systems are directed to satisfy the specific social, cultural, legal and political needs and goals of local groups. Articulation with nation-state systems, through pluralistic mechanism, is possible, as illustrated by numerous cases. The co-production of hybrid models of governance that are informed by indigenous principles, sensitive to issues of scale, diversity and jurisdiction, may enhance the sustainability and resilience of arctic socio-ecological systems.

Acknowledgements

Gail Fondahl thanks Dmitri Azarov for his research assistance on this project.

Authors

Gail Fondahl is Professor of Geography at the University of Northern British Columbia. Her northern research has focused on indigenous rights to land in the Russian North, with fieldwork carried out among the Evenks, Evens, and Yukagirs in the Buryat Republic, Chita Oblast, and Sakha Republic since the early 1990s. She has also participated as co-organizer and instructor in several International Summer Schools on Indigenous Rights, held in the Russian Federation for indigenous students and leaders (1999, 2001, 2007). Dr. Fondahl is currently working on the Arctic Social Indicators project, a follow-up to the Arctic Human Development Report.

Stephanie Irlbacher-Fox is Assistant Professor at the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, affiliated with the Institute for Circumpolar Health Research based in Yellowknife, Northwest Territories. For the past fifteen years Dr. Irlbacher-Fox has worked as a negotiator and researcher for Indigenous peoples in the Northwest Territories, Canada on self-government and rights-based negotiations. Her most recent book is *Finding Dahshaa: Self Government, Social Suffering and Aboriginal Policy in Canada* (UBC, 2009).

Figure 1
Arctic Peoples
 (from Arctic Human Development Report (2004))



compiled by:
 W.K. Dallmann, Norwegian Polar Institute
 P. Schweitzer, University of Alaska Fairbanks

Arctic peoples subdivided according to language families

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Indo-European family</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germanic branch Uralic family Finno-Ugric branch Samoyedic branch Altaic family Turkic branch Tungusic branch Chukotko-Kamchatkan fam. | <p> Isolated languages
(Ketic and Yukagir)</p> <p>Eskimo-Aleut family</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inuit group (of Eskimo br.) Yupik group (of Eskimo br.) Aleut branch Na-Dene family Athabaskan branch Eyak branch Tlingit branch |
|---|---|

- Arctic circle
- Arctic boundary according to AMAP

Notes:
 Areas show colours according to the original languages of the respective indigenous peoples, even if they do not speak their languages today.
 Overlapping populations are not shown. The map does not claim to show exact boundaries between the individual language groups.
 Typical colonial populations, which are not traditional Arctic populations, are not shown (Danes in Greenland, Russians in the Russian Federation, non-native Americans in North America).

Table 1
Indigenous Peoples of the Russian and North American Norths

Northern Peoples of the Russian Federation*

Aleut	Evenk	Nganasan	Udege
Alutor	Itelmen	Negidal	Ulchi
Chukchi	Kamchadal	Nenets	Veps
Chulym	Kerek	Nivkh	Yukagir
Chuvan	Ket	Orok	
Dolgan	Khanty	Oroch	Komi
Ents	Koryak	Saami	Sakha
Eskimos	Mansi	Sel'kup	
Even	Nanai	Tazy	

Northern Peoples of North America

Ahtna	Gwich'in	Kaska	Tlingit
Alutiq	Hän	Métis	Tutchone
Aleut	Holikachuk	Slavey	Upper
Chipewayn	Innu	Dogrib	Kuskokwim
Deg Hit'an	Inuit	Tagish	Yupik
Dena'ina	Iñupiat	Tanacross	
Eyak	Inuvialuit	Tanana	

* This list excludes eight peoples who have the same legal status as the Indigenous 'Numerically Small Peoples of the Russian North, Siberian and the Far East of the Russian Federation', but live the far south of Siberia (Chelkans, Shors, Soyots, Telengits, Teluets, Tofalars, Tubulars, Tuva-Todzhins), and who were not considered in this report. It includes the Komi and Sakha (Yakuts), who are not 'numerically small', and thus have a different legal standing, but are indigenous to the north of Russia.

Appendix 1

Inuit Principles of Governance from Inuit Qaujimanituqangit (IQ)

Pijitsirniq

This word reflects the idea of leadership in service of the community. Within Inuit culture, authority comes from knowledge, skill, experience and wisdom rather than elected, appointed or inherited position. Leadership comes from merit. A real leader puts the interests of the community ahead of his/her own interests.

Aajiiqatingiingniq

This principle refers to the Inuit form of decision-making, by comparing views, conferring and taking counsel. This process ensures that all parties understand each other, and that people doing different functions or jobs are nevertheless working towards a common purpose.

Pilimmaksarniq

This concept refers to knowledge gained through observation and experience. Traditionally, skills needed to ensure success and survival were passed on through observation and practice. Collectively, the community needs to ensure that each member has the skills required to contribute effectively.

Piliriqatigiingniq

This word contains the concept of a community working collaboratively to ensure wise use of limited resources. It is based on the idea that all members can contribute something to the community. The emphasis is on sharing and collaborative relationships.

Avatimik Kamattiarniq

This concept encompasses the Inuit's relationship to the environment. Because they see themselves as part of the environment and understand that what they put into the environment will come back to them, this concept implies a responsibility for environmental stewardship. It also reflects accumulation of environmental knowledge.

Inuuqatigiittiarniq

This word reflects the idea of viewing individual behaviour within a larger community context. Respect, tolerance, and forbearance are seen as qualities of mature and civilized behaviour.

(Wihak 2004:30-31)

References and Resources

- Abel, K. (1993) *Drum Songs: Glimpses of Dene History* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University)
- Abele, F. (1997) Traditional ecological knowledge in practice, *Arctic* 50(4): iii-iv
- Adaev, V.N. (2007) *Traditsionnaya ekologicheskaya kultura khantov i nentsev [Traditional Ecological Culture of Khanty and Nentsy]* (Tyumen':Vektor Buk)
- Alekseenko E.A. (1974) Narodnie znaniya ketov [The folk knowledge of the Kets], in *Sotsialnaya organizatsiya i kultura narodov Severa*, I.S. Gurvich, ed., pp. 218-226 (Moscow: Nauka)
- Alekseev, A.A. (1993) *Zabyty mir predkov (Ocherki traditsionnogo mirovozzreniya evenov Severo-zapadnogo Verkhoyan'ya) [Forgotten World of the Ancestors (Notes on the Traditional Worldview of the Eveny of Northwest Verkhoyan'ye)]* (Yakutsk: Sitim)
- Alfred, T. (2009) *Peace, Power Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*, 2nd Ed. (Toronto: Oxford University)
- Alunik, E., D. Kolausok, and D. Morrison (2004) *Across Time and Tundra: The Inuvialuit of the Western Arctic* (Seattle: University of Washington)
- Anderson, D. (2000) *Identity and Ecology in Arctic Siberia. The Number One Reindeer Brigade* (Oxford: Oxford University)
- Archibald, L. and M. Crnkovich (1999) *If Gender Mattered: A Case Study of Inuit Women, Land Claims and the Voisey's Bay Nickel Project* (Ottawa: Research Directorate, Status of Women Canada)
- Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR) (2004) (Akureyri Stefansson Arctic Institute)
- Armitage, P. (1991) *The Innu (The Montagnais Naskapi)*. (New York: Chelsea House).
- Asch, M. (1993) *Home and Native Land: Aboriginal Rights and the Canadian Constitution* (Vancouver: UBC)
- Ashinti, D. (1995) The Innu Struggle, in *On the Land: Confronting the Challenges to Aboriginal Self-Determination in Northern Quebec and Labrador*, B.W. Hodgins & K.A. Cannon, eds., 29-41 (Toronto: Betelgeuse Books)
- Ayvaseda, Y.K. (Vella, Y.) and E.F. Ayvaseda (2006) *Chto znachit byt vozhdem [What it means to be a chief]*, *Pravo v zerkale zhinni*, N. Novikova, ed., 99-103 (Moscow: Strategiya)
- Balalaeva, O.E., E. Viget, Ye.M. Glavatkaya, T.N. Dmitrieva, K.G. Karacahrov, Yu. P.Chemyakin (1999) *Ocherki istorii traditsionnogo zemlpol'zovaniya Khantov (materially k atlasu) [Notes on the History of Traditional Land Use of the Khanty (material for an atlas)]* (Yekaterinburg: Tezis)

- Benoit, F. (Writer/Director) (2008) *One River, Two Shores* (Montreal: National Film Board of Canada)
- Berger, T. (1976) *Northern Frontier, Northern Homeland: The Report of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre)
- Bielawski, E. (2003) *Rogue Diamonds: The Rush for Northern Riches on Dene Land* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre)
- Blondin, G. (1990) *When the World Was New: Stories of the Sahtu Dene* (Yellowknife: Outcrop)
- Blondin, G. (1997) *Yamoria: the Lawmaker* (Edmonton: NeWest)
- Blondin, G. (2006) *Trail of the Spirit: Mysteries of Dene Medicine Power Revealed* (Edmonton: NeWest)
- Bouchard, S. (2004) *Caribou Hunter: A Song of a Vanished Innu Life* (Vancouver: Greystone)
- Brody, H. (1987) *Hunters of the Canadian North* (London: Faber and Faber)
- Burch, E. Jr. (1979) Indians and Eskimos in North Alaska 1816-1977: A study in changing ethnic relations, *Arctic Anthropology*, 16(2):123-151.
- Burch, E. Jr. (1981) *The Traditional Eskimo Hunters of Point Hope, Alaska, 1800-1875* (Barrow: North Slope Borough)
- Chance, N. (1990) *The Inupiat and Arctic Alaska: An Ethnography. Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology* (Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston)
- Condon, R. (1988) *Inuit Youth: Growth and Change in the Canadian Arctic* (New York: Rutgers University)
- Condon R. and J. Ogina and the Holman Elders (1996) *The Northern Copper Inuit: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto)
- Crate, S.A. (2006) *Cows, Kin, and Globalization. An Ethnography of Sustainability* (Lanham: Altimira)
- Crowe, K. (1974) *A History of the Original Peoples of Northern Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's)
- Cruikshank, J. (1991) *Life Lived Like a Story: Lifestories of Three Yukon Native Elders* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska)
- Coulthard, G. (2008) Subjects of empire: Indigenous peoples and the politics of recognition, *Contemporary Political Theory* 6(4):437-60.
- Damas, D. (1972) The structure of Central Eskimo associations, in *Proceedings of the 1971 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, L. Guemple, ed., pp.40-55 (Seattle: University of Washington)
- Damas, D., ed. (1984) *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 5: Arctic* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution)

- Dumond, D. (1977) *The Eskimos and Aleuts* (London: Thames and Hudson)
- Dene Nation (1984) *Denendeh: A Dene Celebration* (Yellowknife: Dene Nation)
- Dolgikh, B.O. (2005 [1960]) O polozhenii malykh narodov Severa i o meropriyatiyakh po pod'emy in khozyaystva, kultury i uluchseyniyu byta [On the situation of the small peoples of the North and on measures for raising their economy and culture and improving their lifeways], in *Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza 1959-1962 gody*, Z.P. Sokolova & Ye.A. Pivnevna, eds., 155-180 (Moscow: Institute etnografii i antropologii RAN)
- Edge, L. and S. Irlbacher-Fox (2002) *Inuvialuit and Gwich'in Traditional Governance Project Final Report* (Inuvik: Beaufort Delta Self Government Negotiations Office)
- Ervin, A. (1976) The emergence of Native Alaskan political capacity, 1959-1971, *The Musk Ox* 19:3-14.
- Fedorova, Ye. G. (2006) Traditsionnaya kul'tura narodov Sibiri na rubezhe tysyacheletiy [Traditional culture of the peoples of Siberia at the turn of the millennium], in *Mezhetnicheskie vsaimodeystviya i sotsiokul'turnaya adaptatsiya narodov Severa Rossii*, 63-74 (Moscow: Strategiya)
- Feit, H. (1985) Legitimation and autonomy in James Bay Cree responses to hydro-electric development, in *Indigenous Peoples and the Nation-State*, N. Dyck, ed., 27-66 (St. John's: Memorial University)
- Fondahl, G. (1998) *Gaining Ground? Evenkis, Land and Reform in Southeastern Siberia* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon)
- Fondahl, G., O. Lazebnik, G. Poelzer, and V. Robbek (2000) Aboriginal territorial rights and the sovereignty of the Sakha Republic, *Post-Soviet Geography and Economics* 41(6):401-417
- Freeman, M. (1971) Patrons, leaders and values in an Eskimo settlement, in *Patrons and Brokers in the East Arctic*, R. Paine, ed., 34-54 (St John's: Memorial University, ISER)
- Gibson, G. 2008. *Negotiated Spaces: Work, home and relationships in the Dene diamond economy*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Mining, University of British Columbia
- Gillespie, B.C. (1981) Bearlake Indians, in *Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 6, Subarctic*, June Helm, ed., 310-313 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution)
- Golovnev, A.V. (1997) Indigenous leadership in northwestern Siberia: traditional patterns and their contemporary manifestations, *Arctic Anthropology* 34(1):149-166
- Golovnev, A.V. and G. Osherenko (1999) *Siberian Survival. The Nenets and Their Story* (Ithaca: Cornell University)
- Golovnev, A.V. and G.S. Zaytsev (1992) *Istoriya Yamala* [History of Yamal] (Tobolsk-Yar Sale: Upravlenie obrazovaniya administratsii Yamal'skogo rayona. Etnograficheskoe byuro)

- Gunderson, L.H. and C.S. Holling (2002) *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press)
- Gurvich, I.S. (2004 [1957]) Informatsiya o zhizni i byte koryakov Koryakskovo natsional'nogo okruga Kamchatskoy oblasti [Information on the life and lifeways of the Koryak of the Koryak Region of the Kamchatka District], in *Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza 1956-1958 gody*, Z.P. Sokolova & Ye.A. Pivnevna, eds., 140-169 (Moscow: Institute etnografii i antropologii RAN)
- Gurvich, I.S. . (2004 [1957]) O polozhenii bystrinskiy evenov Kamchatskoy oblasti [On the situation of the Bystrinsk Evens of the Kamchatka District], in *Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza 1956-1958 gody*, Z.P. Sokolova & Ye.A. Pivnevna, eds., 170-184 (Moscow: Institute etnografii i antropologii RAN)
- Gurvich, I.S. . (2005 [1959]) O polozhenii yukagirov, evenov, chukchey, russkikh starozhilov ryada rayonov Yakutskoy ASSR i Magadanskoy oblasti [On the situation of the Yukagirs, Evens, Chukchi and Russian Old-Settlers in a number of regions in the Yakut ASSR and Magadan District], in *Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza 1959-1962 gody*, Z.P. Sokolova & Ye.A. Pivnevna, eds., 45-113 (Moscow: Institute etnografii i antropologii RAN)
- Gurvich, I.S. . (2005 [1961]) Spravka o narodakh SSSR, sokhranivshikh do ustanovlaniya sovetstvoy vlasti perezhitki rodoplemennogo byta [Information on the peoples of the USSR maintaining vestiges of clan-tribal ways of life at the onset of Soviet power], in *Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza 1959-1962 gody*, Z.P. Sokolova & Ye.A. Pivnevna, eds., 257-261 (Moscow: Institute etnografii i antropologii RAN)
- Gurvich, I.S. and B.O. Dolgikh, eds. (1970) *Obshchestvennyy stroy u narodov Severnoy Sibirii [Social Structure Among the Peoples of Northern Siberia]*(Moscow: Nauka)
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board (2001) *More Gwich'in Words About the Land* (Inuvik: Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board)
- Habeck, J.O. (2005) *What it Means to be a Herdsman: The Practice and Image of Reindeer Husbandry Among the Komi of Northern Russia*. Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia (Berlin: LitVerlag)
- Hall, Edward T., (1976) *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hearne, S. (1958) *A Journey from the Prince of Wales Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean*, R. Glover, ed. (Toronto: MacMillan)
- Heine, M., A. Andre, I. Kritsch and A. Cardinal (2001) *Gwich'ya Gwich'in Googwandak): The History and Stories of the Gwich'ya Gwich'in* (Yellowknife: Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute)
- Helm, J. (1976) *The Indians of the Subarctic: A Critical Bibliography* (Indianapolis: Indiana University)
- Helm, J. ed. (1981) *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 6. Subarctic* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution)

- Helm, J. (1973) *Subarctic Athapaskan Bibliography* (University of Iowa: Iowa City)
- Helm, J. (1994) *Prophecy and Power Among the Dogrib Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska)
- Helm, J. (2000) *The People of Denendeh* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's)
- Helm, J. and E.B. Leacock (1971) The hunting tribes of Subarctic Canada, in *North American Indians in Historical Perspective*, ed. by E.B Leacock & N.O. Lurie, eds., 343-374 (New York: Random House)
- Helm, J. E.S. Rogers and J.G.E. Smith (1981) Intercultural relations and cultural change in the Shield and Mackenzie borderlands, in *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 6 (Subarctic), J. Helm, ed., 146-157 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution)
- Henderson, A. (2006) *Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture* (Vancouver: UBC)
- Honigmann, J. J. and I. Honigmann (1965) *Eskimo Townsmen* (Ottawa: St. Paul University)
- Hippler, A.E. and J.R. Wood (1974) *The Sub-Arctic Athabaskans, A Selected Annotated Bibliography* (Fairbanks: University of Alaska)
- Ingold, T. (2000) *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill* (London: Routledge)
- Irlbacher-Fox, S. (2009) *Finding Dahshaa: Self Government, Social Suffering, and Aboriginal Policy in Canada* (Vancouver: UBC)
- Jarvenpa, R. (1975) The People of Patuanak: The Ecology and Spatial Organization of a Southern Chipewyan Band. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Jarvenpa, R. (1976) Spatial and ecological factors in the annual economic cycle of the English River Band of Chipewyan, *Arctic Anthropology* 23(1): 43-69
- Jarvenpa, R. (1977) Subarctic Indian trappers and band society: the economics of male mobility, *Human Ecology* 5(3): 223-260
- Jarvenpa, R. (1979) Recent ethnographic research - Upper Churchill River drainage, Saskatchewan, Canada, *Arctic* 32(4): 355-365
- Jarvenpa, R. (1980) *The Trappers of Patuanak: Toward a Spatial Ecology of Modern Hunters*. Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper 67. (Ottawa: National Museum of Man)
- Jarvenpa, R., and H.J. Brumbach (1983) Ethnoarchaeological perspectives on the Athapaskan moose kill, *Arctic* 36(2): 174-184
- Jarvenpa, R., and H.J. Brumbach (1985) Occupational status, ethnicity, and ecology: Metis Cree adaptations in a Canadian trading frontier, *Human Ecology* 13(3):209 -220.

- Jenness, D. (1956) The Chipewyan Indians: an account by an early explorer, *Anthropologica* 3:15-33
- Jenness, D. (1957) *Dawn in Arctic Alaska* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota)
- Kawagley, A. O. (2006) *A Yupiaq Worldview: A Pathway to Ecology and Spirit*, 2nd Ed. (Juneau: Waveland).
- Khomich, A.V. (1966) *Nentsy. Istoriko-etnograficheskie ocherki [Nentsy: Historical –Ethnographic Notes]* (Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka)
- Krech, S. III. (1970) Northern Athapaskan ethnology in the 1970s, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 9: 83-100
- Krech, S. III. (1980) Northern Athapaskan ethnology: An annotated bibliography of published materials, 1970-79, *Arctic Anthropology*, 17(2): 68-105
- Krivoshapkin, A.V. (1997) *Eveny [The Evens]* (Saint Petersburg: Prosveshchenie]
- Krupnik, I. 1993 *Arctic Adaptations. Native Whalers and Reindeer Herders of Northern Eurasia* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England)
- Krupnik, I. & N. Vakhtin (1997) Indigenous knowledge in modern culture: Siberian Yupik ecological legacy in transition, *Arctic Anthropology* 34(1):236-252
- Kulchyski, P. (2005) *Like the Sound of a Drum: Aboriginal Cultural Politics in Denendeh and Nunavut* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba)
- Kurshanova, A.I., ed. (1987) *Istoriya i kul'tura Chukchey. Istoriko-etnograficheskie ocherki [History and Culture of the Chukchi. Historical-Ethnographic Notes]* (Leningrad: Nauka)
- Kurshanova, A.I., ed. (1990) *Istoriya i kul'tura Itel'menov. Istoriko-etnograficheskie ocherki [History and Culture of the Itel'men. Historical-Ethnographic Notes]* (Leningrad: Nauka)
- Lee, R. and I. Devore, eds. (1968) *Man the Hunter* (Chicago: Aldine)
- MacNeish, J. Helm (1960) Kin terms of Arctic drainage Dene: Hare, Slavey, Chipewyan, *American Anthropologist* 62: 279-295
- Mazin, A.I. (1984) *Traditsionnye verovaniya i obryady evenkov-orochonov (konets XIX-nachalo XX v.) [Traditional Beliefs and Rituals of Evenks-Orochons (late 19th-early 20th centuries)]* (Novosibirsk: Nauka)
- Morrow, P. and C. Hensel (1992) Hidden dissension: minority-majority relations and the use of contested terminology, *Arctic Anthropology* 29(1): 38-53
- Nadasdy, P. (1999) The politics of TEK: power and the “integration of knowledge, *Arctic* 36 (1-2):1-18
- Nadasdy, P. (2005) *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon* (Vancouver: UBC)
- Nelson, R. K. (1969) *Hunters of the Northern Ice* (Chicago: University of Chicago)

- Novikova, N.I. (2000) Traditsionnoe prirodopol'zovanie – pravo i/ili obyazannost' [Traditional resource use – right and/or obligation], in *Yuridicheskay antropologiya. Zakon i zhizn'* [Legal Anthropology. Law and Life], N.I. Novikova, ed., 212.-220 (Mocow: Strategiya)
- Novikova, N.I. (2006) Self-government of the indigenous minority peoples of West Siberia: analysis of law and practice, in *People and the Land: Pathways to Reform in Post-Soviet Siberia*, E. Kasten, ed., 83-98 (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer)
- O pravovom... (1997) O pravovom statuse korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa [On the legal status of the indigenous numerically small peoples of the North], Law of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)
- Osgood, C. (1934) Kutchin tribal distribution and synonymy, *American Anthropologist* 36 (2):168-179
- Osgood, C. (1931) The ethnography of the Great Bear Lake Indians, *National Museum of Canada Bulletin* 70:31-97
- Osgood, C. (1938) Contributions to the ethnography of the Kutchin, *American Anthropologist*, New Series, 40(1):146-147
- Oquilluk, W., with L. L. Bland (1973) *People of Kauwerak, Legends of the Northern Eskimo* (Fairbanks: Alaska Methodist University)
- Oswalt, W. H. (1978) The Chipewyan: Subarctic Hunters, in *This Land Was Theirs: A Study of the North American Indian*, 3rd ed., 29-64. (New York: John Wiley and Sons)
- Pettitot, E. (2005) *Travels Around Great Slave and Great Bear Lakes, 1862-1882* (Toronto: The Champlain Society)
- Pika, A., ed. (1999) *Neotraditionalism in the Russian North. Indigenous Peoples and the Legacy of Perestroika* (Seattle: University of Washington)
- Popova, U.G. (1976) Rassokhinskaya gruppa evenov [The Rassokhina group of Evens], in *Ekonomicheskie ie istoricheskie issledovaniya na Severo-Vostoke SSSR (Trudy SV KNII DVNTs AN SSSR, vyp. 67)*, 121-146 (Magadan)
- Price, J. (2008) Living Inuit governance in Nunavut, in *Lighting the Eighth Fire*, L. Simpson, ed., 127-138 (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring)
- Ridington, R. (1979) Changes of mind: Dunne-za resistance to empire, *British Columbia Studies* 43: 65-80
- Ridington, R. (1988) Knowledge, power, and the individual in Subarctic hunting societies, *American Anthropologist*, New Series, 90(1): 98-110
- Rogers, E.S. (1981) History of ethnological research in the Subarctic Shield and Mackenzie Borderlands", in *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 6: Subarctic*, J. Helm, ed., 19-29 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution)

- Rushforth, S. (1994) Political resistance in a contemporary hunter-gatherer society: More about Bearlake Athapaskan knowledge and authority, *American Ethnologist* 21(2): 335-352
- Ryan, J. (1995) *Doing Things the Right Way: Dene Traditional Justice in Lac La Martre [Whati], NWT* (Calgary: University of Calgary and Arctic Institute of North America)
- Scott, J. (1998) *Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University)
- Simchenko, Yu. V. (2005 [1962]) Sovremennoe khozyaystvo, byt i kul'tura avamskikh i taymyrskikh nganasan [Contemporary economy, lifeway and culture of the Avam and Taymyr Nganasans], in *Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza 1959-62 gody*, Z.P, Sokolova & Ye.A. Pivnevna, eds., 273-298 (Moscow: Institute etnografii i antropologii RAN)
- Sirina, A.A. (2006) *Katanga Evenks in the 20th Century and the Ordering of Their Life-World* (Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute)
- Slobodin, R. (1966) *Metis of the Mackenzie District* (Ottawa: St. Paul University)
- Smith, J. G.E. (1973) The Chipewyan hunting group in a village context, in *Cultural Ecology: Readings on the Canadian Indians and Eskimos*, B. Cox, ed., 315-322 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart)
- Smith, J. G.E. (1975) The ecological basis of Chipewyan socio-territorial organization, in *Proceedings of the Athabaskan Conference*, A. McFadyen Clark, ed., 389-461. *Canadian Ethnology Service Paper 27* (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, Mercury Series).
- Smith, J. G.E. (1976a) Chipewyan adaptations, *Arctic Anthropology* 13(1):12-24
- Smith, J. G.E. (1976b) Local band organization of the Caribou-Eater Chipewyan in the 18th and early 19th centuries, *Western Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 6(1):72-90
- Stammler, F. (2005) *Reindeer Nomads Meet the Market. Culture, Property and Globalization at the 'End of the Land'*. Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia (Berlin: LitVerlag)
- Stefansson, V. (1912) *My Life with the Eskimo* (New York: Macmillan).
- Stefansson, V. (1914) *Stefánsson-Anderson Expedition, 1909-12*; Anthropological Papers, AMNH, vol. XIV., (New York)
- Tanner, A. (1973) *Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the Misstasini Cree* (New York: St. Martin's Press)
- Tanner, A. (2001) The Double Bind of Aboriginal Self-Government, in *Aboriginal Autonomy and Development in Northern Quebec and Labrador*, Colin H. Scott, ed., (Vancouver: UBC)

- Turov, M.G. (1990) *Khozyaystvo evenkov taezhnoy zony sredney Sibiri v kontse XIX - nachale XX v. [Economy of the Evenki of the Taiga Zone of Central Siberia, Lat 19th-early 20th Centuries]* (Irkutsk: Izd-vo Irkutskogo universiteta)
- Van Stone, J. (1961) *Point Hope : An Eskimo Community in Northwest Alaska* (Fairbanks : Alaskan Air Command, Arctic Aeromedical Laboratory)
- Van Stone, J. (1962) *Point Hope: An Eskimo Village in Transition* (Seattle: University of Washington)
- Van Stone, J. (1963) *The Snowdrift Chipewyan* (Ottawa, Canada : Northern Coordination and Research Centre, Dept. of Northern Affairs and National Resources)
- Van Stone, J. (1967) *Eskimos of the Nushagak River; An Ethnographic History* (Seattle, University of Washington)
- Vasilevich, G.M. (1969) *Evenki. Istoriko-etnograficheskie ocherki (XVII-nachalo XX v.) [The Evenki. Historical-ethnographic Notes (17th-early 20th centuries)]* (Leningrad: Nauka)
- Vaté, V. (2005) Kilvêi: The Chukchi spring festival, in *Rebuilding Identities. Pathways to Reform in Post-Soviet Siberia*, E. Kasten, ed., 39-62 (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer)
- Ventsel, A. (2005) *Reindeer, Rodina, and Reciprocity. Kinship and Property Relations in Siberian Village*. Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia (Berlin: LitVerlag)
- Vinokurova, L.I and V.I. Shadrin (2006) Lesnye yukagiry Yakutii: sostyanie etnicheskoy kul'tury [Forest Yukagir of Yakutia: the condition of their ethnic culture], in *Mezhetnicheskie vsaimodeystviya i sotsiokul'turnaya adaptatsiya narodov Severa Rossii*, 75-95 (Moscow: Strategiya)
- Vdovin, I.S. (1965) *Ocherki istorii i etnografii Chukchey [Notes on the History and Ethnography of the Chukchi]* (Moscow: Nauka)
- Watson, Paul, (2009) The bear facts about the polar bear hunt, Toronto Star, Accessed 20 Nov 2009, online edition, <http://www.thestar.com/news/insight/article/722760--the-bear-facts-about-the-polar-bear-hunt>
- Wiget, A. & O. Balalaeva (1997) National communities, native land tenure, and self-determination among the Eastern Khanty, *Polar Geography* 21: 10-33
- Wihak, C. (2004) Psychologists in Nunavut: A comparison of the principles underlying Inuit Quajimanituaqangit and the Canadian Psychological Association Code of Ethics, *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Indigenous Health* 2(1):25-40
- Willerslev, R. (2007) *Soul Hunters. Hunting, Animism, and Personhood among the Siberian Yukaghirs* (Berkeley: University of California)
- Ziker, J. (2002) Land use and economic change, in *People and the Land. Pathways to Reform in Post-Soviet Siberia*, E. Kasten, ed., 207-224 (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer)

Ziker, J. (2002) *Peoples of the Tundra. Northern Siberians in the Post-Communist Transition* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland)

Zoe, J.B. (2007) *Trails of Our Ancestors: Building a Nation* (Yellowknife: Outcrop)