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Abstract

This dissertation explores how historical knowledge is produced and maintained within the Inuvialuit (Western Arctic Inuit) community of Sachs Harbour, NWT, to determine how archaeological research can best complement and respect Inuvialuit understandings and ways of knowing the past.

When archaeologists apply Indigenous knowledges to their research they often have limited understandings of how these knowledges work, and may apply them inadequately or inappropriately. I employ an archaeological ethnographic approach to help Ikaahukmiut (people with ties to Banks Island, NWT) articulate to archaeologists how they construct their knowledge of Banks Island’s past. Inuvialuit understandings of the past are experiential and holistic in nature and are passed down through oral histories. They are also learned through doing and are embodied and lived in everyday practice.

Archaeologists often overlook diversity within the communities with whom they partner in community-based projects. My research aims to recognize diversity in Ikaahukmiut understandings of the past and of archaeology so that it can ultimately be accounted for in developing community-based research. Although sub-communities can be identified based on any social cleavage, I found that participation in sub-communities based on cultural background, family group, generation, and education and employment background had the greatest influences on community understandings of the past and opinions of archaeology.

To establish an effective and inclusive community-based archaeology project on Banks Island, archaeologists will need to engage with and navigate diversity within the community. Future projects should be built with two main guiding principles: the Inuvialuit guiding principle of respect and the notion that there is more than one way to do something right. There is a need for future projects to respect traditional beliefs, apply community knowledge, and address community concerns. In general archaeologists establishing community-based projects may need to broaden their understandings of what constitutes archaeological research to develop culturally meaningful projects. This may require dissolving academically imposed divides between archaeology and anthropology, history and heritage, and
Indigenous and academic knowledge. In doing so archaeologists may more effectively involve Inuvialuit people and better represent their knowledge.
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Chapter 1

1 Introduction

When I was a kid we were at Masik Pass and we’re at this Masik River and probably about eight-ish years old I was, just guessing. Then we see somebody walking towards us out in the middle of nowhere. Like, it looks like a person walking towards us. And we’re like, "What is that? What is that?" and they must have realized he was going to come upon strangers so he turned, he had a vest on—black on the outside, red on the inside, or orange, and he turned it around so to let us know he was a person. And he walked up to us and he was part of an archaeological dig just a couple of miles from where we were and they seemed to be nice young people like yourself. Digging up everything and anything and taking it for their museums. I don’t know. I can’t remember. But they were really nice good people. Back then, times were different (Bridget Wolki, personal communication July 14, 2014).

In the above quotation, Sachs Harbour community member Bridget Wolki told of her first of few encounters with archaeologists. Although there is a long history of archaeological research in the Arctic, for much of that time archaeologists had little interaction with local community members as engaging with communities was often seen as outside of the scope of archaeological research. As a result, community members were rarely informed of what archaeologists found and what was taken from their land to be preserved in museums in the south. Archaeologists also made little use of Inuit interpretations of the past. These actions effectively alienated the Inuit from certain aspects of their history and heritage. Beginning in the 1970s, the Inuit have become

---

1 For the purpose of this dissertation heritage refers to tangible cultural heritage such as objects and structures; intangible cultural heritage such as oral histories, traditional
increasingly politically mobilized and have negotiated a series of land claim agreements. These agreements have meant a restructuring of research relationships that has changed the way southern archaeologists conduct and understand their research in the North. Archaeologists are now applying community-based approaches\(^2\), working with local communities to confront the colonial legacy of archaeology and build research projects that serve community interests.

The Ikaahuk Archaeology Project (IAP) is a five-year study headed by Dr. Lisa Hodgetts at the University of Western Ontario. The project began in 2012 with the aim of combining traditional Inuvialuit\(^3\) knowledge with archaeological knowledge to better understand the history of Banks Island, or Ikaahuk\(^4\), in the western Canadian Arctic. The project employs community-based strategies to engage with the Inuvialuit community of Sachs Harbour, N.W.T. Sachs Harbour is the only town on Banks Island and currently

knowledge, ideas, songs, and memories; and natural heritage such as “natural sites with cultural aspects such as cultural landscapes, physical, biological or geological formations”\(^5\) (UNESCO 2016). Heritage is often understood as an inherently political practice that performs aspects of the past in the present; therefore, it can often tell us more about the present than the past (Smith 2006). Western academics make a distinction between history (the truth about the past) and heritage that may not be applicable to the way other people understand their connections to the past, which will be discussed in Chapter 4.

\(^2\) I use the term “community-based approaches” as a signifier for any approaches that work to involve the community. This can include community-based research, Indigenous archaeologies (Atalay 2010), community-oriented archaeology, etc.

\(^3\) In simplest terms, the Inuvialuit are the Inuit who reside in the western Canadian Arctic. A more detailed definition will be given in Chapter 2.

\(^4\) Ikaahuk is the Inuvialuktun name for Banks Island, which expresses that it is a place that you cross to. Some community members also suggested that Ikaahuk specifically refers to Sachs Harbour.
has a fluctuating population of approximately 80 people. It is also the smallest and most northerly town in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR) (Figure 1, Plate 1).

Figure 1: Map showing the ISR and the location of Sachs Harbour

As part of the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project, my PhD research explores how perceptions
of the past and archaeological research vary within Sachs Harbour to determine how archaeology can best complement Inuvialuit understandings of the past. My research uses methods from the emerging approach of archaeological ethnography, which uses ethnographic methods to work through the political context of archaeological research. This range of approaches aims to reflexively engage with descendent communities and local stakeholders to appraise and inform archaeological practices, making them socially relevant and ethically conscious. The purpose of my research is to help community members articulate their guiding principles for heritage practices to archaeologists, fostering the establishment of an inclusive and culturally meaningful archaeology project. My project also critically examines the strengths and weaknesses of archaeological ethnography.

Plate 1: Sachs Harbour, NWT, 2013
1.1 Archaeological and Ethnographic Research in the Arctic

The following is a short introduction to the context in which my research is carried out. I give a brief history of archaeological and ethnographic research in Northern Canada outlining the effects this research has had on Inuit communities. I then explain the political context of the rise of community-based archaeology in Northern Canada.

The history of archaeological research in the Canadian Arctic is very complex and has its beginnings in colonial exploration and expansion. Research can have a multitude of effects on communities. These effects can be positive, negative, or neutral; often, however, the effects are all three (Pyburn 2009). In colonial situations such as the Canadian Arctic, where research is often politically motivated by colonial agendas, the effects tend to be negative for Indigenous communities.

Ethnographic and archaeological research in the Arctic are intrinsically linked, perhaps more so than anywhere else in the world (Burch 2002). Early “ethnographic observations” and “archaeological collecting” were mainly carried out by European missionaries, explorers and whalers (Burch 2002; Rowley 2002). Scientists and naturalists made some ethnographic observations as part of larger expeditions but they did not place emphasis on these endeavors (Burch 2002). It is widely regarded that historical observations of “others” are steeped in European ethnocentrism and often say more about the cultural ideologies of the person writing the account than the people it describes (Johnson 1996; Lutz 2007). Hodgetts (2012: 83) lists a few early descriptions of the Inuit written by Europeans: ‘these savage subjects of our most Gracious Queen’, ‘uncivilized’, ‘simple children of nature’, ‘filthy’, ‘animals’. Europeans used depictions of Indigenous peoples as inferior, such as those listed above, to help justify colonialism (Hodgetts 2012: 83; Lutz 2007).

On behalf of museums and anthropologists, these early European visitors collected material culture, human remains (Rowley 2002; Ross 1984), and sometimes even living people (Stopp 2010; Steckley 2008). Captain George Comer, a whaling Captain from Quebec often mentions collecting “native implements” and human remains on behalf of
museums in Europe, the United States, and Canada in the journal he kept from 1903 to 1905 while working in Hudson Bay (Ross 1984). In an attempt to be respectful he would place a gift, usually a hunting tool, in the graves that he disturbed, stating, “The natives tell me I can take them if I will place a small present in the grave for the dead person – then it will be alright” (Ross 1984: 127). However, this attempt to appease spirits and the local Inuit was not undertaken by other collectors (Ross 1984: 127). It is also difficult to decipher how prominent this sentiment was among the Inuit. Beliefs and cultural understandings differ greatly between and within Inuit groups in the present day and it is safe to assume that they did in the past as well.

Most of the earliest major excavations by archaeologists in the Arctic were carried out as part of European and American expeditions, which influenced the archaeological permitting processes of the Northwest Territories (Richling 1995; Morrison 2002). The Fifth Thule Expedition was a Danish expedition that conducted excavations across the Canadian Arctic and collected vast numbers of artifacts from 1921 to 1924. The artifacts were brought to Denmark and few have been returned to Canada. This expedition prompted the Canadian government to establish the *Ordinance Respecting Scientists and Explorers* in 1926, which required researchers and explorers to obtain a permit before visiting the Northwest Territories. In 1930 the Canadian government passed the *Eskimo Ruins Ordinance*, making it illegal to excavate in the Northwest Territories without a license. The *Eskimo Ruins Ordinance* also made it illegal for the Inuit to dig in the dwellings of their ancestors (Rowley 2002: 263-264).

Arctic archaeology and ethnology conducted by Canadian researchers began to grow at the beginning of the twentieth century resulting from a rise in Canadian nationalism and an increased desire to affirm Canada’s claim to northern territories (Richling 1995). Beginning in the early 1900s, most Canadian archaeologists and ethnologists were employees of the Canadian government. As Richling (1995) explains, this made “intellectual and logistical aspects of their scientific agenda contingent on what politicians and bureaucrats deemed to be in the public interest.” One of the primary agendas for anthropologists and ethnologists at this time was to record the “vanishing Indian.” Researchers assumed that Indigenous cultures in North America were on the
verge of extinction due to European contact. They viewed Indigenous culture as static and any change in the culture was seen as deterioration, so when they researched Indigenous cultures they recorded the cultures as they imagined them before contact, not as they were at the time (Nurse 2006). Richling (1995) argues that before World War II, politicians and bureaucrats dictated archaeological and ethnographic research in the arctic, making scientific investigation difficult and leading to the slow progression of arctic archaeology. During this early period of archaeological and ethnographic investigation researchers sometimes employed Inuit as field assistants and often asked them to help identify animal bones and artifacts (Rowley 2002; Gulløv 2002).

Following World War II, changes in archaeological thought and practice increasingly alienated Inuit people from southern interpretations of their past (Rowley 2002: 264). The relationship between ethnography and archaeology changed at this point. These fields become more specialized, and the research appears to diverge. Archaeologists began using early ethnographic accounts to help interpret their findings (Gulløv 2002) instead of asking local Inuit, and anthropologists became interested in studying the assumed acculturation of Inuit people (Lyons 2016). Arctic archaeology worked within a modernist framework, and as the discipline became more specialized the Inuit became increasingly alienated from certain aspects of their past. This alienation intensified with the processual movement in archaeology, which held that archaeology is an objective science that apolitically studies the truth about the past. This approach has no use for the “non-scientific” interpretations of Inuit people (Rowley 2002; Lyons in press; Lyons et al. 2010; Wilcox 2010). Processual interpretations of the archaeological record portray the actions of Inuit ancestors as determined by the environment, rather than independent thought.

The postmodernist movement in anthropology originated in the 1960s and argued that anthropologist’s worldviews and experiences influence their interpretations, therefore ethnography is not an objective science. This impacted the way that anthropologists working in the North conducted their research (ex. Briggs 1970). Influenced by the postmodernist movement, archaeology experienced a post-processual movement during the 1970s and 1980s that mirrored many aspects of postmodernism. However, this
movement had little influence on the theoretical approaches of archaeologists working in the Arctic until the late 1990s (Hood 1998, 2002).

### 1.2 Impacts of Early Research on Northern Communities

The research outlined above has had varying effects on Northern communities, although the impacts have been mainly negative. At the 1978 Canadian Archaeological Association’s annual meeting Daniel Weetaluktuk critiqued the un-inclusive practices that archaeologists have traditionally implemented, which have negatively impacted Inuit communities. These included the lack of consultation with communities about what research to conduct, the exclusion of Inuit knowledge from archaeological interpretations, the problems concerning artifacts being stored in the south, and the lack of dissemination of research findings to communities. By not consulting with local communities before excavating, archaeologists showed a lack of consideration for Inuit people and a lack of acknowledgement of Inuit ties to their heritage and land. Through the exclusion of Inuit understandings of the past, archaeologists exhibited a disrespect and skepticism towards Inuit knowledge. By taking human remains, archaeologists perpetuated the stereotype of archaeologists as grave robbers and by taking material culture to the south without disseminating results to local communities, archaeologists took away a chance for the Inuit to learn about their past through material culture. These actions alienated the Inuit from their material heritage and certain interpretations of their past. These actions also contributed to negative views of archaeologists and other researchers held by the Inuit.

Some of the less obvious implications of archaeological research have to do with interpretation and language. Archaeologists are increasingly recognizing that their interpretations have real implications for living people (Hodgetts 2012; Cojti Ren 2006). Hodgetts (2012) points out that interpretations of Arctic history that portray Inuit cultures as homogenous fail to recognize their dynamic nature. Homogenous and static portrayals of past cultures imply that changes that occur today in these cultures are the result of acculturation rather than conscious adoption and adaptation of outside thoughts and material culture (Ferris 2009). Likewise, arctic archaeologists have previously explained all observed changes in the archaeological record as responses to environmental change.
Such environmentally deterministic interpretations portray Inuit people and other previous occupants of the Arctic as one dimensional and incapable of independent thought. On top of that, men of European descent have dominated arctic archaeology (Hood 1998, 2002), so interpretations of the past have lacked different viewpoints, such as those of women and Indigenous peoples.

Archaeologists’ language also serves to marginalize Inuit people (Watkins 2006; Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009; Wobst 2005). For example, common archaeological terms such as “prehistoric”, “Thule”, “abandonment”, and “uninhabited” can marginalize present peoples from their history and land. Archaeology is often divided into “prehistoric” and “historic” sub-disciplines, which use different theories and methods to investigate the past. This division implies that Indigenous peoples did not and do not have histories prior to European contact. Furthermore, most historical archaeologists do not study Indigenous peoples, which gives the impression that Indigenous peoples disappear from the archaeological record after contact (Lightfoot 1995; Rubertone 2000; Little 1994; Silliman 2010; Condori 1989; Wilkie 2005). It is also common for archaeologists to label the ancestors of Indigenous peoples with different names. Archaeologists have labeled the ancestors of the Inuit “Thule”. They often cite environmental factors for the transition from the Thule culture to various Inuit cultures (see Friesen 2010); however, the distinction between the Inuit and their ancestors is one based on ethnocentric European assumptions, and the Inuit may not make this distinction between themselves and their ancestors.\(^5\) Similarly, Watkins (2005) argues that archaeologists misuse the word “abandonment” and it is interpreted by others to mean that a place has been permanently deserted. Archaeologists, however, are trying to convey that a site or area is no longer in use, which does not necessarily mean that it was no longer important to the people who had used it, or that those people disappeared.

Early ethnographic accounts of the Inuit by Europeans were largely ethnocentric and although they recorded much information and many observations about Inuit practices, 

\(^5\) To work towards phasing out the use of “Thule” I refer to the ancestors of the Inuit as “Thule-Inuit”.
many of these accounts do not explain social dynamics and how communities worked (Burch 2002). However, these accounts captured the imagination of southerners, and fostered the creation of a specific Inuit identity for consumption in the south. Popular stereotypes, such as the Inuit leaving Elders on ice flows to die, living only in igloos, and eating raw flesh, were conceived from these accounts as well as popular “ethnographic films” like *Nanook of the North* (Steckly 2008; Fienup-Riordan 1990). Culturally ascribed identity groups are based on expressions of real or assumed shared culture and common descent. Jones (1997) argues that the maintenance of a cultural identity requires a consciousness of difference and that this relies on both internal and external perceptions. The way a group of people is perceived by non-members of the group will impact how the group understands its own identity (Sawchuk 2001; Searles 2008). The ethnocentric understandings of Inuit cultures, produced both archaeologically and ethnographically, negatively impact the way that the rest of the world views Inuit people and affects outsiders’ relationships with Inuit. Ideas that the Inuit are primitive or savage help southerners justify colonialism and policies that are meant to assimilate Indigenous peoples.

In some cases Inuit people were brought to the south for “scientific” study. Some were housed in museums or taken on tours for the entertainment of white people. Many never returned home because they died from smallpox and tuberculosis (Steckley 2008; Stopp 2010). This undoubtedly led many Inuit not to trust southern researchers.

A less explored impact of ethnographic research is the effects anthropologists and ethnologists had on Inuit communities while living with them for extended periods of time. For example, Vilhjalmur Stefansson “married” an Inuit woman, Pannigablu, during the Canadian Arctic Expedition, and fathered her son Alex, but never acknowledged Alex as his son (Pálsson 1998; Steckley 2008). Intimate relationships between researchers and local people were not uncommon (Steckley 2008), and these relationships undoubtedly had an effect on Inuit people. During my first field season, a Sachs Harbour community member told me she was a descendent of Alex and referred to Stefansson as a “deadbeat” and an “asshole.” Although this particular community member did not seem to have any ill feelings towards researchers, it is easy to understand
how Stefansson’s actions towards his son may contribute to ill feelings towards researchers held by community members. Outsiders living in communities undoubtedly had effects on them, but these effects are still not well explored.

The positive impacts cited of both ethnography and archaeology are usually from a research perspective. Archaeologists feel that the early archaeological collections played an important role in developing arctic archaeology (Rowley 2002). Early European observations of the Inuit are also valuable to archaeologists who use analogies in their interpretations (Gulløv 2002). Less discussed are the positive impacts early research had on actual Inuit people. Some may argue that early interactions provided the Inuit with trade opportunities and employment and a way to learn about European culture (Steckley 2008).

Although it may be unclear if and what positive impacts early research had, if this research is made accessible to communities they may be able to identify ways that it could be beneficial to them today. Despite this potential, early research damaged relationships between the Inuit and researchers and has led many Inuit people to have negative views of researchers – seeing them as grave robbers and thieves who cannot be trusted and who temporarily come from the south to benefit from Inuit peoples and lands and give nothing in return. Historic ethnographic and archaeological research have alienated Inuit from their material cultural heritage and have worked to develop an Inuit identity for the consumption of non-Inuit people that is based on European ethnocentrism.

1.3 Previous Archaeological Projects on Banks Island

There have been various archaeology projects on Banks Island. These projects have, in some form or another, shaped the way community members understand and feel about archaeology. Although many projects have taken place on Banks Island, community members who remember or have knowledge of archaeology projects mainly recall only a few. Most community members recognize that there were many other projects that they
do not have knowledge of because of a lack of consultation and communication from archaeologists.

Some of the earliest interactions community members have had with “archaeology” were not even with archaeologists. During an interview with Elder Lena Wolki and her daughter Bridget (personal communication, June 11, 2015), Lena told of how when she was young and living on Victoria Island, Father Henri Tardy, as well as other priests who were stationed there, asked community members to bring them artifacts from graves:

**Lena:** Yeah. With that picking them up, that priest wanted us to pick them up so we start doing that. My mom didn’t like it alright.

**Bridget:** Did he pay for them?

**Lena:** Little bit. Maybe candy….

**Laura:** Where did people get the stuff from? Did they get them from graves? Or did they get them from old houses?

**Lena:** Just from graves cause they were all around that side, I guess, and under the rocks.

Lena and other community members assumed that the priests brought the artifacts to the south to be sold to either museums or “rich people.” Stories such as this undoubtedly led some community members to believe that archaeologists are interested in disturbing graves (a taboo for the Inuvialuit), and that they worked for personal monetary gain. It was evident in our conversation that Lena felt guilty for bringing artifacts to the priest and that Bridget was shocked that the priest would ask people to do this.

A few community members talked about the archaeological work done by “the Germans,” which referenced the work led by Müller-Beck (1977) in the 1970s. Those who have knowledge of these projects have mainly negative opinions of them, as they are known for not consulting with the community and “leaving nothing but holes.” Some community members remember work carried out by
Charles Arnold, although those who referenced it were directly involved either as Elders providing traditional knowledge or an employee working as a wildlife monitor/guide. Both groups recognized the positive impacts that Arnold’s project had on them personally in the form of trips on the land or monetary gain through employment. The most widely recognized project by community members was the Aulavik Oral History Project, conducted by Murielle Nagy on behalf of the IRC during the 1990s. This project mainly focused on oral histories but also involved the documentation of archaeological sites, many of which Nagy visited with Elders from the community. Many community members recognized the contribution this project made in recording the history of the community and recommended her work to me. A community member even said that they use transcripts of their family’s interviews to help teach their children about the past.

Community members had a range of opinions on how previous archaeological work has impacted the community, which influenced their opinions and willingness to support or participate in current research. Many people recognized both positives and negatives. Unfortunately, those who had particularly negative opinions of archaeology did not want to speak with me. Many themes arose when discussing previous archaeological work, mainly, lack of consultation by archaeologists and the removal of ancestral materials from Inuvialuit land.

A few community members felt that previous archaeological projects did not impact the community at all. Their main reason for feeling this way was that previous archaeologists did not properly consult with the community prior to research or tell the community what they had found after the project ended. Rodger Kuptana (personal communication, September 2, 2014) explained: “Well, a lot of that, they come and go. I don’t think it has really impacted us. We weren’t really told what was going on. None of us knew what they found out there.” However, most community members saw this lack of communication as a negative impact:

I think [previous archaeologists did] a poor job because if they don’t give us feedback, what’s the use? We have no information. We have no knowledge
of, you know, prior events that happened here. I mean I think it’s… I’m glad for the rules now people got to follow, you know. Be respectful for traditional knowledge and for, you know, people’s livelihood and you know everything ’cause it’s just like intruding. I kind of feel like they are intruding if they are not courteous enough to tell us we are going to do this and take that, and you know (Betty Raddi-Haogak, personal communication, July 13, 2014).

It [previous archaeological research] actually didn’t benefit us at all. Like I’ve heard of researchers coming up in the 50s and 60s and we never hear anything back (John Lucas Jr, personal communication, August 28, 2014).

We didn’t know much about it [previous archaeological research]. They didn’t tell us. They never had public meetings. Maybe if you meet the person who is doing that kind of stuff you get to know a bit. But they didn’t come to the community as a whole to announce to the people (Beverly Amos, personal communication, September 17, 2014).

Community members see the lack of communication as damaging for several reasons. First, they feel that their knowledge, which could have been beneficial to previous
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6 Previous archaeologists may not have consulted with the community for a variety of reasons. Prior to the Inuvialuit Final Agreement (IFA), researchers technically did not have to do community consultation, which also traditionally fell outside of the realm of archaeology. Additionally, budgetary restraints may have also played a role. Archaeologists usually have to charter flights to their field sites and may have not had the time or money to stop in Sachs Harbour. There may have also been attempts at community consultation and engagement that are no longer part of the community memory.
studies, was overlooked and that their cultural beliefs about how to treat archaeological remains have been ignored. Second, they do not know which sites have been excavated or investigated and they do not know what was found. Even more troubling is that they do not know what has been taken to the south. People often raised questions about what happens to artifacts after they leave the island during IAP community meetings and my interviews. The following quotes demonstrate some of the community’s concerns:

I don’t think it’s [previous archaeological research] very much of an impact because it’s a lot of just taking from, so much, from way up north. That’s why yeah. Like it, I mean they were trusting people and they take advantage at that time, kind of not right I guess (Earl Esau, personal communication, August 27, 2014).

Like it’s good to know what was in the huts or camp. It’s good to know that and where they are. But it hasn’t, it hasn’t impacted on it because we all want to know. We all want to see. We are all interested in that. But with, with archaeologists they don’t realize they are taking part of… you know… it’s there. Just take a picture and leave it. But they don’t realize they are taking a part of our heritage. Our… somebody else’s heritage away (Kim Lucas, personal communication, September 7, 2014).

There’s a lot of negative, eh. Pervious archaeological [research] in the 70s, especially in the 70s. They didn’t need community consultation. There was no IFA [Inuvialuit Final Agreement] or nothing so they could just do whatever they want. They took a lot of artifacts. There are a few places that I know of that have been excavated. They have taken everything. And we don’t have nothing from it. I’d like to see replicas (David Haogak, personal communication, September 16, 2014).

Some community members highlighted positive impacts previous research has had. As stated above, people who were directly involved in some of the projects found that it directly benefitted them through employment or through trips on the land and a chance to share their knowledge with a wider audience. Other people acknowledged the benefit of
having archaeological sites recorded before they disappear and that previous archaeological interpretations can contribute to their own knowledge of their past and culture:

Um, I don’t think [previous archaeology had a negative effect on people]. Probably let the people know more about our past history. Have better understanding of it and what kind of animals they lived on (Joe Kudlak, personal communication, August 20, 2014).

It gives us more of a… people who can’t really see how it was a long time ago. It gives us an idea of how they lived and what they stayed in and it… what they ate (Mariah Lucas, personal communication, June 10, 2015).

Maybe better ’cause, you know, you archaeologists are marking things down now that even if they do disappear they are put away some place safe and there is a story behind it (Paul Kowikchuk, personal communication, June 2, 2015).

Previous archaeological work on the island has shaped community opinions in a variety of ways. Unfortunately, in the past there was often little consultation and communication by the archaeologists and this has led many community members to feel that previous work has negatively impacted them. Although some community members recognized positive outcomes, such as having sites recorded, community members with particularly positive views of archaeology are those who have been directly involved in previous research. For example, Joe Kudlak worked for Parks Canada and Mariah Lucas worked on the 2014 IAP excavation. Previous archaeological projects have raised many concerns about archeological research that current archaeologists have to take into consideration. The primary concerns of community members were that they do not want archaeologists disturbing graves; they want to be consulted and informed of archaeological research; and they want to know what happens to artifacts after they leave Banks Island.
1.4 The Rise of Community-Based Archaeology

Since the 1970s the Inuit in Canada have been increasingly regaining control of their traditional lands and the research conducted on them. In 1977 the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (PWNHC) and the Canadian Museum of Civilization gave local communities more input into research by instituting a new permitting process. Researchers had to get community approval before conducting any investigations. However, no legislation was changed so the permitting committee still had the power to overturn community rulings (Rowley 2002). This new permitting process was followed shortly after with the Inuvialuit Final Agreement (IFA) in 1984, the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement in 1993, the Labrador Inuit Land Claim agreement in 2005, and the Nunavik Inuit Land Claim Agreement in 2006 (Bonesteel 2006). These land claim agreements have furthered established Inuit control over their lands.

The IFA acknowledges the Inuvialuit as the “traditional owners and formal stewards of the ISR (Lyons 2009: 63). This region encompasses a large portion of the Western Canadian Arctic and six communities: Aklavik, Paulatuk, Inuvik, Tuktoyaktuk, Ulukhaktok, and Sachs Harbour. Archaeologists applying for an NWT Archaeologists’ Permit to conduct research in the ISR apply through the PWNHC and have to receive approval from the Hunters and Trappers Committee (HTC), the Hamlet Office, and the Community Corporation of the nearest community or communities. My research required me to have a Scientific Research License, which is administered through the Aurora Research Institute. To obtain my research license I had to receive approval from the University of Western Ontario’s Non-Medical Research Ethics Board and Sachs Harbour’s Community Corporation, HTC, and the Sachs Harbour Hamlet Office.

The advancements in Inuit rights within the Canadian political domain have changed the way arctic research is conducted. Inuit knowledge plays an important role in the way the
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7 In 1991 the Labrador Metis Association (now the NunatuKavut Community Council), representing the southern Inuit (formally the Inuit-Metis) filed a land claim encompassing parts of southern and central Labrador, which is still being negotiated.
Inuit control their land. For example, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), roughly translated as Inuit knowledge, has been established as a guiding principle for the Government of Nunavut and is also expected by them to be applied to scientific research conducted within Nunavut in collaboration with the Inuit (Wenzel 2004; Tester and Irniq 2008). The ethics of involving Inuit people in research have also come under focus, noting that southern ideas of research ethics are not always consistent with Inuit ideas (Nickels and Knotsch 2011; Felt and Natcher 2011).

Government officials and scientists are increasingly collaborating with Indigenous people in the North to develop government policies and conduct environmental research. Although these projects can be fruitful, there are cases where they further damage research relationships. For example, when researchers try to incorporate Indigenous knowledge but decide to ignore what Indigenous people are telling them because it conflicts with their data or interpretations (Nadasdy 2003) or when both parties agree to something, not realizing that they have completely different understandings of what the other means (Morrow and Hensel 1992). These negative outcomes of collaborative projects can make it difficult for future researchers to engage with a community. However, northern peoples are increasingly becoming involved in anthropological studies as researchers. They are applying their own cultural knowledge to formal anthropological training, which is challenging the ways that anthropologists investigate and interpret present phenomena. This trend in anthropological research in the North is also forcing other researchers to re-evaluate how their cultural and political standpoints affect their interpretations and the way they do research. It has also led to research projects that are more beneficial to northern communities (Cruikshank 1995).

Increased Inuit control over northern lands has allowed the Inuit to inform archaeologists that they want to be included in the production and management of their history, sometimes by denying permission for archaeologists to excavate (Lyons et al. 2010; Helmer and Lemoine 2002; Rowley 2002). In recognition of Inuit concerns, beginning in the 1970s archaeologists established a series of archaeological field schools involving Inuit youth and Elders in an attempt to open a dialogue between Inuit and Western understandings of the past (Rowley 2002; Bertulli 1985; Bielawski 1989; Rigby and
Stenton 1992; Stenton and Rigby 1995; Arnold and Hanks 1991; Hart 1994). More recently, projects have progressed towards a more meaningful and inclusive archaeological practice (ex. Dawson et al. 2011; Lyons et al. 2010; Loring and Rosenmeier 2000) that involves Inuit in most aspects of the research from the initial design to the dissemination of research results.

Such community-based archaeology projects seek to minimize colonial power imbalances that are still present in today’s archaeological practices (Atalay 2006; Silliman 2008; Watkins 2000). As Atalay (2008: 29-30) points out, community-based projects are not defined by one cohesive theory or method. Indigenous peoples are not a homogenous group; they have their own histories and their own ways of understanding, engaging with, and relating to the past. Therefore, the methods and theories undertaken in community-based archaeological projects are dependent on the group of people who are involved, as well as the context in which the project is being conducted (Colwell-Chanthaphon et al. 2010). However, all projects have the common goal of applying and respecting the experiences and epistemologies of local communities and Indigenous groups (Atalay 2008: 30) and collaborating with local communities throughout the research process, from the initial design to the dissemination of research results. Archaeologists are increasingly using ethnographic methods to aid in these tasks. Chapter 2 gives an analysis of the recent trend to use ethnographic methods or “archaeological ethnography” and outlines how I employ these methods in my research and research questions.

Despite the relatively long history of collaborative projects in the North, not all archaeologists are in favour of community-based archaeological approaches. The most vocal of these archaeologists has been Robert McGhee. McGhee (2008) purports that Indigenous archaeologies foster “Aboriginalism” by promoting Indigenous people and societies as inherently different from non-Indigenous peoples and extending privileges to Indigenous peoples based on these differences. He argues that one such privilege – the “proprietary rights over archaeological and other heritage materials, jurisdiction over how these material are investigated, and claimed authority over the dissemination of information recovered by archaeological and historical research” – is especially
problematic because he feels that no one group should have control over the archaeological record. He argues that archaeology should be an objective study of the past (McGhee 2008).

Additionally, because some archaeologists (e.g. McGhee 2008, Mason 2006) still believe that archaeology can and should be objective, subjective oral histories and Indigenous knowledges should not be included in archaeological interpretations. McGhee (2004: 20) argues, “[It] would be racist to pretend that we accept oral traditions as valid and accurate records of extremely ancient events, when we don’t believe that such valid traditions exist in other cultures of Europe and Asia” (McGhee 2004: 20). Mason (2006: 250) feels that history reconstructed by archaeologists and Indigenous knowledges “inhabit different explanatory worlds” (Mason 2006: 250) and serve different purposes in society. One is “scientific” and the other is not. Although both serve to help people understand and relate to the past they should remain separate but equal (McGhee 2008).

However, many archaeologists have heavily criticized McGhee’s standpoint. Wilcox (2010) points out that McGhee over simplified archaeological and Indigenous knowledges, as neither is homogenous and they are certainly not mutually exclusive. Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. (2010) argue that archaeologists should reflect on the sociopolitical context of scientific inquiry to better understand why scientific objectivity is not a valid argument for un-inclusive practices. Silliman (2010) also highlighted that McGhee has mischaracterized Indigenous archaeologies (and community-based archaeologies) and their goals. These projects do not seek to replace Western scientific knowledge with Indigenous knowledge. As Atalay (2008: 38) points out, “[t]he replacement of one power structure with another without changing the way power is perceived and enacted is pointless.” Community-based approaches seeks to empower Indigenous people and knowledge, not to privilege them.

There are many complications that can arise when bringing two different understandings of the past together but that does not mean that it should not and cannot be done. The purpose of bringing different knowledges together is to create holistic views of the past that are meaningful for present peoples. However, bringing Indigenous understandings of
the past and archaeological understandings of the past together requires archaeologists to reflect critically on their own methodologies and knowledge frameworks, and to learn more about Indigenous knowledges. Chapter 3 examines archaeological and Inuvialuit historicities (the ways people construct, relate to, and understand the past) and how these historicities are reflected in historical narratives of Banks Island.

Archaeologists who want to apply Indigenous understandings of the past also often focus solely on oral histories as they are closely aligned to their own understandings of what constitutes history. Oral histories, however, are only one aspect of Inuvialuit historicity. Chapter 4 examines the Inuvialuit principle of learning about the past through doing.

Community-based approaches are often applied with the misunderstanding that a community is homogeneous. However, a single community can be highly diverse and made up of several sub-communities. This diversity can lead to competing opinions of archaeological research that archaeologists have to navigate. Chapter 5 discusses diversity in Sachs Harbour and how people’s position within the community influences their opinions of archaeological research, and offers suggestions for working with this diversity.

Although community-based approaches are a step in the right direction for (re)building relationships between archaeologists and Inuit communities, they are not without their challenges. Chapter 6 reflects on some of the challenges that arose during my project and over the course of the IAP. By reflecting on these challenges we can better work towards building community-based archaeology projects.
Figure 2: Places mentioned in Text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Place</th>
<th></th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sachs River</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nelson Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Egg River (Manniliqpik)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Haogak Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mary Sachs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Forks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cape Kellett</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shoran Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Angus Lake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Suunguqpaaluk Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Middle Lake</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ukalikpialuk Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fish Lake</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mercy Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Agvik</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aulavik National Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2

2 Research Methods: Archaeological Ethnographies

Archaeologists have always used ethnography to aid in their understandings of the past. More recently, archaeologists have begun using ethnographic research as part of a reflexive methodology to engage with local stakeholders and descendent communities and produce multivocal interpretations of the past, usually as part of community-based projects. These methods, which have come to be known as archaeological ethnographies, recognize and embrace the political nature of archaeology and seek to produce archaeological projects that are “ethical” and relevant to a broader public. I drew on these methods during my research, in an attempt to understand how archaeology can best complement existing Inuvialuit heritage practices in Sachs Harbour to help establish a community-based approach for archaeological research.

Archaeological ethnographies are still developing methodologically and are critiqued because they are reflexive and often carried out by people with little or no ethnographic training. As archaeological ethnographies are still in their infancy, recognizing and addressing these issues is crucial to ensure that they do not become deeply embedded in the practice. I therefore used these criticisms to guide my methodology and fieldwork. This chapter discusses archaeological ethnographies and how its principals and critiques of it shaped my project.

2.1 Archaeological Ethnography

The use of ethnography in archaeology can be divided into three main categories (Castañeda 2008, Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009; Edgeworth 2010). The first category involves more traditional uses of ethnography in archaeology, where ethnography is used as an aid to archaeological interpretation. It includes ethnoarchaeology, the use of ethnographic analogies, and the use of oral histories to supplement archaeological research. All three will henceforth be referred to as ethnoarchaeology for the sake of simplicity (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009; Castañeda 2008; Edgeworth 2010). The second
category has been referred to as *anthropology of archaeology* (Castañeda 2008), or *ethnographies of archaeological practice* (Edgeworth 2010). This category includes projects where archaeology is the object of anthropological and ethnographic study. These projects examine archaeology as a social phenomenon through an external lens, similar to any other anthropological study (Hollowell and Mortensen 2009). The third category is *archaeological ethnographies* (sometimes also referred to as *ethnographic archaeologies*) (Castañeda 2008; Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulou 2009; Meskell 2005; Edgeworth 2010; Griebel 2013). Archaeological ethnographies aim to be reflexive and change the way archaeologists do research by appraising archaeological practices and opening up new understandings of the past (Castañeda 2008).

Despite employing similar methods to ethnoarchaeology and ethnographies of archaeological practice, archaeological ethnographies differ in a number of ways. Ethnographies of archaeological practice also use ethnographic methods to learn about the social and political aspects of archaeology, but this study is an “external” process, where the ethnographer is generally working from outside of the archaeology project and studying the project for the sake of anthropological understandings. As stated above, although these projects can provide a reflexive view of archaeological processes, the goal is not always to promote change within a particular project, or the discipline as a whole. Archaeological ethnographies examine the social and political elements of archaeological research to promote positive outcomes of the work for the public or specific communities (Castañeda 2008). Archaeological ethnographies are also often used to help develop projects with a community to ensure that they are relevant and culturally appropriate for community members. Ethnographic interviews are used to help community members articulate their heritage principles and needs to archaeologists (ex. Hollowell and Nicholas 2009).

Although some archaeologists have been using oral histories to supplement their interpretations since the earliest days of the discipline, the use of oral histories and Indigenous or local understandings of the past in archaeological ethnographies differs. In archaeological ethnographies, oral histories are used not simply to support a singular modernist interpretation of the past, but with the aim of creating an inclusive, multivocal
interpretation. This requires acknowledging the validity of community understandings of the past, even if they are different from or conflict with those of archaeologists. Oral histories are not seen as supplementary evidence but legitimate, important, and real knowledge of the past (Forbes 2009; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2004; Beck and Somerville 2005, Lyons and Dawson et al. 2010).

It is widely acknowledged that archaeology as a discipline grew out of 18th and 19th century nationalist and colonial projects and was founded on modernist principles that idealized scientific objectivity (Hodder 2003; Pels 2008; Pels and Salemink 1999). The relatively recent turn to reflexivity in archaeology is the result of both theoretical discussions of “objectivity” and the interactions between archaeologists and various communities, especially Indigenous and descendant groups (Hodder 2005; Hamilakis 2007). These exchanges have led archaeologists to acknowledge the inherently political nature of the past and archaeological appropriations of it.

The underlying principle of reflexive approaches is the recognition that a researcher’s standpoint affects his or her perspective. Reflexivity involves “recognizing the value of multiple positions and multivocality, not as an egocentric display, but as an historical enquiry into the foundations of one’s claims to knowledge” (Hodder 1991: 58).

Hamilakis (2007: 24) identifies the questions most relevant to reflexivity in archaeology: “Who is benefiting from our archaeological and other interventions, and at whose expense? What kind of class, gender, ethnic, national or other interests are being promoted by our interventions?”

Archaeological ethnographies attempt to work through the political contexts within archaeology to produce socially relevant, multivocal archaeological projects. Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulo (2009: 67) define archaeological ethnographies as:

a highly contested and thus fertile cross-disciplinary as well as transcultural, politically loaded space; a space for multiple conversations, engagements, interventions, and critiques, centered on materiality and temporality. This space encourages the downplaying of the distinction between past and present, and between diverse publics and researchers of equally diverse backgrounds.
These projects require archaeologists to rethink the way their discipline creates knowledge (Castañeda 2008). Within this body of work archaeologists use ethnographic methods to learn about the archaeological past as well as the present social and political dynamics involved in their research.

The methodologies and practices of archaeological ethnographies are open and flexible, and are contingent on the specific project. They are multi-sited and multi-temporal projects that use holistic approaches employing a combination of some or all of the following: traditional archaeological methods, interviews, participant observation, oral history research, and archival work (Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009). Archaeological ethnographies work to blur the line between observer and observed, working as an exchange of knowledge rather than a unilateral acquisition of knowledge. The people who would traditionally be seen as the observed are encouraged to participate and learn from the research. Both the observed and observer learn about alternative knowledges and methods and build these new understandings into their own (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2004; Lyons 2011; Hollowell and Nicholas 2009; Pyburn 2009; Griebel 2013). Ethnographic methods including interviewing and participant observation serve two main purposes in these projects. They work to: 1) understand the perspectives of the multiple communities and stakeholders of archaeological projects to recognize how archaeology impacts or can impact various groups of people in hopes of building a project that is relevant and socially conscious and 2) record oral histories and other understandings of the past to use them alongside archaeological knowledge to create a multivocal and inclusive interpretation of the past.

2.2 Critique of Ethnographic Archaeologies

2.2.1 Reflexivity

When post-processual archaeologists first began to write reflexive critiques about the way archaeological knowledge is produced and used, there was a backlash among processualists that still continues today. Some (McGhee 2008; Mason 2006) have argued that archaeology can and should be an objective, scientific study of truth and
archaeologists should not get involved in politics. It has also been argued that reflexivity is just a more subtle way to claim truth by critiquing it, and that it disempowers critique and establishes a new, distanced authority (Hodder 1991; 2003; Handler 2008; Pels 2000). Writing about reflexive observations also runs the risk of becoming “self-indulgent” and “egocentric” (Hodder 2003: 58) and these self-critiques are not outside the realm of bias.

Reflexive methods that incorporate other understandings of the past come under fire because they are no longer seen as “archaeology.” The goal can easily become appeasing other stakeholders or descendent communities, and the commitment to understanding the past can become secondary, or non-existent. Archaeologists worry that real “history” will become lost in a sea of dialogues when engaging with people outside of the discipline (McGhee 2008). Finding a balance between the objectives and understandings of the past of communities and archaeologists has proven to be a difficult task (Nicholas and Hollowell 2007; Hollowell and Nicholas 2008; Hodder 1991; 2005), yet one that is worth attempting. As all communities, stakeholders, and projects are different, the level of community or stakeholder input and engagement will vary. Establishing clear goals can help project leaders wade through these dialogues.

2.2.2 Lack of Ethnographic Training

A lack of ethnographic training can perhaps lead to the biggest problems associated with archaeological ethnographies. Archaeologists often have a simplified idea of ethnography, and often forget that anthropologists have their own theories and methods, and colonial history to account for (McGill 2010; Holtorf 2009). Limited ethnographic training can lead to a failure to correctly identify the community, the reproduction of unequal power relationships, and misrepresentation. Archaeological ethnographies have been criticized for doing ‘second rate’ anthropology (McGill 2010; Holtorf 2009) because of the relatively short field seasons compared to traditional ethnography and for focusing solely on interviewing. Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos (2009) encourage archaeologists to pursue ‘total ethnography’ so researchers can learn about and familiarize themselves with the communities and surroundings in order to have context
for their interpretations. However, time and financial limitations often make total or complete ethnography unrealistic.

Archaeologists tend to have a simplified understanding of human social organization and often define communities based simply on political, ethnic, or geographic boundaries. Communities are often assumed to share common interests and a homogeneous value system. However, communities are multifaceted, complex, and heterogeneous. Many communities are comprised of multiple sub-communities with conflicting aspirations and principles. Additionally, communities are often fluid and people can identify with and be a part of several communities (Pyburn 2009; Zimmerman 2005; Atalay 2012; Zehra Rizvi 2006). As well, archaeologists often create communities that did not exist a priori (Pyburn 2009). Failure to problematize the concept of community can have a series of negative consequences. First, by incorrectly identifying the communities in a project, archaeologists may employ inappropriate methods or develop irrelevant research projects.

For example, Zehra Rizvi (2006: 394) failed to properly identify the stakeholders in her archaeological project and developed a public archaeology project, which aimed to engage the general public, instead of a community archaeology project aiming to “hand over partial control of the project to the local community,” which she believes caused her project to be unsuccessful. Archaeological sites and materials mean different things to different people and different communities (Deltsou 2009; Zimmerman 2005). By assuming there is only one community, or choosing to work with only a single sub-community, an archaeologist can alienate other groups of people. Defining or identifying a community should not be taken lightly. Archaeologists need to be reflexive and critically aware of the social and political implications of their definitions.

Improper ethnographic training and knowledge can also recreate existing power relationships and misrepresent local, Indigenous, and descendant communities. Pyburn (2009) notes that well-intentioned archaeologists with strong commitments to increasing ethnic pride or fostering economic development can neglect to learn and understand the
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8 Archaeologists and sociocultural anthropologists also have different conceptions and definitions of culture, which may also contribute to this issue.
lives and needs of real individuals. The commitment of well-funded, educated, government supported archaeologists to ‘help’ or ‘teach’ non-archaeologists who do not have access to these advantages can be as colonialist and hegemonic as those archaeologists who choose not to engage with local people (Pyburn 2009: 165-166).

Similar to archaeology, the discipline of anthropology arose from colonial hegemony and imperialism (Darnell 2001; Pels and Salemink 1999; Pels 2008; Pinkoski 2008; Lewis 1973; Nicholas and Hollowell 2007). Traditional ethnographic methods were conceived as part of colonial hegemony and continuously perpetuated unequal colonial power relations between the European observer and the Indigenous observed (Matthews 2004). Since the 1970s anthropologists have tried to distance themselves from the colonial past of their discipline by being reflexive about anthropology’s history and role in colonialism. Pels (2008: 81) points out that the major features of anthropology including culture, ethnographic interviews, participant observation, and ethics of cross-cultural respect, need to be understood in the colonial contexts in which they were conceived before they are treated as objects or tools of anthropology. Anthropologists have been adjusting their methods to account for the unequal power relationships that inherently occur as part of ethnographic research, succeeding to varying degrees (Pels 2008; Pinkoski 2008). If anthropologists who are trained in ethnographic methods find it difficult to reduce the inborn power inequities in their research, then it will likely be even more difficult for archaeologists with minimal training and understanding of these processes (Matthews 2004). In an attempt to achieve more balanced power relations in archaeological research, many archaeologists are using ethnographic methods that have the potential to continually perpetuate the imbalances.

2.2.3 Misrepresentation and Appropriation of Indigenous Knowledge

Archaeological ethnographies are often used to produce multivocal interpretations of the past by recording Indigenous and local knowledges and oral histories. Inexperience with oral histories and other forms of knowledge, however, can lead to issues of appropriation and misrepresentation of knowledge. Many archaeologists assume oral histories and other
forms of knowledge work under the same principles as western scientific knowledge and hold them to the same standards. Archaeologists working within the framework of *ethnographies as aid* will often use oral histories only when they are supported by archaeological evidence, and disregard them when they are not supported by or directly conflict with the archaeological record (Beck and Somerville 2005). Archaeologists may also dissect these knowledges using only information that is relevant to them, which removes the information from its original contexts and diminishes its original meaning. Archaeological ethnographies aim to use other forms of knowledge and oral histories in multivocal interpretations of the past that give equal weight to both understandings. However, these projects prove to be difficult and archaeologists may take on the authoritative role and follow similar frameworks as ethnographies as aid.

A lack of comprehension of Indigenous knowledge and oral histories is a demonstrated problem of early ethnography. Brill de Ramírez (2007: iii) explains, “Much of the early construction of published American Indian autobiographies went through a linguistically and ideologically interpretive process that transformed conversive tellings into discursive texts that, more often than not, diverged substantially from their storied beginnings and instead present the ideologies, language, and discursive forms of colonizing powers of the academy.” Anthropologists and ethnographers are trained to be mindful of the ways meaning is changed through different mediums and translation. Archaeologists who are untrained in ethnographic methods and who lack an understanding of Indigenous knowledges may overlook these shifts in meaning and misrepresent the knowledge and information they are being given.

### 2.2.4 Intellectual Property Rights

Property rights have been a debated issue in archaeology for a long time. However, these debates have mainly focused on material property rights – both in terms of access to and ownership of monuments, material culture, artifacts, and human remains – among archaeologists, Indigenous groups, and local and descendant communities (Hollowell and Nicholas 2009: 144;). More recently, concerns with intellectual property rights have become more prominent, and focus on two issues. First, archaeological materials reflect
past knowledge systems and can serve as symbols of identity, so the claim of intellectual property right is linked to material property rights (Nicholas 2005: 97). Some archaeologists believe that ethnography can help identify, understand, and “settle” these claims. The second issue has more to do with the information gathered from ethnographies and the use of Indigenous knowledge by academics. These kinds of intellectual property issues are very prominent within the field of bioprospecting and are only recently making their way into anthropological and archaeological discussions (Posey 2004; Nagy 2011a, 2011b). Indigenous knowledge and oral histories are increasingly being recorded and published by archaeologists, raising questions about whether Indigenous peoples or archaeologists should own rights to and control the information (Lyons 2011; Hollowell and Nicholas 2009; Nicholas 2005). It is important to note that for the most part when Indigenous peoples argue for intellectual property rights they are not arguing for economic or legal reasons but because losing these rights can affect their livelihood. Nagy (2011a) points out that Western understandings of ethics and ownership may differ from those of Indigenous peoples. Indigenous concerns often revolve around the appropriation and misuse of knowledge, and loss of access to and control of their knowledge. They are concerned about human dignity and community survival (Hollowell and Nicholas 2009: 146; Nicholas 2005: 97). Archaeologists should work with communities before beginning the recording of Indigenous knowledge to determine how knowledge will be used and who will hold the intellectual property rights to and control the knowledge (Nagy 2011b).

2.3 Research Methods

This dissertation is the result of my understandings of conversations I had and observations I made over the course of my fieldwork. Therefore, this dissertation is not necessarily a concrete representation of the community I worked with but a representation that has been shaped by who I am and my experiences.

I was born in Toronto Ontario, Canada. Growing up, it seemed my family moved regularly. Before I was eight I had lived in Toronto, Ontario; Houston, Texas; Walkersville, Maryland; Shenandoah Junction, West Virginia; and London Ontario.
Consequently, I have never felt rooted in a place or particularly tied to a community. I know that this has influenced my work but I am still unaware of how.

I am of Hungarian, Ukrainian, Irish, and Native American descent. I feel the most affinity towards my Hungarian heritage, as my Hungarian grandmother had a great love for her culture and found her heritage to be a source of pride. She was always excited to share her heritage with me and taught me that heritage is an important part of self. What I hope to work towards with my work, however, is very much influenced by my Native American heritage, which, due to colonial processes, my other grandmother was unable to learn much about and share with her family. In the long term, I hope to contribute to understandings of the past that better reflect the understandings and experiences of Indigenous people as part of a greater effort to foster knowledge and appreciation of Indigenous heritage in North America.

My parents have always had an interest in archaeology and they often brought my siblings and me to museums. I remember being young and feeling a disconnect between exhibits featuring Indigenous people and what I understood about my heritage, which prompted my own interests in archaeology. I completed my undergraduate degree at the University of Western Ontario in anthropology, with a focus on archaeology and a minor in First Nations studies. I received a MA in archaeology from Memorial University of Newfoundland. My MA research used oral history research and archaeological survey to examine the history of the Inuit-Metis in Sandwich Bay, Labrador. This research was part of the Understanding the Past to Build the Future Community University Research Alliance project that was initiated by the Southern Inuit in Labrador. The training that I received from these two very different departments has shaped the way that I understand archaeology and the university system, which will be discussed in Chapter 6.

It was important for me to keep the issues and criticisms of archaeological ethnographies in mind while I was planning and executing my research. Due to financial and logistical limitations, the time I was able to spend in the field was short compared to many traditional ethnographic PhD projects. I opted for three shorter field seasons rather than one longer one because it allowed me to be present when IAP activities were taking
place. It is unfortunate that I was unable to be present in Sachs Harbour during the winter months since I missed the opportunity to learn more about activities that typically take place in the winter that the community uses to pass down historical knowledge and heritage. However, I was still able to maintain contact and relationships with community members between field seasons through Facebook, a popular way for community members to keep in touch with friends and family on the mainland. This gave me some insight into what the community is like over the winter. Additionally, I had many conversations with community members about winter activities and community life during this season.

2.3.1 Defining the Community

Above I wrote about the importance of properly defining the community that archaeologists partner with. As stated earlier, defining a community can be difficult, as they are often comprised of several smaller sub-communities. Additionally, defining a community can be challenging for a researcher who is new to the community and not yet aware of sub-communities and local politics. A community is built on a common identity. Identity is complex and fluid, making it difficult for social scientists to come up with an agreed upon definition. For the purpose of this dissertation, identity refers to the ways “individuals and collectives are distinguished in their social relations with other individuals and collectives” (Meskell 2002: 280). Identity can be based on an “affiliation an individual feels to particular groups, ideas, and/or standpoints” including things like “place, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, history, and ethnicity” (Lyons 2009: 64). Identity can be based on both internal and external perception and can be defined by difference. Sökefeld (1999: 417-18) explains, “in the social and cultural sciences, what was once called ‘identity’ in the sense of social, shared sameness is today often discussed with reference to difference. Difference points to the contrastive aspect of identities and thereby emphasizes the implicit condition of plurality.” Identity is constantly changing, as individuals and collectives negotiate their identity in response to their circumstances. Individuals have multiple identities that can be fragmented, overlapping, and intersecting (Lyons 2009), and therefore individuals can belong to multiple communities.
Identity and community membership influence the ways in which people relate to and understand the past. This dissertation maintains that all constructions of the past are socially inspired. Friedman (1992: 837) identified the practice of identity as a process and the constitution of meaningful worlds, specifically of historical schemes. He also acknowledges that “making history is a way of producing identity insofar as it produces a relationship between that which supposedly occurred in the past and the present state of affairs” (Friedman 1992: 837). Therefore, the past is both imprinted on the present, shaping identities and people’s relationship to the world around them, and constructed based on these identities.

When I first began applying for a research permit and grants to conduct my fieldwork, I identified the community that I would work in as “the Inuvialuit community of Sachs Harbour.” Upon my first visit to Sachs Harbour it quickly became clear that this definition was both insufficient and problematic. Like all identities, “Inuvialuit” is multifaceted and steeped in social, political, and historical complexities. Additionally, although Sachs Harbour is small, many communities can be found within the town. Identifying and defining the community that I work with has been an ongoing process that required many revisions throughout my fieldwork and writing.

Prior to land claim processes in the Western Canadian Arctic the term “Inuvialuit” was not in widespread use (Lyons 2009; Morrison 2003a: 12). The Committee for Original People’s Entitlement (COPE), that initiated the land claim process in the 1970s, replaced the Western term “Mackenzie Inuit” given to them by outsiders with the word “Inuvialuit”, which means “the real people” in the Siglitun dialect (Lyons 2009). Through the land claim process “Inuvialuit” became a geo-political signifier for all the people living in what would become the ISR, even though some do not culturally identify with the signifier. Today, “Inuvialuit” encompasses three distinct cultural-linguistic groups: the Siglit, the Uummarmiut, and the Kangiryuarmiut. These groups have diverse histories and identities.

Archaeologists argue that the Thule-Inuit ancestors of the Inuvialuit first arrived in the region around AD 1250, although many Inuvialuit understand that their ancestors have
been there since time immemorial. At the time of contact, the area stretching from Herschel Island in the west to Darnley Bay in the East was occupied by at least seven groups with a total population of about 2500 (Morrison 2003a; Lyons 2009; Betts 2009; Oehler 2010). Although these groups were independent of one another with their own territories and economies, Lyons (2009) notes that oral and written histories indicate that they distinguished themselves from neighbouring Inuit and Dene groups. They had little contact with the neighbouring Inuit groups and were known to be enemies of the Gwich’in (Morrison 2003a; Lyons 2009; Oehler 2010). The traditional Inuvialuit territory was centered on the Mackenzie Delta, which included highly diverse ecozones compared to other regions of the Canadian Arctic. Oehler (2010: 16) suggests that this uniqueness of the region likely set the Inuvialuit apart from all other Inuit groups across the North American Arctic.

The establishment of a Hudson Bay Company fur post in the lower Delta in the 1850s increased Inuvialuit contact with the Gwich’in, gave them greater access to European goods, and exposed them to new epidemics (Morrison 2003b: 58-70). In 1889 the first whaling ships came to the region, quickly followed by the explosion of the whaling industry, which brought Europeans, Siberians, Inupiat, Polynesians, and Cape Verde Islanders to the region, many of whom had unions with Inuvialuit women (Morrison 2003c: 82). In 1902, a devastating measles epidemic wiped out the majority of the Inuvialuit population. Morrison (2003c: 89) estimates that by 1910 there were only 150 Inuvialuit survivors. He notes (2003a: 12) that “Siglit” is an identifier that at least some of the Inuvialuit used during the 19th century. The descendants of these survivors are now called the “traditional Inuvialuit” or Siglit by the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC) and their dialect is known as Siglitun9.

9 One community member told me that she did not like the word “Siglitun” because her people’s dialect had another name. Although I acknowledge that the terms “Siglitun”, “Uumarmiutun”, and “Kangiryuarmiutun” may be problematic I have used these terms to write about the Inuvialuktun dialects as they are the ones used by the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation.
Beginning at the end of nineteenth century some Inupiat, also referred to as the Nunatama or Nunataarmiut (“inland people”), migrated in a series of waves from Alaska to the Delta region as a result of the decline of caribou herds in Alaska (Oehler 2010: 18; Lyons 2009; Stephenson and Arnold 2011: 11). This group intermarried with the local Inuvialuit and today is known under the IFA as the Uummarmiut, “people of the evergreens and willows” (Stephenson and Arnold 2011: 11). Their dialect is called Uummarmiutun.

The Inuvialuit Final Agreement also includes a group known as the Kangiryuarmiut, meaning “people of the large bay,” or Inuinnaqtun (Stephenson and Arnold 2011: 11). This group speaks a dialect of Inuinnaqtun called Kangiryuarmiutun. They are more closely related culturally to people from Cambridge Bay and Coppermine. The Kangiryuarmiut traditionally participated in seasonal rounds, which meant moving between their hunting areas on Victoria Island and Banks Island. The harsh environment meant that the Kangiryuarmiut had to have a great degree of flexibility in their economic and social organization. This means that seasonal areas of exploitation often changed depending on the year, as did the demographic makeup of hunting groups or camps (Condon 1996).

Because of their isolation, they were one of the last Inuit groups to experience sustained European contact. During the early 20th century, European traders and missionaries came to the region and noted many Kangiryuarmiut settlements in Minto Inlet and Prince Albert sound. In 1937, a man named Natkusiaq and his family settled in the location of what is now the Hamlet of Ulukhaktok (previously Holman). A few years later the HBC moved their post nearby and a Roman Catholic mission was also established in the vicinity. Slowly many more Kangiryuarmiut families came to the settlement (Condon 1996: 121-122). The Kangiryuarmiut were included in the land claim because of their geographic position and some family relationships with people from other communities in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Lyons 2009). Although I did not interview anyone
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10 The Kangiryuarmiut and their ancestors are often referred to as the Copper Inuit (and earlier as Copper Eskimo) by archaeologists and anthropologists, although there is a move away from this identifier.

11 Natkusiaq (Billy Banksland) was Inupiat, who came to the Canadian Arctic with Stefansson. He helped establish white fox trapping on Banks Island and Victoria Island.
living in Ulukhaktok, some interviewees suggested that people from Ulukhaktok prefer not to be identified as Inuvialuit, but either Inuinnait or Ulukhaktokmiut. In Sachs Harbour, a few Elder interviewees who were of Kangiryuarmiut background said that when they were young they called themselves Inuinnaqt but now they see themselves as Inuvialuit, and are proud of this identity. Therefore, throughout this dissertation I will refer to the Kangiryuarmiut living on Banks Island as Inuvialuit but may identify their background as Inuinnaqt and those living in Ulukhaktok as Ulukhaktokmiut.

Interviewees defined “Inuvialuit” in a variety of ways. More often than not they articulated their pride in their Inuvialuit heritage, even if they were unable to define what Inuvialuit meant to them. Many people gave the direct translation of Inuvialuit as their definition. Betty Raddi-Haogak (personal communication June 1, 2015) explained, “first of all, we are people, and that is who we are. The real people. The Inuvialuit. You know. That’s what it means, the real people.” Although this could be seen as a simple translation, I believe that this is a greater reflection of how they see themselves in relation to the rest of the world. Many people acknowledged the cultural diversity described above and described this diversity as a strength. Many others focused on a strong sense of community and family:

I think Inuvialuit means family. Everyone helps each other (Mariah Lucas, Personal Communication, June 10, 2015).

I’m proud to be Inuvialuit. I’m just thinking back when I would go on the land hunting and trapping in Tuktoyaktuk, we would come across once in a while people from the Delta on the land and we were always happy to see people on the land and have tea and chat. And so, it is important to be Inuvialuit (Norm Anikina, Personal Communication September 5, 2015).

Some interviewees defined Inuvialuit based on how they were different from neighbouring people. Many stated that they understood the Inuvialuit to be “more modern” than other Inuit people, but despite embracing aspects of Western culture they have still maintained their traditions. Most definitions however were based on a connection to the land:
We live off the land and we do a lot of our subsistence hunting and harvesting and just being out on the land. That’s Inuvialuit. The Inuvialuit way (Beverly Amos, Personal Communication, September 17, 2014).

Well being Inuvialuit is, I mean it has always been our culture. Hunting and everything. It is always going to be the same. It’s just a different way of doing it now with the technology and the GPS and the motorized vehicle. You know, it just makes everything easier (Earl Esau, Personal Communication, August 27, 2014).

Although many Inuvialuit also have European and other ancestry as a result of the whaling and early trapping eras, many do not feel that this influences their identity. For example, Bridget Wolki (Personal communication, August 14, 2014) explained, “and on my dad’s side, his grandfather was white. German. And my mom’s side, her grandfather was Scottish. So it doesn’t really define me or anything because I am Inuvialuit. I was brought up Inuvialuit, our cultural ways of growing up.” However, one informant told me of the prejudice against them by other Inuvialuit because their physical appearance expressed many white features. They were often told they were not as “Inuvialuit” as other people.

Additionally, many young people who are of mixed Inuvialuit and Gwich’in heritage have to choose between land claims. Lyons (2009: 72) states, “by various accounts, young people make this choice based on the perceived strength of each claim, and perhaps more significantly, on which culture they feel affinity with.” One informant who is of both Inuvialuit and Gwich’in heritage was put under the Gwich’in land claim by their Gwich’in parent. Now, while living in Sachs Harbour they are unable to hunt with their family members (although still able to accompany them) because they cannot be part of the Sachs Harbour Community Corporation or the HTC and a hunting license for non-Inuvialuit is too expensive. Although they identify as both Inuvialuit and Gwich’in, they are unable to access certain parts of their Inuvialuit heritage because they are not included in the land claim (Anonymous, personal communication 2014). Having to
choose between land claims undoubtedly impacts one’s identity and the ways in which they can connect to their heritage.

Today the coastal communities of Tuktoyaktuk and Paulatuk are regarded as Siglit communities, the Delta communities of Inuvik and Aklavik are understood as mainly Uummarmiut communities, and Ulukhaktok is an Inuinnaitsu community. Sachs Harbour is widely regarded by its residents as a multicultural community as people from all three cultural groups settled there, although mainly Siglit and Inuinnait. As stated above, the Inuinnait traditionally traveled between Banks Island and Victoria Island. Beginning in the 1920s, Inuvialuit from the mainland began travelling by schooner to Banks Island for trapping during the winter, settling in small communities along the southwestern coast (Plate 2). They would travel back to the mainland in the summer to trade their furs and stock their supplies. During this time the Inuinnait stayed in small settlements on the eastern coast, many continuing to travel around the island and move back and forth to Victoria Island. In 1953, the RCMP established a post in Sachs Harbour. Around this time Fred Carpenter, a prosperous Inuvialuit trapper from the mainland, founded a store in Sachs Harbour. Soon after, families from all backgrounds began to settle there as well. The community was originally governed by a group of men regarded as leaders who would vote on matters pertaining to trapping and the community. The leaders were able to determine who could and could not trap and settle on the island. Initially, some non-Inuvialuit, mainly Gwich’in, came to the island but the community leaders voted against them in order to preserve an Inuvialuit identity and culture:

That was the plan [to come to Sachs Harbour for fox trapping] until he got, how do you say it, removed, because they didn’t want non-Inuvialuit. They thought he was non-Inuvialuit but his parents are actually Inuvialuit (Anonymous, personal communication 2014).
Plate 2: The schooner *Blue Fox* before painting in De Salis Bay, Banks Island, NWT, spring 1935. Photo credit: Mrs. Peter Sydney/ Library and Archives Canada/ PA-027673.

Although Sachs Harbour community members see themselves as Inuvialuit, their affiliation with their families’ place of origin and cultural background can still influence their personal identities and the relationships they have with other community members. Sachs Harbour is regularly labeled a Siglitun speaking town. However, many families in the community speak the Kangiryuarmiutun dialect. Additionally, many community members mentioned that Sachs Harbour has its own unique dialect, but when questioned about it were not able to provide any further information. This unique dialect could be the result of the different dialects spoken in town. Unfortunately, there are few community members, primarily Elders, who speak Inuvialuktun fluently. Inuvialuktun language acquisition is a big concern for community members as younger generations generally have little knowledge of the language, which will be examined in more detail in Chapter 4.

All research participants identified Banks Island as their home, even if some were born elsewhere. Those who were born in other regions of the ISR had various ties to these places. Some felt like they had two homes, like Betty Raddi-Haogak who was born in
Tuktoyaktuk. Her family moved to Sachs Harbour when she was young for fur trapping. They would return to Tuktoyaktuk each summer to trade their furs:

Yeah. I still call it my home because there’s, I made a lot of friendships and I have most of my two hundred relatives there. It’s like there is a bond there and everybody when I see them in Inuvik and they’re from Tuk… So, there is strong ties there yet for me in Tuk and my mom still lives there and my relatives… Yeah, two homes (Betty Raddi-Haogak, Personal Communication, July 13, 2014).

Other community members born elsewhere or with strong family ties to other regions felt less connected to those places:

Well, I’ve lived in Sachs Harbour for so long, this is my home now. I've lived on the island for forty-seven years. So, I call this my home (Anonymous, Personal Communication, August 22, 2014).

No, [I do not feel connected to the Delta]. Not me. My Delta family is, so you know, no. No, me I’m from Sachs Harbour. I’m a coastal person. You guys were born there. Me, I born over [here] on the island (Earl Esau, Personal Communication, August 27, 2014).

I don’t [feel affinity towards] Victoria Island… I don’t know. I don’t know. Too much hunger long ago. Just about starved there lots of times. And we move here 1955 and we never got hungry again. So, I just love Sachs Harbour. It’s my home (Lena Wolki, Personal Communication, August 20, 2014).

Although some research participants no longer lived in Sachs Harbour, they still identify as being from Sachs Harbour and felt that to some degree it would always be their home.

Community members feel that Sachs Harbour is different from the rest of the communities in the ISR, and because of that their identity is also partially defined by being from Sachs Harbour, rather than just being Inuvialuit. When talking about these differences, most community members mentioned that Sachs is a “multicultural town”,
with people of different Inuvialuit backgrounds. Many think this difference is also based on their isolation and small population size. They also said that they had the lowest percent of non-Inuvialuit population. This isolation also makes community members feel that they are more “free” than other people in the ISR. Some feel that the isolation leads them to become more resourceful than other people in the ISR:

Well, Sachs People in particular, I always get that we’re really resourceful. It’s only because there’s not much resources on the island. Like there’s no trees and everything that comes in is pretty much low quantities. So, if you are not resourceful it doesn’t help survival much (Anonymous, personal communication, 2014).

Many people also feel they are more “modern” than other people in the ISR, meaning that to a degree they are less bound by their traditions and more open to accept more “modern” ways of living. This could possibly stem from the idea that many of their families had left their traditional homelands in pursuit of new opportunities that trapping offered, making them innovators of sorts. Many others mentioned that each place in the ISR had distinct ways of sewing, hunting, and ways of doing things. Of particular importance in defining difference was food, specifically geese. Although other places in the ISR, such as Tuktoyaktuk, have a spring goose hunt community members often use Sachs Harbour’s goose hunt to differentiate themselves from other communities, in particular Ulukhaktok:

Even Sachs and Holman [Ulukhaktok] is different because they got no geese there. They get different, they live a different way. I mean that’s really different (David Haogak, Personal Communication, September 16, 2014).

Sachs Harbour is really unique. They are away from the mainland. We get abundance of geese every spring (Norm Anikina, Personal Communication, May 23, 2015).

I guess we’re, ours is the western side and then there are some in the eastern side around Victoria Island. Our culture is different than theirs. Us, in the
springtime, we hunt snow geese, and them, in the June they hunt eider ducks. So they are pretty different (Trevor Lucas, Personal Communication, May 28, 2015).

As stated above, I initially identified the community as the “Inuvialuit community of Sachs Harbour.” This identification was problematic because of the different ways that people relate to the term Inuvialuit. It was also problematic because some of the people I interviewed no longer live in Sachs Harbour, so a definition that was geographically bounded was also insufficient. Furthermore, there may be people who once lived on Banks Island in one of the smaller communities before Sachs Harbour was established who feel connected to Banks Island and its history and may find my work or the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project of some interest. Therefore, I always kept in mind that my work was not limited to the community of Sachs Harbour.

The community that I worked with is a diaspora community whose members share a common connection to Banks Island and its past. It encompasses many interweaving sub-communities, which are based on cultural background, family relationships, age, gender, affinity to traditions, and education, to name a few. Community members’ affiliation with these sub-communities can impact the ways they relate to and understand the past. I have decided to conceptualize this community as “the Ikaahukmiut community”, which translates as the “the people of Ikaahuk”. Although not in widespread use, some community members use this term to identify themselves and their fellow community members. Additionally, Ikaahukmiut will be used as an identifier for people who lived on Banks Island a long time ago and whose cultural affiliation cannot be ascribed.

2.3.2 Research Methods and Questions

My first field season occurred during July 2013. I had originally hoped my project would largely focus on interviewing Elders for a traditional knowledge project based around archaeological findings from IAP excavations. However, in 2013 the Sachs Harbour Community Corporation denied the project permission to excavate, leading the archaeology crew to focus their investigation on magnetometer surveys of Cape Kellett and Agvik (Figure 3). My field season then focused on understanding why permission to
excavate was not granted although Hodgetts had consulted with community members prior to applying for the SSHRC Insight Grant. My approach to this field season was somewhat informal, focusing mainly on casual conversations with community members and a couple of formal traditional knowledge interviews with Elders. It became clear that although this community only had a population of approximately 80 people, views and understandings of the past and archaeology differed tremendously among community members. As discussed above, archaeologists often overlook diversity and fail to properly identify, define, and understand the communities with whom they partner. Documenting and understanding diversity of opinions and understandings of the past among Ikaahukmiut community members became a vital aspect of my project. The only way to understand how archaeological knowledge can contribute to and complement Inuvialuit understandings of the past was to engage with this diversity. I did this by investigating the following research questions:

- **What impact has archaeological research had on the community and how has it influenced community members’ perceptions of archaeology?**
- **How is historical knowledge produced and maintained by different community members?**
- **How do the ways in which people are positioned within the community influence their perceptions of historical knowledge?**
- **How can archaeologists account for this diversity within community-based approaches?**
- **How might the community use archaeological knowledge to supplement their own historical knowledge?**
My second field season spanned from June to September 2014. I spent a week in Inuvik both on the way to and from Sachs Harbour. Inuvik is the administrative centre for the Inuvialuit Settlement Region as well as the location of the high school that teenagers from Sachs Harbour attend. While in Inuvik, I interviewed people with ties to Banks Island and conducted library research at the Aurora Research Institute and the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Center (ICRC).

**Figure 3:** Map showing the locations of Cape Kellett and Agvik archaeological sites.
While in Sachs Harbour, I focused on understanding diversity in the ways people understand and pass down knowledge of the past. My research methods mainly included semi-structured interviews with a diverse range of community members, including people of different ages, genders, political backgrounds, education, etc., as well as participant observation. During interviews I asked participants about their understandings and knowledge of the past and about how they relate to the past through daily practices. I also asked how they learned about the past and whether and how they wish to pass their knowledge on to the community’s youth. I also worked with people to record their family histories and oral histories about Banks Island, so they can later be used alongside archaeological findings. Additionally, I asked participants about their perceptions and knowledge of archaeology.

In 2014, the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project was given permission to excavate the Agvik archaeological site, a pre-contact Inuvialuit site located approximately 50 kilometers from town. The IAP employed two local youth, Alex Kudluk and Mariah Lucas to help with the excavation. Excavation occurred during my field season, providing unique opportunities for community members to share their opinions and understandings of archaeology with me. I conducted interviews with individuals as well as interviews where multiple family members were present, to better understand generational interests in and understandings of the past (McDavid 2004). With permission from participants, the interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Taking part in everyday activities that community members use to know, connect with, and pass down the past and their heritage was a very important aspect of my research. Solely focusing on interviews is problematic for many reasons. More often than not the interview process creates unequal power relations in favour of the interviewer. I found that interviewees often felt uncomfortable during formal interviews and were reluctant to
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12 Previous archaeologists have tried to ascribe Inuinnait or Mackenzie Inuit affiliation to sites on Banks Island. However, cultural affiliation of archaeological sites is difficult, if not impossible, to determine. Instead, Hodgetts applies the term pre-contact Inuvialuit to these sites. Others have applied the term ancestral Inuvialuit.
formally share their knowledge with “an expert.” Interviewees were also uncomfortable discussing sensitive subjects such as residential schools, social issues, and divisions within the community formally, while being recorded. Additionally, in some cases interviewees were not honest during interviews, perhaps out of fear that the recording could be used against them later. In one instance, an interviewee told me that he would never try to take anything from an archaeological site. Directly after interviewing him, I interviewed his wife. When I asked her if she knew what people usually do when they come across archaeological sites on the land, she told me of how her husband tried to take a piece of whalebone from a site a month earlier. Community members were much more open and honest during informal conversations especially if they took place during a heritage-based activity. Most importantly, taking part in these activities gave context to the information and insights community members provided me during interviews. Furthermore, community members often expressed that they learned about the past “through doing,” therefore, partaking in these activities was essential to my research. During this field season I was able to take part in activities that evoked the past such as trips on the land, fishing, and community gatherings. Three different women in town taught me some Inuvialuit sewing. I was also given the opportunity to work at the Ajgaliq Recreation Centre as a summer day camp counselor. This provided me a chance to work with children and youth in the community and take part in organized activities aimed at teaching youth about heritage. In keeping with community-based approaches, I developed a Google Map that displays some of the information from interviews to disseminate the traditional knowledge aspect of my research, as suggested by some community members.

In May and June of 2015 I conducted my final field season, which consisted mainly of follow-up interviews with previous participants. At this time, I was able to ask community members for feedback on the Google Map I had been constructing. I was also able to ask community members about some of the artifacts that the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project crew excavated the previous summer. I chose the spring for this field season because community members had previously stressed the importance of the spring goose hunt to the community and suggested that I should come back for it. Therefore, I was able to participate in goose hunting activities with the community.
In early June of 2015, the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project hosted a visit to the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (PWNHC) in Yellowknife to examine artifacts from Banks Island in the collections. Participants included three Elders, two adults, and six youth from Sachs Harbour, and Hodgetts, myself and another graduate student working on the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project. We were joined by Mervin Joe, representing Parks Canada, Beverly Amos from the Inuviialuit Cultural Resource Centre, and Charles Arnold, the former director of PWNHC who has been involved in a number of projects designed to disseminate Inuviialuit perspectives on the past to Inuviialuit audiences. This trip was organized in response to community concerns and questions about what happens to artifacts after they leave the Banks Island. At the heritage centre, trip participants were able to see and hold artifacts and make digital models of some of them. I and the other graduate student also interviewed some of the participants.

I transcribed the interviews I conducted during my research and my field notes and compared them to material from other oral history and traditional knowledge projects carried out with the Ikaahukmiut community (Nagy 1999, Usher 1971, Slavik 2013) to better understand changes in historical understandings and relationships to the past within the community over time. It is important to stress that the goal of my research is to understand how archaeological knowledge can complement Inuviialuit understandings of past. This reinforces the notion that Indigenous knowledge cannot simply be incorporated into archaeological interpretations. Many researchers comprehend Indigenous knowledge as something that can supplement their own understandings rather than inform them (Beck and Somerville 2005). The Traditional Knowledge Guide for the Inuviialuit Settlement Region explains why this is problematic:

The terms ‘use’ and ‘application’, as opposed to ‘incorporation’ or ‘integration’, are used [in this guide]… as the latter are felt to imply a relationship in which traditional science is subsumed within western science. The potential for traditional knowledge to complement western science

---

13 These projects include the Inuviialuit Living History Project and Taimani, a book used throughout the ISR to teach Inuviialuit history.
indicates the need for equivalency in the approach to its application, as opposed to more narrow, hierarchical interpretation of its ‘incorporation’ into data verification and issues scoping (Fredirechuk et al. 2008: 6).

As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, the foundations of Indigenous knowledge and archaeological knowledge differ and the two bodies of knowledge serve different roles within communities. “Incorporation” implies that the two are fundamentally the same and should be held to the same standards. Failing to recognize the differences between the two, researchers often set them in opposition to one another. Thus, when these two knowledges give different interpretations one ends up being “right” while the other is “wrong.” In many cases, projects that use Indigenous knowledge still implement a hierarchy of knowledge that places Western scientific knowledge and understandings of the past above all other forms of knowledge, creating a hierarchical power relationship among project contributors. The objective of my research is to better understand Inuvialuit knowledge to help avoid, or decrease these power inequities when trying to bring these two forms of knowledge together.
Chapter 3

3 Historicities and Historical Narratives of Banks Island

Archaeologists are increasingly using Indigenous knowledges to complement their own understandings and provide multivocal narratives of the past that are relevant to a wider public and descendant communities. However, some archaeologists have suggested that archaeological and Indigenous knowledges are fundamentally incompatible and should remain separate but equal (McGhee 2008; Mason 2006). This argument is primarily based on a modernist paradigm, which has largely informed arctic archaeological narratives, despite theoretical advancements in the field over the last two decades. This approach has historically worked to undermine Indigenous understandings of the past and further marginalize Indigenous peoples.

Hirsch and Stewart (2005) point out that the dominant Western concept of “History” only developed within the last two hundred years. This notion of the past as a linear sequence of events, which can be studied to find the truth of the past, works within a broader organization of knowledge that compartmentalizes subjects of study such as “history”, “geography”, “biology” etc. This compartmentalization of what constitutes “History” denies many Indigenous understandings of the past, which are often holistic in nature, encompassing what western academics would consider distinct subjects of study. They are often also embodied, meaning that they are lived and experienced in everyday practice, and therefore are not always easily identifiable to Western academics that aim to study history. These differing conceptions of history can create challenges for community-based archaeology projects that aim to work with Indigenous understandings of the past.

The narrow concept of “History”, therefore, has many limitations for understanding Indigenous understandings of the past. The concept of “historicity” is perhaps more usefully applied. Within anthropology, historicity can be defined as “the culturally patterned way or ways of experiencing and understanding [and] constructing and representing history” (Csokna 2005: 322). Hirsch and Stewart (2005: 262) describe
Historicity as a “human situation in flow, where versions of the past and future (of persons, collectives or things) assume present form in relation to events, political needs, available cultural forms and emotional dispositions.” It can be expressed in many ways including spoken or written narratives, dances, arts and handicrafts, landscapes and memoryscapes (Csonka 2005). Historicities are reflexive and adaptive so they are always changing.

Since the “historical turn” in anthropology during the 1980s, anthropologists have been increasingly interested in studying Indigenous understandings of the past. However, they more often than not neglect to understand how their own views of the past function and the ways in which they could be imposing them on other people (Hirsh and Stewart 2005: 263). This limitation can be a major roadblock for community-based archaeology projects. Applying the concept of historicity to examine Western understandings of the past is therefore also useful.

This chapter examines Inuvialuit and modernist archaeological historicities to better understand how modernist knowledge systematically denies Inuvialuit understandings of the past. It then reviews the mainstream historical narrative, the widely accepted archaeological narrative, and Inuvialuit narratives of Banks Island and analyzes them to elucidate why these narratives are sometimes conflicting.

3.1 Inuvialuit Knowledge and Historicity

The numerous Indigenous groups across North America hold diverse worldviews; however, the foundations of these worldviews comprise many similarities so there is some consensus on basic characteristics of Indigenous knowledge (Harris 2005; Cajete 2000; Castellano 2000: 25). The terms local knowledge, traditional knowledge, and Indigenous knowledge are often poorly defined in archaeological literature and are sometimes used interchangeably (Antweiler 1998; Stump 2013). These terms have different meanings to different people and they are all contested (Antweiler 1998: 469; Stump 2013: 270). For the purpose of this dissertation, I will define these terms as I understand them. Local knowledge, as defined by Antweiler (1998: 469), is “rooted in
local or regional culture and ecology,” and thus everyone possesses local knowledge in some capacity. *Traditional knowledge* is knowledge that is passed down from generation to generation more or less intact, and can include knowledge of creation, genealogies, ancestral rights and so forth (Castellano 2000: 23). Traditional knowledge and local knowledge can be regarded as sources of *Indigenous knowledge*. Other sources of Indigenous knowledge can include *empirical knowledge*, which is gained through careful observation and *revealed knowledge*, which is spiritual in origin and is acquired through dreams, visions, and intuitions (Castellano 2000: 23-24). Indigenous understandings of the past are informed by all of these forms of knowledge.

Within Indigenous worldviews there is no separation between nature and culture; everything is alive and everything is related. Indigenous knowledge is rooted in personal experience and is willfully qualitative and subjective rather than quantitative and objective. Within Indigenous knowledge there is nothing that is true for all people. Therefore, different and even contradicting concepts can be accepted as valid (Castellano 2000, Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010). Harris (2005: 35) describes Indigenous knowledge: “The holism of Indigenous thought… [is] characterized by conceptions of interconnectedness of all life; perpetual movement of all through space and time; connection between the past, present and future; and life and death as aspects of the same thing.”

Presented here is my current understanding of Inuvialuit knowledge based on conversations with community members and my participation in various community activities. I do not claim to fully understand Inuvialuit epistemologies and this is not meant to be a static, concrete representation of their knowledge. Inuvialuit knowledge is both intergenerational and experiential, meaning that it is passed down from Elders and family members and acquired through personal experience. During my research, interviewees often reminded me that their answers were based on their experience and understanding and they did not speak for everyone in the community. The Inuvialuit Joint Secretariat (2015: 8) describes Inuvialuit knowledge as follows: “Inuvialuit knowledge has passed through the generations and embedded itself in important ways in the hearts and minds of contemporary elders and younger people, who continue to spend time on
the land, water and ice.” Inuvialuit knowledge is based on interconnectedness and a
guiding principle of respect. If you are respectful of animals, people and the land, then
you will learn well and do well in life. For example, Lena Wolki (personal
communication, August 20, 2014) warned of what can happen if you do not respect
animals:

You can’t make fun of animals. Yeah. You can’t say anything about, like it’s
easy for you, you know. One time [Anonymous] kind of did that. He told me,
“I am going to go load up with wolves.” A few weeks after he got chased by
wolves. I told him, “See! When you talk to when you talk about animals like
that they hear you and get after you after that. Go for you. Don’t talk like that.
Don’t be pride like that. Don’t.” They are scary. Especially the polar bears.
They really can hear you. Scary, yeah. We learn that since we were a kid, so.

Ikaahukmiut often discussed the importance of Inuvialuit knowledge for their survival in
our conversations and interviews. Jack Anawak (1989: 50) of Nunavut, articulates this
notion especially well when referencing Inuit knowledge more broadly: “Our unique way
of passing on this knowledge which allows our young to know who they are, and to see
how they belong to time immemorial, has allowed us to survive.”

Indigenous knowledge is passed down in a variety of forms including songs, dances,
beading, and of most interest to archaeologists, oral histories and traditions. Western
academics tend to divide Indigenous histories into two categories: oral histories, which
are personal accounts of people, events etc. experienced in the lifetime of the person
telling them; and oral traditions, which have been passed down from generation to
generation and may include fairy tales, prayers, and creation stories (Manson 2006).
Western academics make this distinction based on what they think is real and what they
think is imaginary. Father Maurice Metayer indicated that the Inuvialuit organized stories
into unipak, which “mingled fantasy and the fantastic with the real”, and kroliat, which
are stories the teller maintains to be true (Nuligak 1966: 67-68). However, the people I
spoke with do not seem to categorize their histories that they shared with me in this way,
so I will use the term oral history to talk about any information about the past that is
passed down orally. For Indigenous peoples the past is embodied and lived in everyday practice (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010; Anawak 1989). Although oral histories and language are very important ways that Sachs Harbour residents teach and learn about the past, there is also a very strong sentiment that they learn about the past through doing. This view includes both what would be considered traditional activities such as travelling the land, hunting and fishing, trapping, traditional food preparation and consumption, and sewing, and non-traditional activities such as photography, technology, and research. Additionally, there are many government and town-organized means of passing down history and heritage including formal education programs, the White Fox Jamboree, youth culture camps, and Arctic sports. These different ways of learning and connecting to the past will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Within Indigenous cultures, it is important to pass information orally because knowledge is power, and not everyone is responsible enough to have that power (Castellano 2000). The information relayed in oral histories is therefore dependent on the relationship between the teller and the listener (Cruikshank 2007; Aporta 2009). Despite the fluid nature of oral knowledge, it is still important to Indigenous peoples to ensure that the information being passed down is accurate. The authority that people keep within a community is dependent on personal and often family reputation (Carlson 2007). Furthermore, Elders often “peer review” each other (Augustine 2008; Lyons et al. 2010; Kelvin 2011).

Elders hold an important position in the community as the knowledge they hold and their ability to pass down this knowledge ensures the continuation of Inuvialuit culture (Plate 3). They are regarded as expert knowledge holders within the community. The IFA defines an Elder as an Inuvialuit person older than 50. Although community members respect this definition, many feel this age is too young or that Elders are not really defined by age but by character. One community member who is older than 50 expressed to me that although they are “getting old” they are not yet an Elder. They felt that they were not yet in the position to take on the role and that the community also did not regard them as an Elder. Many people suggested that individuals become Elders when they have grandchildren; when their children start coming to them for advice on how to raise their
children, their role in their family changes and their knowledge and life experiences take on new meaning. Many community members, however, acknowledge that there are many Elders who have never had children or grandchildren. Elders are characterized by their life experience, as well as their knowledge of the land, language, and culture. The role of an Elder in the community is “Teaching us ways of life. How to hunt, what you should respect.” (Mariah Lucas, personal communication, June 10, 2015). The relationship Elders have with other community members is reciprocal. Elders share knowledge and community members in return give them respect and help when it is needed. Throughout my dissertation I have identified some community members as Elders. These are people who identified themselves as Elders to me and other community members clearly regard as Elders.

Plate 3: Inuvialuit Elders Edith Haogak (left) and Lena Wolki (right) at Canada Day Celebrations 2014.
Within Sachs Harbour certain people are known to possess certain kinds of knowledge and are considered to be experts in specific areas. Beverly and Lawrence Amos (personal communication September 14, 2014) explained:

**Beverly:** They noticed a child is really interested in certain things; they fixed that person, that kid to grow up knowing lots about that certain thing. There’s people that could tell the weather. There’s people that are good with, like the dogs, there’s people that are really good at testing the snow. Some people are good at hunting. It’s not that everybody does everything. You know about it but you don't necessarily do all of it…. There’s experts and everything. Expert storytellers, singers, dancers.

**Lawrence:** It’s just like having, just like science. You got, everybody does their own little thing. Just like a cultural thing.

**Beverly:** And you don’t force somebody to do something that they are not interested in. It’s not their calling. You know.

Additionally, if people are unsure of the information they are telling you about, they will often direct you to someone who can confirm that information.

Oral histories, which are often presented as stories of the past, are the most obvious ways that the Inuvialuit pass down knowledge and learn of the past. The Elders think that it is very important to tell stories of the past. During my first interview with Elder Edith Haogak, I asked her if it was all right to record her and to share her stories. She replied that it was important to share her stories because if we do not, *it is like they [the stories] are sleeping*. Stories of the past bring life to the island and connect present generations to the land and their heritage. These stories can be used to inform and make sense of the present and future.

For some community members, their Elders and family members shared these stories any time. For others, these stories were shared when it was too cold out or there was nothing on television. Others stated that it was during camping, trips on the land, or taking part in traditional activities that these stories were most often shared. Community members also
talked about the importance of visiting and having tea, which was when many stories of the past were shared with me.

John Lucas Jr. (personal communication, August 28, 2014) explained that Elders tell more stories out on the land: “That’s when a lot of Elders open up. They don’t talk too much when they are in town here but when you go out on the land, when you are actually in the field, you actually hear a lot of good stories.” Paul Kowikchuk (personal communication, July 22, 2014) suggested that Elders tell more stories while on the land because they are reminded of certain stories: “When we are out on the trap line [Elders] tell us, ‘Uncle shot a… not a bear, but a caribou there, or ten’.” One community member suggested that more stories are shared during camping because people are “getting back to their roots.” David Haogak (personal communication, September 16, 2014) illuminated the way that taking part in traditional activities brings to life these stories of the past:

One time my granny got a polar bear. She was 75. They were skinning it right outside her house. Her, Geddes Wolki, [?], she already passed away. But they were skinning a polar bear, right? I don’t know how they dragged it outside her house. She was skinning it and to hear their enthusiasm, they were talking different. They were… it was just a different sound coming out of their mouths. Happiness. And you could hear the stories they were telling each other, when they do something. Especially when they do something together.

During the fur trapping days, when people would return to the community they would visit with other community members sharing stories of the trap line. Beverly Amos (personal communication, September 16, 2014) explained that it is not just a matter of passively being told stories but actively listening to these stories, even when they are not directed at you:

And not necessarily being told stories, you listen to what they are talking about. When the adults are gathered. Like at somebody’s house. They used to do that at my parents’ house. When my dad comes back from his trap line, they have… they gather and have tea and talk about all of their trips….That’s how they know what’s going on with the whole island, all the different
trappers, because they go on different parts of the island. The west part or the east part. And they talk all about it but they never talk in English. I used to listen to those. The men talking.

Community members acknowledge that important cultural information is embedded in Inuvialuktun. The language reflects Inuvialuit history and contributes to both personal and collective Inuvialuit identity. Betty Raddi-Haogak (personal communication, July 13, 2014) explained, “When you say it in [Inuvialuktun] it has more meaning. It’s just like they say in any language, when you translate it to English you lose something.” Although English is now the primary language among younger generations, the importance of Inuvialuktun as a cultural channel is not lost on them. Many community members recognize that a lot of stories and details of some stories have been lost as the number of Inuvialuktun speakers declines. The effects of loss of language will be discussed in Chapter 4.

3.2 Archaeological Knowledge and Historicity

Archaeological thought is diverse, as different archaeologists subscribe to differing theories and methodologies; however, archaeology was founded within a modernist ontology that was deeply rooted in European colonialism and imperialism, which still informs much of the discipline (Filippucci 2010: 73-74). Archaeology in the Arctic always worked within a modernist framework. As the discipline became more specialized, it increasingly alienated Inuit from archaeology. As discussed earlier, this alienation intensified with the processual movement in archaeology, which promoted archeology as an objective science and discouraged the use of Inuit interpretations (Rowley 2002; Lyons in press; Lyons et al. 2010; Wilcox 2010). The post-processual movement in archaeology had little influence on the theoretical approaches of archaeologists working in the Arctic until the late 1990s (Hood 1998, 2002), making much of the archaeological history of the Arctic written within a processual framework, which is why it is a focus of this chapter.
Dichotomies such as real/imaginary, nature/culture, true/false, science/religion, observer/observed, animate/inanimate and natural/supernatural are common in Western thought and shape the way archaeologists study the past and ultimately disenfranchise other understandings of the world (Harris 2005; Cruikshank 2007). During the Enlightenment, Europeans began to conceptualize a strict divide of the world into Nature, a single universe that works objectively and independent of human action, and Culture, which is the consequence of human subjectivity. Nature is seen as being made up of absolute truths that are universal, and these truths can be identified through rationalist thought and scientific investigation (Latour 1993; 2004).

They also began to divide people into two categories: modern societies that recognized the divide between nature and culture, and traditional societies that did not (Latour 1993). Science provided Europeans with a way of knowing and understanding the world and they used this understanding to consider themselves superior to non-Europeans and to justify colonialism. This mentality persists today when other understandings that are not deemed scientific are often not regarded as knowledge but as beliefs or opinions that fall under the lesser realm of religion (de Sousa Santos 2007; Deloria 1999; Watkins 2005; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010; Stewart 2012). Modernism separated European cultures from what they considered less evolved traditional cultures. This separation was partially due to the subjective nature of Indigenous understandings of the world that were discussed above. The argument went that there was a need for anthropologists and archaeologists because Indigenous thought is based on subjectivity; therefore, Indigenous peoples cannot objectively study themselves or their past (Deloria 1999; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010).

Within this ontology more knowledge is always better, which is one of the main reasons for pursuing scientific studies (Burkhart 2004). This motivation can be seen in this quote from the Society for American Archaeology (2013) website that seeks to explain to a public audience why archaeologists study the past:

To be human is to be curious, questioning, and inquisitive…. As long as humans exist we will ponder the mysteries around us and seek to acquire the
knowledge and understanding necessary to satisfy our needs and solve our
problems…. This thirst for knowledge reaches into the past, even when one is
focused on solving contemporary problems…. We study the past to acquire a
broader and richer understanding of our world today and our place in it.

Many modernist archaeologists see themselves as apolitical, so the purpose of
understanding the past is to acquire more knowledge in order to understand a collective
human history and nothing else.

Science in general gains authority by removing observations from their local context and
inserting them into larger explanations that are universal (Cruikshank 2007). Universality
is used to deny validity to any other ways of knowing or interpreting the world (de Sousa
Santos 2007; Lutz 2007). However, authority within archaeology is not strictly based on
scientific facts but is also established through the social organization of academia.
Authority is gained through social status markers such as PhDs and the prestige
associated with certain institutions (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010).
Additionally, it is not enough to have scientific arguments; one must write them down
and publish them. Within academia, words that are written are more truthful than words
that are spoken. Collingwood argues “…an historian who accepts testimony of an
authority and treats it as historical [in the absence of verifiable evidence]…obviously
forfeits the name of historian” (Carlson 2007: 66). Where these words are written down
also determines the degree of their authority. If a publication is not peer-reviewed, then it
has minimal authority. Additionally, some peer-reviewed journals and academic presses
are recognized as more prestigious than others, and material published in them has more
authority than material published in less well-regarded venues.

Archaeological information is primarily produced through surveys and excavations.
Archaeological knowledge may also be informed by historical documents, oral histories,
and traditional knowledge and often relies on other sciences to help with interpretations
or explanations, such as biology or geology. Archaeologists examine time, space, and
material culture to reconstruct the past.
3.3 Material Culture and Archaeological Sites

Modernist archaeologists conceptualize material culture, termed *artifacts*, human remains, and archaeological features as inanimate objects. All are thought to be objective and it is the archaeologist’s job to study them objectively. Archaeologists categorize artifacts and use changes in artifact form or technology to indicate cultural change. The problematic nature of artifact classification has been noted by many people, who have pointed out that these classifications are based on the archaeologist’s own culture and the same classifications may not have existed for people in the past. For example, archaeologists often classify material culture as “art” but many anthropologists have pointed out that “art” is actually a Western notion not necessarily shared by other cultures (Hood 1998; May 2010).

What archaeologists call *artifacts* are sometimes considered to be alive or to have their own agency by Indigenous peoples. This is a point of contention between Indigenous peoples and archaeologists. Archaeologists want to “freeze time” through the conservation of these living beings (Ladd 2001; Ridington and Hastings 1997). This attitude, however, works against nature and can be regarded as disrespectful. For example, *Umon’hon’ti*, the sacred pole of the Omaha, is a man made out of wood. Like all other men, he is created, lives, dies, returns to the earth, and then is eventually recreated. When the Omaha asked the Peabody Museum to repatriate *Umon’hon’ti*, the museum refused until the Omaha constructed a place to store and “properly” preserve *Umon’hon’ti*. This went against the natural lifecycle of *Umon’hon’ti* but the Omaha eventually agreed to the museum’s terms in order to bring *Umon’hon’ti* home (Ridington and Hastings 1997).

The relationship to and understandings of ancestral material culture vary among community members. Most Ikaahukmiut community members felt that the artifacts connect them to their ancestors or that the artifacts are part of them. When discussing artifacts that she saw during the IAP trip to the PWNHC, Beverly Amos (personal communication, June 9, 2015) said, “And that’s a really special part. I felt like I belonged to something. It was like a part of my people, yeah, my ancestors. So that was really
special.” Although these understandings of artifacts may not consider them animate objects, they certainly point to them as having agency and the ability to shape certain outcomes. This perception is in sharp contrast to an archaeological understanding of artifacts as object evidence. Because of the understood agency of material culture and its often spiritual connections, Indigenous relationships to material culture are often seen as “religious”, something a modernist understanding of the world values less than science.

Traditional teachings regarding material culture and archaeological sites are based on guiding principles of respect and spirituality. Community members were traditionally taught never to touch anything that was left behind by the people that came before them. Lena Wolki (personal communication, June 9, 2014) explained: “My mom wouldn’t let us touch them [old sites]. It’s against the law for Old Timers.” Other community members also referred to this teaching as an “Old Timer Law.” Community members gave differing interpretations of this law and have multiple ways of following it.

The main reason given by community members for not disturbing sites and taking artifacts was respect. In order to show respect for the people who came before, you do not touch their property. A few people equated taking things from sites with stealing from people who are alive today. The following quotes from interviews display the strength of this guiding principle:

Respectful, I guess. Respect the person who lived and died there. They leave the different materials that they had (Jean Harry, personal communication, June 15, 2015).

I know it is somebody else’s. Of course it is somebody else’s. I was taught never to touch anything that is not mine (Kim Lucas, personal communication, September 7, 2014).

14 Old Timers are the people who lived the traditional lifestyle before substantial European contact. This will be discussed further below. Charles Arnold (personal communication) notes that Inuvialuit in Tuktoyaktuk also refer to artifacts found on the land as Old Timers.
I was told from not just my great-grandmother but many other Elders that if you see things like that you leave them alone. And that is to show some respect (Charlton Haogak, personal communication, June 18, 2015).

When we were growing up, like myself anyways, when I was growing up we were taught not to touch anything that was left by somebody. We were brought up not touching somebody’s stuff. You know, just continue on the way back (John Lucas Sr., personal communication, August 22, 2014).

For many other community members their motivation for leaving sites and artifacts alone goes beyond showing respect; they must leave them alone to ensure their well-being. For these community members archaeological sites and artifacts have a spiritual aspect to them. Community members stated that disturbing sites causes bad luck in hunting and trapping, bad weather, bad dreams, and even illness. David Haogak (personal communication, September 16, 2014) explained that even camping near a site can cause bad things to happen:

Like we had an Elder go to Fish Lake and he camped too close to an archaeological site and he had… outside of his canvas tent, there was noises and people talking and animals making noises. And when he went out there was nothing but when he went back to his tent he couldn't sleep. It was just too loud. Dogs barking. There’s no dogs around. That's the kind of thing we believe. Like if you camp around an archaeological site things can happen. Especially if there is burial sites. We really tend to stay away from them because we think that bad things to us can happen to our soul. We can get sick or we could get like… you break a mirror, you know, for so many years or whatever you have bad luck. Animals won’t go to you and stuff like that.

Bridget Wolki (personal communication, August 14, 2014) explained:

You know the energy of the people before go into their worldly possessions. But, yeah, it was a big taboo for us. Touching or taking any of that stuff… Everybody has their own opinion on everything so I can’t speak for
everybody but I can speak for my family and say we weren’t allowed to touch because of bad juju would be on you, bad luck. It would bring bad weather.

She went on to tell a story of the repercussions she faced after accidentally picking up an artifact while working as a wildlife monitor for geophysicists at Johnson Point:

A couple years ago I mistakenly took an old arrowhead from around Johnson Point. Like about five miles from Johnson Point right near some old tent rings. I’m Inuvialuit, you know we like to pick rocks that we see. So from odd sites here and there if I find an unusual rock I’ll put it in my pocket. And I never thought nothing of it. I was a little further away from the tent rings and I came home for three days. I was gone up there for two months in total. And I was cleaning my rocks and I washed the mud off of one and there was some…it kind of looked like an arrowhead with some striations on both sides. The lady from Parks was looking at it too but we couldn’t really confirm it. Anyways, when I left Johnson Point the bears started coming in, coming in, coming in. And we had a problem with bears after that. And I went back to Johnson Point like after three days of being home and I couldn’t bring that rock personally to where I picked it up but the next day one of the pilots went and dropped it off for me close to those tent rings and those bears kind of slowed down after that. So even by accident you have got to watch what you touch or pick up.

Community members cited countless other similar stories, where removing artifacts or simply disturbing sites caused people to fall ill, or caused bad weather and bad luck for hunting and trapping. As mentioned in Bridget Wolki’s story, in order to reverse the bad luck or illness which can fall upon a person who disturbs sites, artifacts that were removed or rocks that were moved out of place on the site need to be put back. In one account that many different community members shared with me, a man from Sachs Harbour had taken artifacts from a nearby site. Soon after he became very ill and he could not figure out why. Finally, his mother told him that in order to get better he must return the artifacts and when he did that his health returned to normal.
Plate 4: Sachs Harbour community member examining Thule-Inuit archaeological site at Cape Kellett.

Although all of the community members I spoke with were aware of the Old Timer Law not to touch things, the degree to which people believe in this law and follow it varies drastically among community members. Some community members take this teaching very seriously and would not touch artifacts that others, including archaeologists, had removed from the ground. Bridget Wolki (personal communication, June 11, 2015) felt hesitant to touch even replicas of artifacts removed from archaeological sites because she was unsure if doing so would have the same spiritual effects as touching the originals. Some community members see no problem with touching artifacts if they did not remove them from a site themselves. Other community members think it is fine to touch artifacts as long as they did not belong to shamans. Still others feel it is all right for them to take things that are on the surface or even to remove them from old campsites:

When we were kids on the coastline long ago, we used to always [take things], because they were still by the shore and things get washed away
anyways. There were some big sites that were at Dunhill area.... We used to always, when we were kids, look around and see if we could find anything. We used to find a lot of those little ulu [woman’s knife, pl. uluit], some needles, and things like that. Sometimes we would find arrowheads and things like that. But when we were kids we used to always look for that. It was like treasure hunting. Looking for stuff like that because it’s not really someone buried or a gravesite or anything. It was somewhere people lived so it’s not really. They always say if you find something, if there is a mound of rocks or something, it’s a gravesite; don’t bother it. Or something like that. But if it’s just a camp it’s fine. Or if you find something on the land like an arrowhead, that’s fine too (Anonymous, personal communication, 2014).

For many of the community members who said that they have taken artifacts from the land, this action connects them with their past. Colwell-Chanthaphonh (2004) argues that, for some, the removal of artifacts contributes to identity and connection to place. It seems that artifact collecting by community members occurs for similar reasons. However, there was one occasion that I heard of where a couple of young community members disturbed a site many years ago for no particular reason aside from boredom. On this occasion they had tried to remove whalebone from Thule-Inuit houses by tying it to their ATVs. The destructive nature of this occasion stands out as rare and seems to go against common community values.

The degree to which community members collect artifacts and disturb sites is still unknown to me. Usually when I asked community members if they or anybody they know take objects from sites, they would inform me that they do not and that they do not know of other people who do. Often, community members brought up a commercial produced by the Northwest Territories government telling people to leave archaeological sites and materials alone because it is the law. I presume that some community members may have not been honest with me out of fear of either legal repercussions or simply that they did not want to upset me or have me scold them. Antoniadou (2009) wrote of similar circumstances she faced while conducting ethnographic research on looting in Greece. Antoniadou (2009) notes that in much of the larger archaeological discourse there is the
tendency to lump all cases of looting together in sharp contrast to archaeological ethics. This lumping overlooks power relationships in archaeology and gives priority to archaeologists’ ethics and understanding of material culture over those of descendant communities. The removal of artifacts by community members needs to be understood differently if archaeologists want to have productive conversations about it.

Although some community members think it is all right to disturb or remove artifacts from old campsites, almost all community members I spoke with agree that it is never acceptable to disturb a grave. The understanding that graves are sacred and not to be disturbed is widespread across the Inuvialuit Settlement Region. The Inuvialuit Settlement Regional Traditional Knowledge Report (Smith 2006) states, “Touching or disturbing a gravesite would slow the process of the person in the afterlife…. Taking items from graves and keeping them would provoke the deceased to cause harm to that person.” The seriousness of disturbing graves is displayed in the following story told to me by John Lucas Jr. (personal communication, August 28, 2014):

I have heard stories, like we used to sport hunt on the next island above us, Melville Island, and we had bad luck that one year. When we did sport hunting, we used to do 12 polar bear hunts on Melville…. every two springs ’cause we alternated the quota with Ulukhaktok. They get it one year and we get the next year. And one Elder…. he was an Elder from here. He was actually with us…. we used to go as helpers. And he figures we might have disturbed a shaman's grave while we were up on Melville. We were actually in a plane crash in 1985. And everybody survived. We were in a Twin Otter. We actually ran out of fuel in the air that spring coming back. We actually got lost. We were looking for another camp on Melville and we made a beeline back to Sachs in the dark and we ran out of fuel 50km from here in the air. And that was pretty bad luck. Nobody got hurt. The plane got damaged but that same week we had a client, he actually had a heart attack and died after

---

15 At the same time, a few community members mentioned that the scientific analysis of human remains was of interest to them.
he got his animal, a muskox. That following week we were going to go back up to the island but the plane broke down again. [The Elder] figured it was bad luck because we disturbed that shaman's grave. You don’t touch stuff like that. A little bit, I was told not to believe that, but in some ways I do believe that. Shamanism is a thing in the Arctic, eh. Don’t touch the old camps. Or any graves. Anything to do with graves. Whenever I see a grave I just leave it alone.

Archaeologists study the past mainly through material culture and many archaeologists come from cultures that value material possessions in a way that people of the past may not have. Wobst (2005: 18-22) points out that this intense focus on material culture may misrepresent people of the past. Material culture may not play the same role in Indigenous cultures that it does in Western society, and by solely focusing on material culture and not what Indigenous peoples can tell them about the past, archaeologists are creating ethnocentric interpretations of the past. Elder John Lucas Sr. (personal communication, August 22, 2014) spoke of how the Ikaahukmiut’s relationship with material culture has changed drastically within the last few decades through greater access to western goods:

Elders, the ones that I know of, they still live the way they did back now. Then, back then. The only thing, they have more access to stuff. Not like long ago. Long ago you had no access. Can’t go on the internet and order equipment that sort of thing, you can’t phone in for what you need cause some days there was no phones, no communication. And the plane only came once every three months sometimes. I mean, we were taught to survive like the old people, back in, about… with nothing, what we had… you know…. When we first moved into our house we had one cup, one plate, one fork, one knife, that sort of thing. But we managed, you know… But everybody helped each other survive.

He later exemplified this point by jokingly stating: “You know Samantha was telling you about, long ago they used to bury people with their earthly possessions. When you bury
me, the hill up there won’t be big enough for all my stuff. You will need a big piece, eh.” Community members are still resourceful in the ways they make new things and reuse materials – something they feel reflects their heritage as discussed in Chapter 2 – but having greater access to equipment and materials has influenced the way they value these items. This noted change in the relationship that the Ikaahukmiut have with material culture indicates that their ancestors’ understandings of material culture were markedly different from their own and those of archaeologists.

Smith (2006, 2012, 2001) argues that the dominant way of seeing heritage, or Authorized Heritage Discourse, privileges Eurocentric and modernist values when it comes to heritage management and policies regarding monuments, archaeological sites, and artifacts. When people uncritically accept Authorized Heritage Discourse they are promoting policies that work to assimilate and dominate minority populations. The Northwest Territories’ Archaeological Sites Act makes it illegal to search for archaeological sites and artifacts, survey archaeological sites, or excavate or disturb archaeological sites without a permit. It also states that artifacts excavated in the territory with a permit must be stored in the PWNHC (Department of Justice, GNWT 2014). This legislation prioritizes archaeological and curatorial understandings of the past and does not necessarily reflect the understandings and beliefs of the Inuvialuit and other Indigenous peoples in the territory.

3.4 Time and Space

Time and space are important features for understanding the past; however, time and space are culturally constructed and this undoubtedly leads to different cultural understandings of the past. Despite an increasing recognition that time is constructed culturally, Agrawal et al. (1999) argue that the social sciences have developed little in the way of theory to talk about time.

Western scholars divide the concepts of time and space into three categories: absolute, relative, and representational (or relational) (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010). Within a modernist paradigm, absolute time and space are universal, independent aspects
of objective reality. Absolute time progresses equably from a beginning towards an end. Absolute space is a “pre-existing and immovable grid amenable to standardized measurements and open to calculations” (Harvey 2006: 121). Relative time and space are relational expressions of how absolute time and space are experienced or perceived by a particular person or group. Representational time and space are symbolic expressions of time and place (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010), for example, a turtle shell representing a 13-moon calendar or North America described as the back of a turtle. These categories divide understandings of time and space into what modernists perceive as true versus subjective understandings. They reinforce the modernist concepts of time and space as rational (Cruikshank 2007).

Archaeologists work within a framework where time and space are absolute. Archaeologists conceptualize time as unilinear, where the past, present, and future are separate entities. Chronologies have always been a central aspect of archaeological interpretation. Archaeologists use both absolute and relative chronologies, but most relative chronologies are tied in some way to absolute chronologies. These chronologies display a linear progression of culture based on changes in technology (Lucas 2005; Wobst 2005; Zimmerman 2004). These chronologies can lend themselves to “the Enlightenment vision of a total history, archaeology as a science of humanity where the whole of human history can be embraced within a single vision” (Lucas 2005: 14). Although this approach can be useful for interpreting the past, if archaeologists are not careful, ultimately it will be restrictive because it does not take into account how past peoples conceptualized time and how this influenced the way they lived their lives.

Space is also regarded as an absolute fact existing outside of the human experience and for modernist archaeologists absolute time informs absolute space (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 330: 2010). Although space is considered to be absolute, archaeologists impose their own biases when defining space. Wobst (2005) notes that archaeologists examine areas based on artifact visibility, artifact density, and the intensity of ground modification, which is influenced by their preoccupation with material culture. They categorize land that does not contain these features as “sterile”, implying that it was not used. However, there are many aspects of Indigenous culture that would not leave
behind a material trace of land use. For example, during interviews community members made it apparent that landscape features have always been important to the Ikaahukmiut as both markers for travelling and mnemonic devices used to recall the past\textsuperscript{16}. These uses of the landscape would provide no physical evidence of human interaction and the importance of these features would be overlooked by archaeologists.

Perhaps the most striking difference in conceptualized space between Westerners and Inuit is sea ice. Aporta (2011) points out that for Westerners the water surrounding the Canadian Arctic Islands is seen as a \textit{passage}. It is not suitable to settle or live on. Sea ice causes a major obstruction to this passage and more than anything is regarded as a nuisance. Western maps always display the area between islands as water, signifying that it is an area that separates land and is not lived on. Aporta (2011) suggests that in 2009 when Google Earth removed sea ice from its imagery it showed that Westerners do not regard sea ice as an important planetary surface.

For the Inuit, however, sea ice is a social surface and part of their homeland (Aporta 2011). For the Ikaahukmiut the sea ice was and is a place for living, hunting, trapping, fishing, and travelling. Many Elders moved out onto the sea ice for the winter to live in snow houses and hunt seals. Frank Kudlak (personal communication, June 17, 2015) explained, “Long ago, we were living in snow house. Out there always living in the snow house.” Beverly and Lawrence Amos (personal communication, September 17, 2014) discussed the importance of summer sea ice for seal hunting:

\textbf{Beverly:} We were so happy when there was ice floating around to hunt around on the ice. Amongst the ice. I don’t even like going out that much when there is no ice. It’s too strange and it’s like you have nothing to hang on to. There is nothing that you could get water to drink. And nothing to keep it calmer, like the ocean. And the animals like that too. They like the ice. Because when I was growing up, when I would go seal hunting with my

\textsuperscript{16} See Collignon (2006) and Nuttall (1992) for other examples from the Arctic.
parents, we would stay on the ice floes all the time. We were not driving all over wasting gas too. So, we would stay on the iceberg.

**Lawrence:** Stay there for hours.

**Beverly:** Yeah, all day we would stay on the iceberg and have our meals on the ice. And my mom would clean the hides and my dad would hunt from there. And you are just like floating.

**Lawrence:** And when you got no ice it’s, it’s like you got nothing to work on. You got no platform or ocean to work on.

Kevin Gully (personal communication, August 30, 2014) talked about learning to fox trap on the sea ice: “Mostly out on the open ice [for fox trapping]. Not open ice, but at least a little bit outside of town on the ocean… Yeah, well you can go up on land but a lot of foxes, they follow the polar bears [on the sea ice] and they just eat the scraps so there would be a lot of foxes running around there.” The ice also continues to be an important place to travel for community members. The sea ice is used to travel to winter hunting spots, spring goose hunting spots, and sometimes even still to travel between Banks Island and Victoria Island. However, as the climate warms the sea ice is becoming less abundant and less predictable, making travelling and hunting more difficult. The effects of global warming on traditional practices will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Although most Arctic archaeologists recognize that past peoples used the sea ice for settling, hunting, fishing, and travelling, the extent of these activities can never really be fully conceptualized by archaeologists. Certain artifacts, such as ice creepers, can indicate that sea ice activities were taking place, but the sites where these activities took place cannot be investigated because these spaces have essentially disappeared and any material evidence of their use has long since been swallowed by the ocean.

Indigenous concepts of time vary. Some people conceptualize time as cyclical (Anawak 1989; Briggs 1992; Bielawski 1989), others as spirals, and others as what would be drawn as scribbles (Harris 2005). Some people understand that human existence is stationary while the future progresses towards us (Agrawal, Bhalakia, Kusumgar 1999).
Some Indigenous groups conceptualize time in more than one way. For example, the Inuit understand time as cyclical, but on some occasions they also understand time as linear (Briggs 1992; Bielawski 1989). Despite different concepts of how time works, the underlying notion that the past, present, and future are not separate entities, but constantly interacting, is common throughout Indigenous worldviews (Williams and Munuggurr 1989).

Indigenous concepts of space also differ from Western scientific concepts (Aporta 2011; Whitridge 2004a; Wobst 2005) and the relationship between time and space affects Indigenous understandings of the past. Bielawski (1989) and Briggs (1992) suggest that the Inuit have a concrete perception of space but an abstract perception of time, which they see as a human invention that does not act independently of humans. Nagy (2002) noticed while interviewing Inuvialuit Elders that they seldom used temporal markers. Men often would remember things based on animals they had hunted or trapped and very rarely used chronological frameworks or mentioned the period of their life in which the events occurred. Nagy noted that women would conceptualize events with places and would use the birth of their children as temporal markers. Both men and women would answer questions about time with a place rather than a date or season.

During my interviews with Elders, I also noticed that stories and narratives were focused around place rather than time. When I first sat down with Elder Edith Haogak to conduct an interview, she looked at a map of Banks Island and began going from place to place on the island telling stories with no chronological order. When I asked her about when certain events took place, she would try to place events temporally, based on how well she could remember them. For example, when trying to recall when an event took place Jean Harry translated, “she can really remember because she was quite big” (Edith Haogak personal communication July 28, 2013, translated by Jean Harry). She also sometimes based when events took place on whether her siblings or children were born. On another occasion when I asked Edith when she and her mother began using metal ulu, her daughter Jean explained to me, “They didn’t have calendars, and they didn’t have years. What years? Nineteen… whatever. She said she don’t remember how long, how long time ago. About these, cause there were no calendars and there was no 19-
whatever. No 1900s” (personal communication June 6, 2015). Jean later reinforced calendar years as a foreign concept when I asked her in a separate interview when she moved to Sachs Harbour and she replied “I can’t even... I don't remember the years. I don’t even know about years. I don’t even talk in English” (personal communication, June 15, 2015).17 Although years are usually not used to conceptualize time, often major temporal markers are used. Perhaps the most widely used at present is the introduction of skidoos. Community members will often say things like, this was a long time ago, before skidoos. These temporal markers will be discussed further below. The Inuvialuit advisors for Inuvialuit Pitqusiit (1991) also defined time in terms of Ingilraani (Time Immemorial) and Taimani (The Recent Past) and Qangma (Now).

A younger community member believed the lack of importance placed on time had to do with the inconsistent amount of daylight throughout the year. He explained that places closer to the equator had more consistent amounts of daylight every day and therefore concrete measurements of time make sense. For the Inuvialuit who experience long periods of 24-hour daylight or 24-hour darkness, concrete measurements of time have no meaning and things are scheduled by task not by time. However, with the introduction of the wage based-economy, nine-to-five workdays, and a western school system, younger generations are becoming more influenced by measurable time. In spite of these developments, cultural embodiment of “Inuit time” is still prevalent. Community members use the Western term “night shift” to explain that they are not on a regular sleep schedule as defined by southern standards. During periods of 24-hour daylight or darkness it makes sense to them to sleep when they are tired not when nighttime hours occur in the south.

Space can be an area where the past can intersect with the present through spirits. Ancestral spirits are often present at places where people once lived (Condori 1989;

17 In his biography I, Nuliagk, Nuligak (1966: 60-61) recalls that the Inuvialuit recognized twelve different moons that worked as a type of calendar. He mentioned that at the time of writing his people no longer knew the names of the moons in their language.
Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010). No matter how long ago people passed away, they are still relatives and must be cared for. Although deceased, they are still alive in a spiritual realm and can still have contact with the living (Harris 2005). As mentioned above, the Inuvialuit were traditionally taught not to disturb sites where people had once lived. Sharon Green (personal communication, September 5, 2014) explains that in order to avoid disturbing spirits Elders would not camp near old sites: “I know when Henry and David would go on their trap line in the winter, they would have to go by some areas I guess and they wouldn’t camp when they knew there was somebody had stayed there or they knew something. They just kept going until they reached another area, then they would camp.” The Inuvialuit understand old sites as places where the past and present are connected through spirits. Spirits do not exist within the confines of absolute space and their connection to certain spaces is generally regarded by archaeologists as a religious interpretation rather than a reality.

3.5 Historical Narratives of Banks Island

In this section I explore different historical narratives of Banks Island. At first glance Western and Ikaahukmiut narratives of the past appear to be in opposition to one another. However, these narratives are the products of the ontologies that produced them. By better understanding how they were produced, we can understand why they seem in opposition and address this opposition so that eventually they can be brought together and inform one another, rather than be seen as competing.

3.5.1 Archaeological Narrative

The widely accepted archaeological narrative of Banks Island states that the island has been alternately occupied and abandoned over the last 4000 years, first by Pre-Dorset groups then by the Thule-Inuit and Inuit groups. The earliest occupation of the island was by Pre-Dorset (ca. 3800-3600 BP) groups that focused on muskox hunting (Müller-Beck 1977, Münzel 1987; Taylor 1967). Their presence is indicated by a cluster of muskox hunting sites in the northern interior of the island. The best-known site is Umingmak (PjRa-2), which dates to 3800 BP.
Following the Pre-Dorset abandonment of the island, a transitional Arctic Small Tool tradition (ASTt) group occupied the island. Archaeologists call this the Lagoon Phase, which is thought to be a transitional period from Pre-Dorset to Dorset cultures in the Western Canadian Arctic. The Lagoon Site (OjRl-3), the type-site for this phase, is located on the south coast of Banks Island and dates to 2500 BP (Arnold 1980). Lagoon Complex people relied on a mix of coastal and marine resources. Two additional sites on the north coast of Banks Island have been dated to the Lagoon phase in recent years (Cary 2012; Hodgetts 2013).

The island was abandoned during the Dorset Period, which archaeologists have suggested was due to a crash in the muskox population (Savelle and Dyke 2002, 2009). It was reoccupied by the Thule-Inuit, the ancestors of the modern Inuit, when they began to migrate from Alaska eastward across the Canadian Arctic at approximately 1200 AD (800 BP). A limited number of Thule-Inuit sites have been found on Banks Island, some of them among the earliest Thule-Inuit sites in Canada (Friesen and Arnold 2008; Hodgetts 2013). The Thule-Inuit relied on marine resources while exploiting limited quantities of caribou and to a lesser degree muskox. The island was not occupied during the late-Thule-Inuit period but was once again occupied later by Inuinnait groups in the late 19th century to exploit wood and metal from the British naval vessel, *HMS Investigator*, which was abandoned in Mercy Bay in 1853 (Hickey 1979, 1984). Archaeologists have suggested the island was abandoned once again after this period until the 1920s when Inuvialuit came to the island for fur trapping. More recent archaeological research is challenging some elements of this narrative of repeated cycles of occupation and abandonment, which will be discussed below.

### 3.5.2 Western Historical Narratives

The historical narrative of Banks Island written by southerners for the consumption of the general southern population tells us that the island was “first sighted” (Usher 1966: 7) by a member of Parry’s first expedition in 1820. M’Clure was the first to set foot on the island in 1850 during his voyage searching for the ill-fated Franklin Expedition. M’Clure’s ship, *HMS Investigator*, became locked in sea ice in the Prince of Wales Strait
that winter. The following winter it was again trapped in ice in Mercy Bay, where it was eventually abandoned in 1853. M’Clure’s crew travelled the island but came across no Inuit people. Few Europeans landed on the island over the next sixty years. The next substantial European exploration of the island was the Canadian Arctic Expedition (CAE; 1914-1917) led by Stefansson. The expedition had its base camp at a place now called Mary Sachs, named after the expedition’s ship. The CAE determined that the island was unoccupied (Usher 1966: 7).

An example of this southern narrative is found on the plaque that overlooks Sachs Harbour, which was erected by the Sachs Harbour Community Association on July 1, 1967 as part of a federal government sponsored celebration for Canada’s centennial (Plate 5). A priest who was stationed in Sachs Harbour at the time wrote the text on the plaque that tells a history of Banks Island. It reads:

Sachs Harbour was first visited by the Canadian Arctic Expedition of 1913-17, and was named after that expedition’s vessel, the Mary Sachs, which was beached and dismantled six miles west of here in 1914. Uninhabited before the expedition, Banks Island was discovered to be rich in white fox. In the late 1920s, Eskimos from the mainland coast began wintering on Banks Island to trap, crossing the sea by schooner. Later joined by Eskimos from Victoria Island, they built the community of Sachs Harbour, which is now inhabited throughout the year. Trapping remains the basis of the economy, and Banks Island is one of the leading white fox producing regions of Canada, and of the World.

Versions of this narrative have made their way into both easily accessible historical resources such as Wikipedia and the Encyclopedia Britannica, and academic writing. Encyclopedia Britannica (Banks Island 2016) states that Banks Island was “First sighted by Sir William Parry’s expedition in 1820, it was named for Sir Joseph Banks. Vilhjalmur Stefansson explored the interior in 1914–17. Sachs Harbour on its southwest coast, with air service to Inuvik on the mainland, is a base for trappers.” In Across Time and Tundra, an important resource for Inuvialuit history, Morrison and Kolausok (2003:
125) state, “Before the 20th century, this [Banks Island], unlike nearby Victoria Island, had been essentially unoccupied.” This (mis)information is cited by other academics such as Oehler (2010).

![Plate 5: Plaque overlooking Sachs Harbour, 2013.](image)

3.5.3 Ikaahukmiut Narratives

Unlike European and Archaeological narratives of Banks Island history, there is no overarching Ikaahukmiut narrative. Instead, Ikaahukmiut history is made up of countless stories pertaining to places, people, animals, and the land. Below are some examples of community narratives about Banks Island’s past. I have organized them temporally for the ease of the reader.

The previous Ikaahukmiut left behind countless features on the landscape. Some of the larger features include tent rings, houses, caches, graves, and kayak rests. Community members attribute many of these features to the Old Timers. Old Timers are described as
people who lived the old ways, before substantial contact with Europeans and the introduction of their technology. Old Timers are regarded as ancestors or relatives of the Inuvialuit. Archaeologists label them the Thule-Inuit. They built their houses out of sod (Nagy 1999: 5-6). Community members understand many other features to have been made by the Tunit or Little People (also called the Pulayuqat or Inuagulit in the Kangiryuarmiutun dialect), who built their houses out of stone. Archaeologists call the Tunit the Dorset (and Pre-Dorset) (Nagy 1999: 5-6; Condon 1996: 10). The Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami also uses the term Sivullirmiut (the First People) to refer to the Pre-Dorset and Dorset or Tunit.

The Tunit lived long ago and have since disappeared into the ground (Nagy 1999: 5-6). However, some community members feel that they are still around today. The Tunit are mostly thought to be from Victoria Island and farther east as stories of sightings on Banks Island are scarce. The stories of the Tunit that place them on Banks Island are mainly from the east side of the island.

One community member explained to me that although they are small, they have superhuman strength. They also have the ability to run extraordinarily fast, which is why you can only ever see them out of the corner of your eye. However, other people believe they have the ability to turn invisible and do this when humans are approaching. The Tunit built and lived in small stone houses. Below Earl Esau and Jean Harry describe Tunit houses:

And [the Elders] lived down there [in De Salis Bay] too and they said some place down here, they thought it was a meat cache but it wasn’t, ’cause it was like a little hut. Just enough for him to get in. He said it might be those little people who might have made it (Earl Esau, personal communication August 27, 2014).

You mean those, those things in the land?... I heard the stories before, but I never ever seen them… You can’t see them. They always disappear. But I mean, I never ever see those kind of, they make rock, you know, houses. Just like little, little house. I see them in Victoria Island, way up in that. My
parents go up inland, do the same thing that they do in Banks Island. I can remember really, really good then, but I never see little people. But little houses. Deep houses with rock and all this neat, little door. Not little door. But door. But it's not on the ground. It’s high from the ground. But my mom said that’s how they go in (Jean Harry, personal communication June 15, 2015).

During a community meeting held in Sachs Harbour in 1976 as part of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry, Susie Tiktalik (of Inuinnaqtuq background) explained that Banks Island had always been part of her ancestors’ hunting territory. Her interpreter translated:

She said she would talk because they have asked her to talk from here. Her name is Susie Tiktalik and she will talk about the time, from the time she was very small and they have lived on Banks Island from time to time with her parents until they got to this day.

Long before, many generations before I was born people had lived here that she knows of. As far as I could remember, the people were here generations before us, there were many. Ever since I was a little girl and since I could remember, and my parents came across here many times too, and many people lived here before our time too.

… [My parents] came across here because they wanted to live off this land, and mainly because there was many muskox in this area and there was lots of geese at that time, in this part of the country.

At one time she remember there was no more muskox in this area, and there was hardly any caribou and they quit coming across here for that purpose. … People come here long before our time, people had learned to come this way because they had found—they had learned to come here from generations that came here before (Canada 2003).
While translating for her mother Edith Haogak, Jean Harry (personal communication, July 28, 2013) told of how Edith’s family would visit the trappers coming from the mainland as part of their seasonal round:

She says when people start coming from across mainland, what do you call it? With boats, what do they call those boats they used? Schooners?... Yeah, those kind. She says when they come from across there with a boat her parents always gone to visit them. Walked down to them [in Sea Otter Harbour]. Yeah, or they'd go to them…. After they would visit with these people in the springtime they would hunt caribou and they would go down this way to Nakhaluk… After they are finished with visiting these people that come from mainland, here around there, they would go hunting. All summer they were hunting and then they go back to Nakhaluk…She says, August or something. She said she doesn’t know if it was August. But she said when they go there before it start getting really dark there, that's when they make their winter clothes and it get cold and the ice freeze up on the ocean, that's when they got enough snow for snow houses so they go out in the ocean in the ice they built their snow houses. So that’s where they stayed. They don’t stay in the land in the wintertime. Just hunt seals in the wintertime.

Below Betty Raddi-Haogak and Beverly Amos told of how their families moved from the mainland by schooner to Banks Island for white fox trapping:

I was born in Tuk… Then we lived there for a couple of years, then my parents moved to Sachs when I was two, on a schooner, the Fox it was called. The Fox. And then we moved to Sachs on the boat (Betty Raddi-Haogak, personal communication, July 13, 2014) (Plate 6).

Yeah. My dad did go to [Banks Island to] trap. We moved there by the North Star, the schooner, when I was about two years old and my dad went there to trap (Beverly Amos, personal communication, September 17, 2014).
Plate 6: Schooner the Fox on the beach in Sachs Harbour. This schooner brought many families to Banks Island from the mainland.

Frank Kudlak and Beverly Amos told stories of what the fur-trapping era was like:

But people always go to De Salis Bay, trapping. Yeah, Tuk people too. Just like Fox boat over there. That’s why they started. Tuk people, Tuktoyaktuk people, start coming around trapping, that’s why they get more fox all the time. Banksland. Nothing when [?] Lots of fox alright but never go trapping too far (Frank Kudlak, personal communication, June 17, 2015).

Everything was there. Everything that we needed. You know when you don’t really need fancy stuff, you know to own. But something to get around with, to be out on the land. Everybody was so busy too. That’s why. With the foxes. Lots of work to do. Try to make a living off foxes. It wasn’t just fun and games all the time. A lot of hard work our parents and families did. And they made good money. A good living.
People are not doing as much as they used to. More sitting around. You know, that’s what I noticed from when I was growing up. And when the men went out trapping they were gone for one, two, three weeks, and the women are busy at home keeping everything going and sewing for their families. And working on the furs that they got, that the men brought home. The, taking the fat off and drying them and then cleaning the dry fur. Lots of work because they had big gunny sack… bails of… and they could really stuff them. I don’t know how many they used to fit in one bag…. They used to have lots. Hundreds throughout the year. And the only time we went, me and my mom, was when it warmed up. The last trip when they snap the traps. I don’t know, at the end of the trapping season. We never went when it was really cold out. Not when I was growing up anyway. We already had houses with a fuel stove and everything. Everybody had their own house too, so you gotta work to keep it going. No one’s gonna come along and fill it up for you. Everybody built their own houses. It was before public housing came along from the government. Everybody were more proud people because whatever they had, they worked for it themselves (Beverly Amos, personal communication, September 17, 2014).

Jean Harry and Lena Wolki tell stories of settling in Sachs Harbour:

My parents were in De Salis Bay. Yeah, but they wanted to come here to hunt geese because never see any geese in De Salis Bay that time. Only ducks. So must be about end of May, my parents come here to hunt geese. They… just around here… go hunting, go back to De Salis Bay…. (Jean Harry, personal communication, June 15, 2015)

And when I first come from Victoria Island we was on the other side, on De Salis Bay. And so me and my mom we walk over in the summer in July to go to Sachs. We used our dogs and camping gear and things like that and we pack our stuff and we moved to Sachs Harbour. Hardly any people there. There was only three houses when we first go there in 1955. And now it get
bigger and everything there. There was better hunting there so we never leave here again. 'Cause more animals and people like helping too, eh (Lena Wolki, personal communication, June 15, 2015).

The fact that there is no overarching Ikaahukmiut narrative of Banks Island is likely a product of three main factors. First, the Inuvialuit conceptualization of time puts less emphasis on the temporal sequence of events. When an event occurred is usually not as important as who was involved, where it took place, and what happened; exact dates are usually not given. Additionally, in many cases there is no easily recognizable start or end to a story about the past, therefore, these stories cannot be readily pieced together chronologically to make one larger narrative. Despite not focusing on chronological sequence, there are some cultural temporal markers. Some widely used temporal markers include the use of the schooner, “before Greenpeace”, and the introduction of the skidoo. The use of the schooner denotes the time when trappers from the mainland would travel back to the mainland during the summer by schooner, before they permanently settled on the island. This occurred between the 1920s and 1950s. “Before Greenpeace” refers to a time when trapping was a good way to make a living and community members relied on trapping as a way of life. During the 1970s, the prices for white foxes dropped drastically and trapping was no longer a viable way of life. Community members understand this decline to be caused by Greenpeace and other animal rights groups. The introduction of the skidoo in the late-1960s made travelling the land faster and easier (Plates 7, 8). The skidoo drastically changed people’s perception of the land as the time it took to travel was greatly reduced and certain resting spots were no longer used. Many community members also view the introduction of the skidoo as “the end of the old days” because dogsleds were no longer used, which many view as iconic for their culture.

Second, as outlined in Chapter 2, the Ikaahukmiut community is diverse. This diversity leads to varied narratives about the past, which are sometimes even conflicting or competing. One example is the narratives surrounding Sachs Harbour. Fred Carpenter, who originated from the mainland, is attributed with making Sachs Harbour a major
Plate 7: Susie Wolki traveling inland near De Salis Bay, Banks Island, spring 1935. Photo credit: Mrs. Peter Sydney/Library and Archives Canada/PA 027698.

Plate 8: Remains of one of the first skidoos in Sachs Harbour, 2014.
camp when he returned to Banks Island in 1937 (Nagy 1999: 104). Many community members say he was the first to camp or settle there. However, Edith Haogak (interpreted by Jean Harry, personal communication, July 28, 2013) explained that her parents used to camp where the town cemetery is presently located before anyone was there:

Now she is going to tell you about this, Sachs Harbour. But there was nobody around there so. But she is going to tell you. Just picture that nobody is here…. She said that nobody around her parents, you see that cemetery up there? That’s… her parents used to have their tents in the summer time…. She says every time they go through here they used to, her parents only them, they used to camp in that where they have the cemetery now. That’s their camping ground but they used, yeah cemetery.

Although Edith’s family was not there when Fred Carpenter settled in Sachs Harbour, the notion that they were there before him can become contentious, as it can be interpreted as a narrative that delegitimizes some families’ claims to the island.

Third, as was established above, a defining characteristic of Inuvialuit knowledge is that it is experiential. This means that the stories that people tell are based on their own experiences or the experiences of community members, which were told to them. Unlike Western narratives that are based on “facts” that occur independently of human conception, there are few narratives that lay claim to understanding what was happening outside of personal experience. Additionally, the stories that are told are based on the relationship the teller has to the listener. The teller will adjust a story so that only certain details are given to certain people, and the emphasis of a story may change depending on the interests of the listener. The stories that were shared with me by community members were undoubtedly different from the stories that are shared with family members and other community members. The experiential nature of these historical narratives would make it particularly hard to piece together an “objective” narrative of facts about events that have occurred throughout time on the island.
3.6 Discussion

The mainstream historical narrative of Banks Island implies that Europeans were the first to discover the island. The town plaque also implies that they were the first to notice the abundance of white fox on the island and that the Siglit and Uummarmiut people were the first Inuit to settle on the island beginning in the 1920s. This narrative erases the Inuinnait from the history of Banks Island. It also fits into a larger narrative of Settler nations that begins history with Europeans.

The narratives of Banks Island told by people of Inuinnait background tell a different history. As outlined above, there are many families who recount that their people had always gone back and forth between Banks Island and Victoria Island. Although interviewees said that the mainstream narrative does not bother them because they know their history regardless, there is still a sense of frustration:

It’s just an interpretation. Someone’s interpretation. To me it doesn’t bother me. I know, I know that the people from the fox trapping where not the first people on the island. I know the Canadian Arctic Expedition were not, they were just 1900s and 1800s…

They’re saying it was uninhabited, you know. Okay. You can say that. Try and pull that one over me (David Haogak, personal communication, September 16, 2014).

Stefansson (1919: 289-290) was told by an Elder named Pamiungittok from Victoria Island that the Banks Island people used to be well off until they started to kill each other. One man who was killed had relatives in Prince Albert Sound who practiced “witchcraft” and caused food on the island to run scarce, and people on Banks Island died of hunger. Stefansson believed that this happened during the 1890s. Nagy (1999: 2) states that little is known about the time between 1890 and Stefansson’s expeditions to Banks Island. She goes on to point out that the Inuinnait were on the island when Stefansson visited it in 1911. Additionally, Stefansson (1919: 289) recorded that the
Inuinnait travelled to the southeast coast of Banks Island during the winter for polar bear and seal hunting.

Manning (1956: 33), who is widely cited, infers that Banks Island was not occupied during the 1850s because M’Clure did not encounter any Inuit on the island and did not mention coming across any recent traces in his accounts. He goes on to argue that the island probably had not been occupied for a long time prior to M’Clure’s expedition, possibly not since the Thule occupation. Nagy (1999: 2), however, emphasizes that M’Clure’s crew spent most of their time in Mercy Bay and that “the huge size of Banks Island and its close proximity to Victoria Island leads to the possibility that people were located elsewhere”. David Haogak (personal communication, September 16, 2014) also pointed out that one of the reasons these explorers could not find any traces of recent Inuinnait occupation was that during the winter they lived in igloos, which would have melted.

Ultimately, Indigenous and Western understandings of occupation of land are also different (Ross and Pickering 2002). In many colonial contexts Europeans often followed the concept of *terra nullius*, “nobody’s land”. In these cases European authorities deemed land to be “empty” if it was not occupied by a Christian nation (Lutz 2007: 40-41), if it did not have a sovereign recognized by European authorities (Pinkoski 2008: 198), if the land was not owned by anyone and there was no tenure of any sort (Pinkoski 2008: 198), or if the land was not worked or managed to a degree suitable to Europeans (Ross and Pickering 2002: 189). The Europeans who visited Banks Island during the 19th and early 20th centuries deemed it unoccupied because they apparently found no one living on the island. Although we cannot say with certainty how the Inuinnait in the past conceptualized their relationship to Banks Island (*Was it part of their territory? Their home? Their hunting ground?*), we do know based on Inuinnait narratives that they did travel to (or live on) and spend a considerable amount of time on the island. The Inuinnait did not traditionally build permanent settlements, although certain areas were re-visited. Condon (1996: 69) states that because “the environment was marked (as it still is) by dramatic seasonal fluctuations in temperature, light duration, snowfall, ice conditions, and game availability, Copper Inuit families had to display great flexibility in economic
and social organization.” The Inuinnait were constantly moving across the land as part of their seasonal rounds, leaving much of what they may have considered part of their territory or hunting ground “unoccupied” in the Western sense of the word. We also do not know how differing European and Inuinnait conceptions of time influence their understanding of “occupation”. If animal populations declined on Banks Island and Inuinnait stopped hunting there for a number of years, how long would it be before Banks Island was no longer part of their seasonal rounds or territory?

The archaeological narrative of cycles of “occupation and abandonment” may also feed into the mainstream Western narrative. The archaeological interpretation that the Inuinnait began coming to Banks Island to scavenge from the Investigator was influenced by and contributes to the notion that history is propelled by Europeans (Hodgetts 2013). However, the widely accepted archaeological narrative is increasingly being called into question and challenged. Until fairly recently, archaeological investigation on Banks Island was mainly limited to the southern and eastern coastal regions of the island, as well as some areas of the northern interior. It has been pointed out (Hodgetts 2013; Bielawski 1988) that archaeologists working in the Arctic often focus their surveys on coastal areas, often for logistical and financial reasons. Figure 4 shows the recorded archaeological sites on Banks Island, which indicates where archaeological survey has taken place. Hodgetts (2013) notes that ethnographic records show that the Inuit often used interior areas, mainly in the warmer seasons, and although limited, there is archaeological evidence that indicates similar patterns as far back as the Arctic Small Tool tradition. Despite decades of archaeological research on Banks Island, areas of its coast and much of its interior remain unsurveyed, suggesting that the long periods of abandonment may not be as marked as initially perceived. Recent research by Hodgetts as part of the IAP (Hodgetts et al 2015; Hodgetts unpublished data) and Shank et al. (n.d.) suggests that continuous occupation of Banks Island from Thule-Inuit to Inuinnait times was likely.
Additionally, little attention has been given to the possible relationship between inhabitants of the island and the mainland. Archaeologists have interpreted some of the archaeological sites on the island to be Mackenzie Inuit (ancestral Inuvialuit) (Toews 1998: 44-46). These interpretations raise important issues that warrant further discussion. First, archaeologists who have interpreted sites on Banks Island as Mackenzie Inuit have yet to publish their findings. Their interpretations, like much of the archaeological information on Banks Island, remain in the grey literature, meaning it is unpublished and difficult to access. This makes it hard to critically assess and challenge the widely accepted archaeological narrative, as many archaeological findings are inaccessible and
not well known. Second, these interpretations are primarily based on surveys of tent rings. Determining the identity of the people who occupied large archaeological sites that have been excavated is difficult, if not impossible without supporting historical information (Curta 2014; Jones 1997), so interpreting the identity of occupants of a tent ring from a survey seems insufficient. Finally, archaeologists should reflect on how productive ascribing a particular identity is, especially in cases such as this. I think it is important to investigate how people from the mainland were connected to Banks Island. However, we do not know and will never know how people from the mainland and the ancestral Inuinnait conceptualized their identities and how they related to one another. Furthermore, the transition from those archaeologists identify as the “Thule” to the various Inuit groups present at the time of European contact is also unclear. Hodgetts (personal communication) therefore, argues that applying specific identifying labels to previous occupants of Banks Island is unproductive. Instead, she has applied the broader term “ancestral Inuvialuit”, acknowledging that it is still problematic because of the political connotations associated with Inuvialuit.

At present, the dominant Western narrative, the widely accepted archaeological narrative, and the Ikaahukmiut narratives tell different, and at times conflicting stories of the past. The above examination of Ikaahukmiut and Western historicities suggests that the two are fundamentally different. However, the conceptualized dichotomy between Indigenous and archaeological knowledges fails to recognize knowledge as fluid and adaptive. Indigenous knowledges have always been adaptive and open to new ideas. This is especially evident in colonial contexts where what was once thought of as assimilation is now recognized as conscious, selective adoption and adaptation of settler ideas and materials by Indigenous peoples (Rubertone 2000: 428; Loren 2008: 113; Gosden 2001; Ferris 2009). Currently, Indigenous peoples are demonstrating this adaptability by initiating and becoming involved in archaeological projects (e.g. The Understanding the Past to Build the Future CURA project (2009) and the Iqaluktuuq Project (Friesen 2002)) and other heritage projects (e.g. the Inuvialuit Living History Project and the Kitikmeot Heritage Society’s 5th Thule Expedition Atlas) and becoming archaeologists themselves (e.g. Sonya Atalaya, Joe Watkins, Daniel Weetaluktuk, and the 36 contributors to Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists (Nicholas 2010)). Likewise, the postmodernist
turn in archaeology that began in the 1970s and 1980s has challenged the modernist narrative and has developed new theories within archaeology that open a middle ground where archaeological and Indigenous concepts of material culture (Whitridge 2004b; Knappett 2008; Latour 1993, 2004), space (Thomas 1996; Whitridge 2004a; Bender 1998, 2002; Ingold 1993; Hodgetts 2013; Basso 1996) and time (Holdaway and Wandersnider 2006, 2008; Lucas 2005; Agrawal, Bhalakia and Kusumgar 1999; Knapp 1999; Gosden and Kirsanow 2006) can find a common ground for understandings.

Although arctic archaeology has been slower to adopt post-modernist theories than other branches of the discipline, archaeologists working in the north have been increasingly applying them over the last twenty years and are calling into question many of the dominant archaeological narratives written through a modernist lens.

This chapter has established how Western forms of knowledge have denied Inuvialuit understandings of the past. By critically examining Western and Ikaahuqumiut historicities archaeologists can gain a better understanding of why they appear to be in opposition with one another. The following chapters will demonstrate how these seemingly different knowledges can be brought together to investigate Banks Island’s past.
Chapter 4

4 Learning Through Doing: Inuvialuit Historicities

Although oral histories provide significant knowledge about the past, they are only one part of Inuvialuit historicity and much of what is learned about the past is attained through doing. One community member explained to me that being told about the past is an important way to learn, but there is nothing like “going to the source of history.” Community members learn about the past “by living it” (Betty-Raddi Haogak, personal communication, July 13, 2014). By taking part in traditional activities in the same spaces that their ancestors performed activities, they experience the past and know the past in ways that cannot be learned through oral histories. When people take part in traditional activities such as traveling the land, hunting, fishing, trapping, the preparation and consumption of traditional foods, and sewing, their present intersects with the past through engagement in the embodied actions of their ancestors. The past is also learned through doing many non-traditional activities, including photography. Learning through doing and other ways of knowing the past became a central theme in my research, throughout which I participated in many of the activities listed above to better understand and articulate these other ways of knowing. I was lucky enough to learn Inuvialuit sewing from three women in town. During our sewing lessons they shared with me their patterns, wisdom, and stories. Community members were also kind enough to take me on fishing, hunting, and camping trips.

The Ikaahukmiut community currently faces many challenges for passing down traditional knowledge. The community is confident that they will be able to overcome these challenges, as they always have in the past. Community members have always adapted their knowledge so they can continue to pass down their traditions and histories. This chapter examines the different ways community members learn through doing and the current challenges they face for partaking in these activities and passing down knowledge. Although these activities are very much interrelated, they will be discussed individually below. It is also important to note that oral histories are not necessarily separate from these activities. The two “categories” are intricately linked and my
discussion of them in distinct chapters was one of many possible organizational choices. By better understanding Inuvialuit historicities, archaeologists can better reflect on their own ways of knowing the past, which will help to produce meaningful community-based archaeology projects.

### 4.1 Learning through Doing

Learning through doing encompasses other ways of knowing that can be difficult to comprehend within academic understandings of history. Although not used by the Inuvialuit, the best way for me to understand these other ways of knowing is through the concept of the Medicine Wheel, which is used in many other Indigenous cultures in North America as a tool to express traditional teachings. There is no standard Medicine Wheel as teachings vary across cultures; however, there are many commonalities. The circle of the Medicine Wheel is a symbol of completeness. The Medicine Wheel is based on the four directions (and seasons), which represent the four aspects of self: physical (body), mental (mind), emotional (heart), and spiritual (soul) (Figure 5).

![Example of a Medicine Wheel](image)

**Figure 5:** Example of a Medicine Wheel, adapted from Kulchyski et al. 2003
One must balance the four aspects of the self to live life in a good way (Kulchyski et al. 2003: xix-xx). Western academics study the past intellectually and know the past primarily in their minds. Learning the past through doing encompasses the other three aspects of self and allows one to know the past in their body, heart, soul, and mind. Knowing the past in these different ways makes one complete. This understanding of knowing the past in different ways was evident when community members talked about and participated in activities involving learning through doing.

4.1.1  Hunting, Fishing, Trapping, and Traveling the Land

An important way that community members know the past is travelling the land and camping. Through these activities they learn where and how their ancestors travelled and how they lived on the land. Although there have been some changes in the way that people travel and hunt, mainly due to modernized equipment, travel routes and the basic principles of the traditional methods used have not changed much over the years.

Plate 9: Community member examining archaeological site at Mary Sachs, 2014.
According to Beverly Amos (personal communication, September 17, 2014), community members learn about the past “mostly when they go out. Take their families camping, hunting. The people that do that are teaching them.” They also see the physical remnants left behind by previous Ikaahukmiut such as old campsites or butchering sites (Plate 9). These remnants serve as constant reminders of the history of the land and its people.

While out on the land, families partake in hunting, trapping, and fishing. Although these activities are often more associated with men, women hunt and fish as well, and there are many stories of women, such as Susie Tiktalik, who “put men to shame” with their hunting skills (David Haogak, personal communication, September 16, 2014). During the summers community members head out on the open sea by boat to hunt seals and occasionally beluga whales. They also line and net fish in nearby lakes, like 25 Minute Lake, Fish Lake, and Middle Lake (Plates 10 - 14).

Plate 10: Elders Edith Haogak (left) and Lena Wolki (right) fishing at Haogak Lake, 2014.
Plate 11: Elder Edith Haogak fishing at Haogak Lake, named after her husband, 2014.

Plate 12: Community members setting fishing nets at Fish Lake, 2014.
Plate 13: Community members checking the fish net at Fish Lake, 2014.

Plate 14: Community member fishing at Middle Lake, 2014.
Traditionally, community members would collect plants during the summer and early fall as well. One particularly important plant was arctic cotton (*Eriophorum scheuchzeri*) (*palliksaq* or *kanguuyaq* in the Siglitun and Inuinnaqtun dialects respectively) (Plate 15), which is used to make a wick for *qulliit* (oil lamps). Jean Harry (personal communication, June 15, 2015) recalls her mother picking arctic cotton at the end of summer:

> Before it freeze, my mother always go in the coast. There is white cotton that grow, you know in a ball, like a little ball, but she would pick lots of those. Bags and bags. So it would last them… last through the whole winter to keep her… keep the wick on the *qulliit*, oil lamp, going. I remember those times.

**Plate 15:** Arctic Cotton in Sachs Harbour, 2013.

The community no longer uses many of the plants the Inuvialuit traditionally harvested\(^\text{18}\); however, *qunguliq*, or mountain sorrel (*Oxyria digyna*) (Plate 16), remains an important

\(^{18}\) See Inuvialuit Elders and Bandringa (2010) for information on Inuvialuit traditional plant use.
Plate 16: Community member picking *qunguliq* on a hill above Sachs Harbour, 2014.

Plate 17: Tea made from *qunguliq*, 2014.
plant to community members. The leaves of this small plant, which have been compared to rhubarb in taste, are used to make tea (Plate 17) and flavor seal oil, or are simply eaten raw. Many community members pick qunguliq in the summer and qunguliq picking is one activity that children take part in during summer day camp.

In the late summer and early fall community members hunt caribou and muskox. They are hunted during the winter when the opportunity arises. Many community members prefer caribou to muskox but population fluctuations during the twentieth century caused the caribou population to plummet in the 1980s (to be discussed below) and presently, community members rarely hunt caribou. The Inuinnait would traditionally move inland to hunt caribou in the summer. Community members residing in Sachs Harbour would travel northeast to Kellett River and Big River to hunt caribou. When muskox populations were at their highest in the 1980s and 1990s, community members could hunt muskox just outside of town. Currently, the muskox population is declining and community members have to travel farther inland to hunt them.

Traditionally, white fox trapping began in the late fall and was carried out in the winter (Plate 18). Men (and sometimes women) would leave the community to tend to their trap lines, and sometimes would be gone for three weeks at a time. They would return for short periods and head out to the trap line again. Since the decline of white fox trapping, most community members do not trap regularly. Some trap for leisure, as a way to connect them to the old lifestyle, and some to generate extra income:

Yeah, I do. I actually set out fox traps last year and the year before. I just do it on the weekends. I work 8:30-5:00 every day. But I still . . . two years ago I sent out 75 foxes for auction and last year I sent out a hundred so. I still do catch foxes (John Lucas Jr., personal communication, August 22, 2014).

Community members also understand trapping as an important way to get children interested and ready for hunting:

It’s more of like… it’s more of a starting thing. Like kids can do it to start out hunting and stuff. So, they can even start out independently. But usually, like
the first couple of rounds, their parents will show them how and then from after that it’s more like… like I did it with my group of friends. Like we trapped just as a thing to do from boredom. Well, not just to kill foxes. We sold the furs and stuff (Kevin Gully, personal communication, August 30, 2015).

Although most people are no longer involved in trapping, many still think it is important to teach children how to trap. Trapping serves as a way for people to assert their identity, as Sachs Harbour was built as a trapping community.

Plate 18: Susie and Roy Wolki, traveling on the trap line, Banks Island, 1930. Photo credit: Mrs. Susie Sydney/ Library and Archives Canada/PA-027663.

In the late winter, community members begin to hunt polar bears. Polar bear hunting usually takes place on the sea ice near open water (Plate 19). Nelson Head has traditionally been regarded as a good place to hunt bears. The Northern Beaufort polar bear population is currently healthy, and abiding by HTC guidelines, the Inuvialuit have the exclusive cultural right to hunt polar bears (Joint Secretariat 2015). Polar bears have important cultural meaning to the Inuvialuit and are prominent in Inuvialuit mythology, spirituality, storytelling, and art (Joint Secretariat 2015: 198). Polar bears can be deadly

to humans; therefore, traditional knowledge of polar bears is important, as is showing proper respect to them. Polar bears provide meat to the community (although in Sachs Harbour it is mostly Elders who eat them today), which must be shared with the community to show proper respect to the animal (Joint Secretariat 2015). The pelts are used for clothing and mattresses. Polar bears are held in high esteem because of their strength and size, and because of the cultural significance of polar bears, hunting them is a spiritual and culturally important experience for many people. Hunting polar bears is also seen by some as an effort to combat influences of Western society.

The Joint Secretariat (2015: 211) outlines how hunting polar bear is important for traditional knowledge formation and transmission:

This points to the fact that TK is largely related to survival — safe travel and harvest for food and clothing — and the requirements are many, including technical knowledge, fortitude, tenacity, courage, quick thinking, emotional self-awareness and discipline and self-confidence based on experience, in addition to knowledge of polar bears. Moreover, an essential hunter attribute
is respect for the animal. This includes an appreciation of the strength, agility, intelligence, willpower and potential lethality of polar bears. How Inuvialuit harvest polar bears, then, informs and is informed by their TK.

Through polar bear hunting, community members learn important traditional knowledge that is applied to other aspects of life to ensure survival in the north.

Polar bear hunting is also economically important for community members. Selling polar bear pelts can significantly supplement a family’s income. Additionally, Inuvialuit have the right to transfer their quota tags to non-Inuvialuit sport hunters, who must also hire Inuvialuit hunting guides. Sport hunting is an important source of income for Sachs Harbour residents and the money made from sport hunting is often used to pay the costs of other harvesting activities, which increase yearly (Joint Secretariat 2015: 199).

In early spring, community members begin ice fishing on nearby lakes and the sea ice. They continue to ice fish until the geese come and many people turn their focus to goose hunting. Although all hunting and fishing activities remain important to the community, the spring goose hunt, which takes place in May and June, stands out as a particularly important (Plates 20 - 27). Goose hunting primarily takes place in and around Sachs River, approximately 5 km from Sachs Harbour. Small hunting communities pop up on the landscape where multiple families camp together in their frame tents. Soon after the geese arrive many families travel to Egg River to collect goose eggs. Betty Raddi-Haogak (personal communication, June 1, 2015) explains the importance of the spring goose hunt:

Yeah, it’s our way of life here. We always look forward to the spring and hunting geese and having fresh food, you know and travelling on the land and continuing our traditional way of life. You know. And teaching our younger ones too, to keep up the culture ’cause, you know, we harvest it for the year, for the whole year. The eggs too could last all winter. We would freeze it and use it during the winter too. So, it is important. You know.
**Plate 20:** Fred Wolki and Fred Carpenter hunting geese, Satsik, Banks Island, 1932. Photo credit: Mrs. Peter Sydney/Library and Archives Canada/PA 027676.

**Plate 21:** Community member at goose hunting camp in Sachs River, 2015.
Plate 22: Community member goose hunting in Sachs River, 2015.

Plate 23: Community members at goose hunting blind in Sachs River, 2015.
Plate 24: Community members heading back to goose hunting camp, Sachs River, 2015.

Plate 26: Community member preparing geese, Sachs Harbour, 2015.

Plate 27: View from inside ice house where community members traditionally stored geese, 2014.
Community members look forward to the goose hunt as it provides fresh meat, which they often do not have access to throughout the winter, and provides a substantial amount of their diet throughout the year. Goose hunting was often talked about as a way the community “re-energizes” or “rejuvenates” after a long winter. Unlike other hunting and fishing endeavors that are usually carried out with smaller parties travelling on the land, goose hunting brings the community together out on the land. As discussed earlier, the goose hunt also sets Sachs Harbour apart from other communities in the ISR. Many community members who now live elsewhere in the ISR return to Banks Island in the spring for the goose hunt.

4.1.2 Traditional Food Preparation and Consumption

It is not enough to simply harvest traditional foods (also called country foods). The preparation and consumption of these foods also connects people to the past and contributes to their Inuvialuit identity. Natuk (2014: 140), who studies Greenlandic foods and cultural identity, explains that, “Aside from supplying our bodies with energy, food also works as a symbol, which tells both ourselves and others who we are and where we come from.” She goes on to explain, “We use food to link identity and memory together both in terms of our life story and to bring together life history and the social history.” This is evident among the Ikaahukmiut, as traditional foods often remind community members of both personal and community histories. The importance of traditional food among the Greenlandic Inuit is exemplified by the direct translation of their word for traditional food, kalaaliment, which translates as “a piece of Greenlander” (Natuk 2014: 140; Sowa 2014: 290). For the Inuit in Greenland, eating traditional foods is what makes them Inuit, and conversely traditional foods are a part of them. This sentiment is also strong among the Ikaahukmiut. One community member explained: “They become potatoes if they don’t [eat traditional foods]. Brown on the outside, white on the inside. If they can’t eat from their homeland then they are a potato. You know, they just, they wouldn’t survive.” Many other community members agreed that eating traditional foods makes you Inuvialuit. Through the consumption of traditional foods, they are connected to the land, its past, and their ancestors. Elders often expressed concern that younger generations were more interested in “white people food” than traditional foods.
The preparation and consumption of traditional foods also helps teach people how to be Inuvialuit. When discussing the importance of traditional foods, Beverly Amos (personal communication, September 17, 2014) explained that in order to have traditional foods, a strong work ethic is required:

Yeah, it is. Because there is a lot of preparation. You get stuff ready ahead of time. It teaches them how to prepare and plan for an event even though it is way ahead of time. It might not be that we’re actually building the weapons anymore, but we still have to get a job or get an education to get a good job if you still want to buy a snowmobile or a gun to get your food. We still depend on that, too…

From planning and preparing for the hunt to preparing food for the winter, such as dry meat and dry fish (Plate 28), a strong work ethic is required. Many community members see “survival” as part of being Inuvialuit; therefore, the strong work ethic needed to survive is seen as characteristic of Inuvialuit.

Plate 28: Smoking dry fish at Middle Lake, 2014.
Additionally, there are some rules that the Inuvialuit learn to follow through the processes of hunting, food preparation, and consumption. These rules are usually based on the guiding principle of respect and are used to ensure that the animals are not offended and the hunts remain prosperous. For example, Elder Jean Harry (personal communication, June 15, 2015) explains one such rule pertaining to polar bears:

Elders tell me stories. She [Jean’s mother, Edith Haogak] say when you eat polar bear, you can’t say, “Oh, it taste good”. That was their way of life I guess, living. Not to use that. Because polar bears going to come to you, and “Tastes good, that person.” Or attack you or something. Yeah.

Food sharing is another important rule for traditional food harvesting and consumption. Traditional foods are shared with Elders and other community members who may not be able to go out on the land or hunt or fish for themselves. These rules, based on respect, help teach people how to be Inuvialuit.

4.1.3 Sewing

Sewing is an important activity that community members learn that ties them to their past. One community member explained to me that, when she sews, she “knows her past” and “is connected to her ancestors.” Community members are taught to sew by parents, grandparents, and Elders. Although sewing is primarily a women’s activity, it is important for men to learn to sew as well, as it is a survival skill while out on the land. I was told that sewing has always been an important part of Inuvialuit culture, as everything had to be sewn, from clothing to tents to sled equipment. Most sewing activities take place in the winter when community members are not as busy with hunting and fishing.

Sewing patterns are passed down through families, although I was often told that, long ago, no one used patterns and a good seamstress could know sizes by looking, not measuring. Community members also informed me that different regions had different sewing styles (Plates 29 - 30). For example, the traditional Inuinnait style for mittens is easily distinguishable from the aitkatiq, or trapper’s mittens that the Inuvialuit from
Plate 29: Moccasins made by Lena Wolki, 2014.

Plate 30: Moccasins made by author from pattern shared by community member.
the mainland traditionally make. In the past the differences in styles served somewhat as a cultural marker; however, mixing styles is quite common today. Community members are protective of their patterns, as they are understood as intellectual property. The women who taught me sewing shared patterns with me based on the understanding that they were for my personal use and I was not to share them with others or start making moccasins or mukluks from their patterns with the intention to sell them.

Sewing is also an important aspect of the community’s economy, especially for community Elders whose primary source of income is their sewing. Young girls sew smaller items that they sell as well (Plate 31). Sewing is sold within the community, at craft fairs in Inuvik, and online through Facebook. Elders often expressed concern that community members are increasingly buying hides and furs online or through the IRC rather than preparing their own for sewing.

Plate 31: Small decorative moccasins made by youth Alexis Lucas, 2014.

Although community members primarily sew traditional garments such as mittens, mukluks, and parkas, traditional materials are often used to sew items not traditionally made by the Inuvialuit, such as sealskin gloves or hats, or giving an “Inuvialuit twist” to
modern items such as a sealskin iPad case. Through these creations community members are able to assert their heritage while embracing new or non-traditional technologies.

4.1.4 Language, Place Names, and Personal Names

As discussed earlier, language is an important way to know the past. It is embedded with cultural knowledge and contributes to personal and collective identity. When stories, information, or words are translated into English from Inuvialuktun, they often loose some of their meaning and cultural nuances (Nagy 2002). There is a strong understanding among community members that language tells them about their culture and who they are.

Inuvialuktun names, both for places and people, play an important role in the way community members know and connect to the past. Collignon (2002: 101) describes how giving a place a name changes it:

A place may be important to someone because it is a good fishing spot, or because it is a familiar marker on a well-travelled trail, or because of something that happened there. But until it is given a name, a particular place is only a memory in someone’s mind. Once it is named, the memory can be shared with other people: the place becomes part of human legacy.

Inuit place names, which are often descriptive of the landscape, are believed by many Western researchers to help people travel the land. However, during her research with the Inuinnait on Victoria Island, Collignon (2006: 110) discovered that place names are not needed for travel on the land. Instead, they are essential for “making people feel at home in their surroundings, and making these surroundings a human territory, where culture may flourish.” Smith (2003: 78) explains that place names reflect “the culturally meaningful landscape of the local population. They are mnemonic codes for local stories and traditions, recognised by and part of the shared memory of the local community.”

This account holds true for the Ikaahukmiut. Many place names on Banks Island are descriptive of the landscape, such as Suunguqpaaluk Hill, which expresses that it is a big green area. Other place names let people know about resources found there, such as
Ukalikpialuk Hills, which expresses that many rabbits can be found there. Other place names are descriptive of events that take place there or have taken place there, such as Manniliqpir (Egg River), which indicates that it is a place to gather eggs, or Blue Fox Harbour, which denotes that it is the location where the Blue Fox would anchor for the winter. Additionally, many places are named after people who camped or hunted in the area.

There are Inuinnaqtun, Siglitun, and English place names on Banks Island, reflecting the island’s history and multicultural community. Although the Inuinnaqtun would travel throughout the entire island, they primarily used the southeastern side of the island during the first half of the nineteenth century. Inuinnaqtun place names are found throughout the island, but there is a higher concentration of remembered place names on the southeastern side. Similarly, when Inuvialuit came to Banks Island from the mainland for trapping, they primarily stationed themselves in small communities along the southwestern side of the island. The trappers collectively agreed not to trap farther north than Bernard River, to give white foxes an area to replenish their numbers. Therefore, the southwestern side of the island contains primarily Siglitun or English names.

Personal names have always been an important way that people connect to the past. Alia (1994: 1) asserts, “Names are the cornerstone of culture. They identify individuals, represent life, express and embody power.” Inuit people traditionally had one name, which was ungendered, although they were often given new names throughout their lives (Alia 1994). The Inuvialuit, like many other Inuit groups, believed in reincarnation through naming (Morrison 2003a: 24). Within many Inuit ontologies, a person is made up of a body (timeq) and three souls, the personal soul (tarneq), the breath soul (anersaaq), and the name soul (ateq). The tarneq and the anersaaq are two separate entities but they are also the same (Hardenberg 2009: 24-25). When a person dies, only their body perishes; their tarneq and anersaaq go on to an afterworld and the ateq is reborn into the body of a newborn baby. The baby is given the same name as the person who passed away, regardless of whether the baby and the deceased person are of the same gender. A person who is named after a deceased person is an atsiaq and the deceased person is known as the atsiaq’s aqqa (Nuttall 1994; 128). When a child is named, it is not seen as
the naming of a new person, but the welcoming back of an old one. With the naming of a child, the bond between the deceased and the bereaved is re-established (Nuttall 1994: 129). A child is not believed to be a person until it receives a name and naming does not usually occur until a few days after birth.

The Inuvialuit were first given English names by missionaries. In some cases, Inuit people adopted surnames or English names on their own terms to adapt to new economies and social circumstances. In the following excerpt from our interview, Jean Harry (personal communication, June 15, 2015), whose Inuvialuktun name is Pigallaq, recalls being given her English name when visiting Sachs Harbour:

**Laura:** What about your English names? When did you start going by an English name?

**Jean:** English name? Excuse me. I guess wintertime. My parents come here for Christmas and everybody around here in Sachs Harbour used their English name. So they start calling me Jean.

**Laura:** Who picked that name? Did you pick that name or did somebody else?

**Jean:** People, my parents picked the name.

**Laura:** Was that hard to have a different name?

**Jean:** It wasn’t hard. It was part of my name.

**Laura:** Did you prefer your Inuvialuktun name?

**Jean:** Well, I don’t mind right now because a lot of people have a hard time remembering my name. They, they all want to phone me or talk to me they use Jean.
Despite saying she does not mind being called Jean now, by the way she spoke of her Inuvialuktun name it was apparent in our conversations that it holds a lot of meaning for her and is an important aspect of her identity.

The government initially kept track of the Inuit by assigning them an Eskimo Identification number, which was put on a small disc they were expected to carry with them at all times (Figure 6). The number started with either a “W” or an “E” to signify whether they resided west or east of Gjoa Haven, respectively. It was then followed by a number that signified the region they lived in, and finally the number that represented the individual. For example, someone from Sachs Harbour’s number would be W3-XXX.

This system was in place from 1941 until 1971, when the government initiated Project Surname. During Project Surname, the Inuit were given new names based on a non-Inuit, patriarchal model of surnaming (Alia 1994: 1). Although there was no apparent rule for coming up with a surname, people often chose to use their Christian name as their first name and their Inuit name as their last name (Alia 1994: 67), and families were often given their father’s or grandfather’s name as their last name. Paul Kowikchuk (personal communication, June 2, 2015) explained that his grandfather had already adopted a last name, Kowikchuk, but government officials thought it was too hard to pronounce so they gave his father his grandfather’s first name, Raddi, as a last name:

Just like me. My name used to be Raddi after my granddad’s first name. But I took my granddad’s last name also, which is Kowikchuk. And they had a hard time pronounce it and spell it, so they just gave my dad my granddad’s first name for his last name. But I took that name back.

Paul explained to me that he changed his last name to Kowikchuk in order to properly honour his family, identity, and heritage. Alia (1994) argues that Project Surname has had an immense impact on Inuit people and their identity. The few conversations I had with people in Sachs Harbour about the project indicated that they felt the way surnames were chosen for them was strange.

Little was shared with me about traditional Inuvialuit naming practices. Inuvialuit names are personal and there are some traditional beliefs that sharing your name with strangers
can be dangerous as it can make it easier for them to send malicious spirits after you. People were traditionally named after family members. Although upon birth people are now usually given English names, these names are often the same English names that Elders or relatives had, thereby carrying on an Inuvialuit tradition of naming people after family members to connect them to their heritage. Community members are also given Inuvialuit names. These names are not always given at birth because they are usually dependent on the person’s personality or the relationships they develop within the community. People told me that these names are not given as quickly as English names because they hold more meaning and are more personal. Again, the names that are given are often the names of past people or names that evoke traditions.

\footnote{English names are gendered and are given to people in the community based on gender.}
4.1.5 Government and Community Organized Events and Programs

Community members also learn about the past and connect to their heritage through many events and programs organized by the community or the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation. Major events in the town include the White Fox Jamboree, Canada Day, Inuvialuit Day and Christmas festivities. During these events community members participate in traditional games, such as fishing derbies, harpoon throwing contests (Plate 32), and bannock making and tea boiling contests. The consumption of traditional foods is also an important part of these events. Through the recreation department, the town also holds day camps during the summer and after school programs for youth. These programs often feature traditional activities, such as teaching the children how to prepare traditional foods. In the past the town also held culture camps for youth, which gave the children as a group the opportunity to take part in traditional activities and connect with Elders out on the land. Youth from Sachs Harbour also participate in Arctic Sports, which traditionally helped people develop and maintain skills for hunting and travelling on the land.

The IRC supplies funding to get adults more involved in traditional activities, for example a town sewing circle and adult Inuvialuktun classes. The Harvesters Assistance Program also provides funding to help offset costs of hunting equipment. The IRC has developed the Taimani curriculum for high school students, and children must take Inuvialuktun language classes while attending school in Sachs Harbour.

4.1.6 Non-Traditional Activities

During interviews, community members also cited many non-traditional\(^\text{20}\) means through which they learn about and connect to their past. Some community members said they

---

\(^{20}\) Although some of these activities encompass what could be considered traditional activities, most of the community members I spoke with indicated that they felt they were non-traditional.
Plate 32: Ikaahuk Archaeology Project team member, Katie Kotar, participating in the harpoon throw contest at the Sachs Harbour Canada Day celebrations, 2014.

learn about their history through research and reading books about the Inuvialuit or Inuit. Many people said that art was an important link to the past for them. Some people said drawing and writing helped them connect to the land, oral histories, and their heritage. One art form that many community members practice to connect to the past is photography (Plate 31). Betty Raddi-Haogak (personal communication, June 13, 2014) told me:

Yeah. When I lived in Tuk. I was born in Tuk. In my mind the memory I always like to this day is canoes because in Tuk there is a harbour. Like a
little bay, a harbour. It was all filled with canoes. And people use them to fish and to hunt and to go get fresh water from the creek we call Water Creek. So I would always go with my uncles to get water in buckets because we had no running water and those boats are just like a precious memory for me. Yeah, so to this day I will take pictures of any canoes like that. And I took a picture, it’s on Facebook, it’s of Tuk’s harbour. That same spot but this time it has those metal boats. Yeah, but it is not the same but I still like the sight of that harbor ’cause my grandparents lived just across the harbour. There’s the harbour, there’s the main road and then their house is just over here.

Plate 33: Community member taking photos, 2014.

The internet is also a popular way that community members connect to the past. Many said that Facebook in particular was a good way that they connect with their heritage. Through Facebook, community members can connect with relatives living throughout the ISR and share photos of traditional activities or historic photos of their ancestors. They also said that visiting and posting on Facebook pages, such as NT Hunting Stories of the Day, Our Elders of the North, and different sewing pages, provides an avenue for them to express their traditions.
4.2 Challenges in Passing Down Traditional Knowledge

The community identified many challenges that they currently face in terms of passing down historical and traditional knowledge. The following section discusses the most prominent social and environmental factors that community members related. Community members believe they will adapt to these challenges, however, and continue to pass down their knowledge.

4.2.1 Social Factors

Community members identified many social factors that create barriers for knowledge transmission. Many of these social factors are rooted in colonialism. Transgenerational trauma, education systems, community diversity, the wage-based economy, and southern influences were the major challenges community members shared.

Between the 1850s and the 1990s, Indigenous children all over Canada were taken from their families and communities to attend residential schools. Under the guise of educating Indigenous children from dispersed, remote communities, these schools were developed to isolate children from their families and assimilate them into mainstream Canadian culture. As part of larger government assimilation policies, an amendment was made to the Indian Act in 1920 that made it mandatory for Indigenous children to attend either residential schools or day schools if they were nearby. If parents tried to keep their children in their community they were incarcerated or forced to pay a fine, which was often beyond their economic means (Blackstock and Tromé 2005: 14). Mandatory attendance for Inuit children came later but Family Allowance would only be paid if children attended school and was used to persuade Inuit parents to send their children to residential schools. While attending these schools, children were encouraged to abandon their language, culture, and spirituality. Government policy mandated that children only speak English or French while attending residential schools, and be taught Euro-Canadian ways and Christian religious practices (Barnes et al. 2006: 20). Many schools were underfunded and relied on the unpaid and involuntary labour of the students to complete tasks such as housekeeping, and general maintenance.
Barnes et al. (2006) recognize that while attending residential schools, children were placed in potentially harmful psychological situations, such as separation from their parents, becoming immersed in a new culture, having to learn a new language, and the deterioration of their language and cultural knowledge. The racist attitudes of school staff and the countless acts of mental, physical, and sexual abuse carried out by staff against students further contributed to these psychologically harmful situations. Many children left residential schools with mental health issues and little knowledge of their language and culture. The devastating effects of the residential school system are still felt today by the people who attended them, their families, and their communities. The trauma of residential schools has manifested across generations within Indigenous communities through domestic abuse, violence, depression, anxiety, addiction issues, and the loss of language and culture. Furthermore, the structure of federal and provincial services provides inadequate health care and addiction services to Indigenous communities, which hinders the healing process. Moreover, the loss of culture within many communities caused by the residential school system has meant a loss of traditional healing practices.

During the residential school era, the Canadian federal government operated 139 residential schools. This number does not count the provincial and church-run residential schools, for which there is no recorded number at this time. Many residential schools, including one that children from Sachs Harbour attended, were transferred among church, provincial, and federal administrations during their operation. The last federally operated school closed in 1996. That same year, the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was released, which recommended a public investigation into the violence and abuses at residential schools. In 2006, the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement was approved by the “legal counsel for former students, legal counsel for the Churches, the Assembly of First Nations, other Aboriginal organizations and the Government of Canada” (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada 2015). In 2008, Prime Minister Stephen Harper issued a statement of apology to former residential school students. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established in 2008 to create an historic record of the residential school system, and released its final report in 2015 (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada 2015).
Children from Sachs Harbour were taken out of the community to attend residential schools. In some cases they did not return to the community for years. They were initially sent to Aklavik to attend the Roman Catholic residential school built in 1925. The Anglican Church began operating a day school in Aklavik in 1919 and opened the St. Jon’s Eskimo Residential School at Shingle Point in 1929. The Anglican All Saints Eskimo and Indian Residential School opened in Aklavik in 1936. The residential schools in Aklavik were relocated to Inuvik in 1959. The Anglican school was then named Stringer Hall and ran until 1975. The Roman Catholic school was named Grollier Hall and was closed in 1997 (Kolausok 2003: 195-201).

Many children from Sachs Harbour had a difficult time adjusting to the residential schools, and many dropped out. Families would make sure that children were away on the trap line when government officials came to bring children to the residential schools. While attending the schools, some children tried to run away, risking freezing to death in the winter. Sachs Harbour community members reported various forms of mental, physical, and sexual abuse that occurred at these schools. Four Grollier Hall staff members were eventually charged and convicted of sexually abusing children at the school from 1959-1979. After an out-of-court settlement in 2002, the Government of Canada and the Catholic Church apologized to the victims from Grollier Hall (Kolausok 2003: 201; Sylvia n.d.).

Many community members stated that they or their parents or grandparents lost considerable traditional knowledge while attending residential schools. Those who attended said they lost much of their knowledge of Inuvialuktun and upon returning to Sachs Harbour, community members “made fun of them” for their lack of language, which discouraged them from trying to speak it. Those who attended residential schools, therefore, were not able to pass down traditional knowledge and Inuvialuktun to their children. Beverly Amos (personal communication, September 17, 2014) recalls what it was like when children returned from residential school:

I never went to public school until I was about ten years old. I lived with my parents in Sachs and got educated from Elders and Adults, my parents and
Sachs. When all of the other kids went to school for ten months, I stayed home. And that is how I know a little bit about my language. Because the other kids left when they were five or six. Never saw them all winter. And as they got older, especially the older ones, when they came back they were like strangers. They were not talking Inuvialuktun anymore and they were acting different; acting kind of like white people.

The loss of knowledge resulting from the residential school system is currently becoming evident in new ways as the Elders, who did not attend residential schools and therefore hold strong knowledge of their language and culture, are passing away. Community members often commented on how concerning it is that there are not many Elders left who lived in the “old ways,” so opportunities for them to share their knowledge with younger generations are becoming fewer and fewer. Furthermore, as more Elders pass away, it is harder for living Elders to recall their knowledge, as they have fewer people to reminisce with. During an interview, Elder Edith Haogak commented on how it was hard for her to remember Inuvialuktun place names because she had no one to talk to about them anymore.

Community members also talked about the psychological impact residential schools have had on those who attended them, and how this is transferred to the next generation, causing mental health and addiction issues across generations. Community members regard these effects as a barrier for passing down traditional knowledge as they make communicating with family members and travelling on the land difficult.

Presently, the community has limited mental health services in the form of fly-in counsellors and the NWT Helpline, a mental health hotline. Community members explained that the fly-in counsellors are not always able to make it to the community because of flight cancelations and delays or schedule changes, so their visits to the community can be erratic. Additionally, proper treatment for addictions has to be sought in Yellowknife, so community members must leave the community and the support of their families to seek treatment. Community members have asserted their concerns over access to mental health services, but these concerns have yet to be properly addressed by
the government. For example, in the summer of 2014, the territorial Minister of Health and Social Services arrived in Sachs Harbour on a chartered flight to hold a community meeting discussing the proposed structural changes for the health and social services system. During fieldwork I attended many community meetings, none of which had a community turnout as high as this one. Throughout the meeting it became clear that many community members attended mainly to inquire about mental health services. The presentation acknowledged community concerns over access to mental health services, stating that the initiative to address the concerns is the NWT Helpline. Community members repeatedly questioned the minister about getting a live-in counsellor for the community and stressed the need for better mental health services but were told such help was not in the budget. The minister’s replies, which more often than not talked around the questions, showcased his “real politician” personality that community members had warned me about prior to the meeting. After the meeting finished, he had his photo taken with an Elder who had not actually attended the meeting, which was later published in the regional newspaper. Community members left the meeting feeling unheard and frustrated.

The impact that this transgenerational trauma from the residential schools has had on the community cannot be properly expressed in this dissertation. The residential school system caused a loss of Inuvialuit knowledge and language. The resulting mental health issues continue to impede the transfer of cultural knowledge to younger generations. By not providing adequate mental health services to the community, the government continues to operate a system that works to disenfranchise the people of Sachs Harbour and their cultural and traditional knowledge.

In the 1960s, the people of Sachs Harbour lobbied to have a school built in the community because they acknowledged the importance of educating their children in an increasingly globalized world, but they wanted to keep their children in the community so they could also learn to be Inuvialuit. The school opened in 1968. Initially the school only went to grade six so children had to go to Inuvik to attend residential school if they
wanted to finish their education. Presently, the Inualthuyak School (Plate 34) goes to grade nine, so children still have to move out of the community to finish high school at East Three Secondary in Inuvik. The present system still impacts the way knowledge is passed down in the community in a number of ways. Having to attend school during the day in Sachs Harbour means less time spent on the land. Families cannot travel far or for extended time periods because they have to be close to town, which greatly decreases opportunities to learn traditional practices and exchange stories or cultural knowledge of the land. This situation is made worse when children have to leave the community to attend high school.

In Sachs Harbour children have Inuvialuktun lessons, where they are also taught sewing and traditional games and told stories. Once they are in high school, students can continue Inuvialuktun and are required to take Northern Studies 10. Doreen Carpenter (personal communication, September 9, 2014) describes what was taught in the Inuvialuktun class in Sachs Harbour when she was a girl:

> We also had sewing and sometimes we would have someone come in and work on different projects. And always Inuvialuktun. But other than that they told stories, too, about long ago. As far as I know, we have always had that.

Community members recognize the importance of having the Inuvialuktun classes in Sachs Harbour:

> Oh yes. Very important. So I am glad they have Inuvialuktun teachers in our schools. Yeah. When I went to Grollier Hall in Inuvik I had to take French. There was no other choice. And I didn’t know any better back then too. So I learned a little bit of French. Not much. Now you have a choice. And things

---

21 Named after an Elder from Banks Island.

22 Children who are lucky have the opportunity to stay with family Inuvik. Other children are placed in homes with strangers, and there have been cases where the guardians neglect or abuse the children who stay with them. In these cases children often drop out of school to return to their community.
are so different now (Bridget Wolki, personal communication, August 14, 2014).


Despite the importance of having Inuvialuktun classes, community members identified a number of challenges with having Inuvialuktun taught in school. Many community members think that the language and traditional knowledge should be taught at home; they believe that these teachings will not be retained by children who only learn it at school. This line of thinking is still problematic because many parents are not fluent in their language as a result of attending residential schools. The primary concern, however, was that with such a small number of students in the school, only one dialect of Inuvialuktun can be taught. As mentioned earlier, Sachs Harbour is often regarded as a Sıglıtı̨n-speaking town despite the many Inuinnaqtun-speaking community members; therefore, Sıglıtı̨n is the dialect taught in school. Many parents felt frustrated that their dialect was not being taught. Older generations who were taught Inuvialuktun in school said they found it difficult learning a different dialect from that spoken at home and because of the confusion found it easier not to continue learning it (Table 1). However,
younger generations stated that they were happy to be learning any dialect because they see Inuvialuktun as a dying language. The UNESCO Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger lists Siglitun and Uummarmiutun as “severely endangered” and Inuinnaqtun as “definitely endangered.”

Table 1: The three dialects on Inuvialuktun (Inuvialuit Regional Corporation 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uummarmiutun</th>
<th>Siglitun</th>
<th>Kangiryuarmiutun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>Aatituu</td>
<td>Aaqana</td>
<td>Haluqqagin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodbye</td>
<td>Ilaatnilu</td>
<td>Ilannilu</td>
<td>Ilaanilu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Morning</td>
<td>Uvlaami</td>
<td>Ublaami</td>
<td>Ublaami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank You</td>
<td>Quyanainni</td>
<td>Quana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re Welcome</td>
<td>Amiunniin</td>
<td>Amiunniin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Are You?</td>
<td>Qanuqitpit?</td>
<td>Qanuritpit?</td>
<td>Qanuritpin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m Fine</td>
<td>Nakuyungua</td>
<td>Nakuyungua</td>
<td>Nammaktunga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>Hii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Naagga</td>
<td>Naagga</td>
<td>Imannaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s All!</td>
<td>Taima!</td>
<td>Taima!</td>
<td>Taima!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community members stated that cultural diversity within the community also affects how traditional knowledge is passed down. Roger Kuptana (personal communication, September 2, 2014) explained divisions within the community based on cultural background:

There’s a lot of different groups that settled on the island. Like there’s Kangiryuarmiut, from Holman, or Victoria Island, Siglit from Tuk and that area, and Uummarmiut, which is the Delta. I think in some ways, because of the clans, there is probably a little bit of animosity towards each other because of, I guess it’s like any other place. It’s no different from the Middle East or anywhere else…. It’s different, yeah. Whereas if you go to Holman [Ulukhaktok] you don’t see that ’cause everybody is the same. You just don’t see it. Here you see it a little bit, the barriers, once you get off the plane.
One community member (personal communication, 2014) indicated that on occasion the cultural diversity makes teaching traditional activities difficult:

Well, I have seen [cultural diversity] cause trouble with some people that sort of try to stick to “We do it this way” and other people do it this way and I don’t. I just say work together. But I see it. I do see it in some people that are stubborn and they want to separate even their way of speaking compared to, “You’re not, you don’t have our dialect. Our dialect is this.” It’s just . . . I don’t understand that. Or even dances. Like drum dancing. “You are not teaching them the right way. That’s not our way.” We don’t really have a way because we never had it here. Yeah, I see it.

Some Ikaahukmiut cited cultural diversity as a reason they believe their culture is not as strong as it is in some other communities within the ISR. Although cultural diversity causes challenges for passing down traditional knowledge within the community, over time these cultural differences have become less important to community members. Roger Kuptana (personal communication, September 2, 2014) explained:

Well, they see themselves as a whole Inuvialuit but the differences aren’t so big as they were before, but they are still in there, you know. It’s something that takes a long time to get rid of, you know. It’s probably going to take another generation or two anyway to get things that much better. I see it going away slowly as time goes by, but it is still there.

Many of the younger generations see themselves as Inuvialuit rather than Inuinnaqt or Siglit, and identify as being from Sachs Harbour, without a strong cultural connection to where their parents, or grandparents originated.

Community members also feel that money greatly hinders the passing down of traditional knowledge in various ways. The introduction of the wage-based economy means that community members have to work every day, which means having to stay in town, which in turn reduces the amount of time spent on the land and taking part in traditional activities. Community members still find time to go out on the land to hunt after work
and on the weekends, but they can neither travel as far as they would like nor stay out on the land as long as they would like. They must stay closer to town and for shorter periods because they have to return to work in town. Many community members suggested that traveling on the land has also become too expensive as the costs of traveling increase annually. David Haogak (personal communication, September 16, 2014) commented:

Price of everything went up. Gas and shells and food just to go out there. You can’t go out there with nothing. Even your equipment is way... it costs way more than it used to. Like you used to get a Ski-Doo for, a brand-new one, for five thousand. Now you are looking at fifteen thousand. It’s just... it’s almost only the well-off people can do it.

Some people also find that the costs of going out hunting can be too much considering that they may not harvest anything:

It costs a lot of money just to go somewhere and try and get a caribou. The chances of getting caribou are pretty slim. So, people get... after a while people get discouraged from trying to do stuff because it costs so much and you try so hard and there is no return (Lawrence Amos, personal communication, September 17, 2014).

Despite programs intended to help offset these costs, such as the Harvester’s Assistance Program, the cost of equipment and supplies for hunting is too much for some community members. There are few economic opportunities for residents of Sachs Harbour. There are only a handful of permanent full-time positions in the town, making steady employment hard to come by. Additionally, the high costs of food23 and housing mean there is very little “disposable” income for families to spend on hunting and camping equipment:

23 For example, during my 2013 fieldwork I paid over $20 for a 2.5 kg bag of flour, which costs $4.99 in London Ontario.
And the good thing about now is if you have a four-wheeler you can go anywhere. And not everybody can afford to do that. If you are living just to get by you can’t afford to buy those ten thousand dollar equipment to go out. Especially if most of your money if you work goes to housing too (Beverly Amos, September 17, 2014).

In recent years there has also been decreased funding for community activities that foster the exchange of cultural, historical, and traditional knowledge. Employees of the recreation department discuss how they have not been able to hold culture camps in recent years because of the lack of funding and the high costs of travelling the land:

It’s hard for travel. It’s always an issue for getting kids from town to camp because there are so many insurance and policies and stuff. A lot of people don’t have insurance on their bikes and things and the rental is crazy. Sometimes the rental fees they’re asking for and the distance you have to go. So it is mostly volunteer. Like we will have this camp if you volunteer to take your kid out there or get someone else to take them out there so we are not liable for the travel, right? But we always have to have sort of an emergency thing. Like if the kids are out there and something happens (Doreen Carpenter, personal communication, September 9, 2014).

For the last two years there has been no culture camp because the funding is so limited through Community Corp and each year they ask us, “Is it going to happen?” and they feel sorry because I say no and then they ask me why and I don’t really want to say because we have limited funding. We just can’t afford it is my response (Kyle Donovan, personal communication, September 1, 2014).

Through lack of funding, high living expenses, and the increasing cost of hunting and travelling the land, the wage-based economy has created many barriers for knowledge transmission.
Another challenge for passing down traditional knowledge cited by many community members is a lack of commitment and interest on the part of the younger generations. For example, Kyle Wolki (personal communication, June 18, 2016) alluded to the lack of commitment in adult volunteer teachers and the lack of students in the adult language classes being offered in Sachs:

There’s like… people here don’t really make an effort really. ’Cause we have… Community Corp has like a language course or whatever. They will pay an Elder or whoever knows the language to teach two people and all they do is sit around and they could just talk about the words they know. They don’t even have to be best at the language or know everything, but they’ll just talk about the stuff that they know, and that person will get paid but no one is doing it. And that has been around since December at least, there has been something like that. I haven’t heard of anyone doing it yet. Even once.

Other community members mentioned that adult Inuvialuktun classes had been held at one point but no one was showing up for them, so the program was cancelled. Many community members said that they think technology is partly responsible for people’s lack of interest and commitment:

I think there is always a constant force pulling your traditional knowledge. You know, the Elders want to teach the next generation but then you’ve got today’s world, the electronics. So, the youth is, you know . . . I see that lots. It’s just a constant teach or a constant telling the youth and the young people about the hunting and the trapping, and the ways of our life long ago (Norm Anikina, personal communication, September 5, 2014).

Well, it’s so different nowadays because the young generation, they’re all caught up with technology. Like they all have computers. They all have iPads, iPods. And then they start learning, teaching them in school how to use a computer. When I was growing up, a teenager, we didn’t have anything like that (Trevor Lucas, August 29, 2014).
4.2.2 Climate and Environmental Changes

Community members reported many significant changes to their environment and local animal populations in recent decades. Many of these changes are the result of climate change, while some are the effects of other environmental processes. The community’s knowledge of environmental changes is the product of their history of land use and occupancy, their current land use, and their personal experiences and histories (Riedlinger 2001). These changes are creating challenges for participating in activities that allow people to connect to the past and pass down historical and traditional knowledge.

Climate change is a real concern for people living on Banks Island. Community members have recognized larger changes to seasonal weather patterns while daily weather is becoming harder to predict. Community members are finding that the summers are longer and hotter, with shorter spring and fall seasons. There is an increase in summer storms, which are also becoming more severe. The winters are also warmer. Community members report that there are no longer many days in the winter that are colder than -30°C, which was the norm in the past. Joe Kudlak (personal communication, August 20, 2014) explained:

"Yeah, well, before we were used to, we used to be able to predict, you know, weather for a few days and . . . but now we can’t anymore ’cause it fluctuates so much. And it’s too warm. We used to get up to fifty or sixty below, when I first moved here, but now it’s . . . you are lucky to get one month of forty below and the rest of the time it’s only thirty, thirty-five below."

More hot summer days, increased rainfall, and overall warmer temperatures are causing the active layer of permafrost, which melts every year, to thaw earlier and faster. Furthermore, the active permafrost layer is now thicker than it used to be (Riedlinger 2001). These changes are contributing to an increase in coastal and inland erosion (Plates 35 - 36). Thaw slumping on hillsides and lake edges is also more extensive as a result of this erosion (Riedlinger 2001). David Haogak (personal communication, September 16, 2014) described some of the erosion he has witnessed:
There is more rain in the fall but even now [in the summer] it is a lot of slumping. The ocean is rising. There are some lakes that are disappearing, just going into the ocean. There’s no more sand spit across the community. It’s, it’s an island now. It used to be one long sand spit but now you can drive a boat through two different places. There used to be an island where the sand spit ends and it’s gone. I see the barge go right through there. It used to have to go right by the shore.

Plate 35: Erosion at Angus Lake, 2014.
Perhaps the most significant changes to the environment are those pertaining to sea ice. Residents report that the breakup of sea ice in the spring is happening earlier, and the freeze-up in the fall is later. There is less multiyear and annual sea ice and there is a lack of land-fast ice and ice floes during the summer. Older community members often recalled dogsled races on the sea ice as part of their Canada Day celebrations. At the 2014 Canada Day celebration I attended there was no sea ice in the harbour, which community members say is now the norm for that time of year. Multiyear ice is thinner and community members find the ice is less predictable, making travelling more difficult. In the winter and spring there is more open water.

Below are excerpts from interviews in which community members discussed the impacts climate change has had on taking part in traditional activities and the passing down of knowledge:

And springtime comes earlier…. So it changes our hunting patterns. Like for geese hunting. You can’t pick eggs because the rivers are running already.
Can’t cross the rivers (Betty Raddi-Haogak, personal communication, July 13, 2014).

It, I know [climate change] is changing life today. People who usually predict the weather, they can’t do it anymore because it changes so fast and it is warmer longer, so that’s . . . it’ll change the culture and the way we do things every season, every year. It is changing. When you are hunting for food in the winter, sometimes you miss out because it got too warm and the snow melted and stuff like that. So, if we don’t watch it carefully to get your food, you are just going to have to eat chicken or something all the time. And I think our geese taste better plus they are fresh and they are not forced-fed. You know it is better for us if you want to have a healthy community. Food you can afford to eat and that you like to eat. Because all of our kids still like the food, eh (Beverly Amos, personal communication, September 17, 2014).

People hunt. Yeah. You can’t go far out on the land now. You can’t even on ice or on land. There’s people that got stuck out on the land. Had to get helicopter rescued when they were hunting geese. They left with thinking they got a few days and boom the melt was so fast they got stuck and they couldn’t make it back to the community, they couldn’t cross the rivers. We had to get a helicopter to rescue one family. You can’t go on the ice. You can’t predict the ice anymore. You can’t go far anymore. It’s just so, so much wind now. It breaks up so fast (David Haogak, personal communication, September 16, 2014).

Yeah, [climate change] will [effect how we pass down our heritage]. They can’t go, they can’t go to the same spots they used to go. They could but not during the right time of season to go there. Some places you only go for fishing and you only go there in the springtime (David Haogak, personal communication, September 16, 2014).

It’s different from a long . . . like it stays warmer longer. We don’t have ice, so that is a big difference. Like when I was younger our ice never left. We
always had the icepack out there. And you could always see big icebergs floating around. You don’t see those anymore. So it brings a lot of the waves and the land erosion. Yeah. So it is different. We don’t go out hunting, sealing anymore because the water doesn’t calm right down. With the ice there, it used to be calm, but with no ice, it’s steady waves so I have barely seen anyone hunting seals this summer. Not doing anything. And it’s . . . you can go further with bikes than you could long ago. With snowmobiles. So, it’s different how we hunt. We never used to be able to hunt with bikes (Doreen Carpenter, personal communication, September 9, 2014).

Eventually it [climate change] will [affect how we pass down our heritage] because of the changing land. There’s . . . from the . . . you can't camp certain places anymore ’cause now they're eroding away, there are big mud holes (Earl Esau, personal communication, August 27, 2014).

Unpredictable weather, changes in weather patterns, and changes in the land and sea ice (Plate 37) have made hunting more difficult than it was in the past. In some cases traditional knowledge of the land and weather has not been as useful because of these changes.

There are other environmental changes that the community has witnessed. Most notable are the fluctuating muskox and caribou populations. Scientists originally believed that muskox and caribou populations on the island were discrete; however, Inuvialuit knowledge has long recognized patterns of interrelation and avoidance between the two species (Nagy 2004: 93). Nagy (2004) points out that Inuvialuit oral tradition indicates that if the muskox population increases then the caribou will disappear. In the first half of the twentieth century, the muskox population on Banks Island was considered endangered, and despite warnings from local Inuvialuit, conservation laws were put in place in the 1970s that forbade them from hunting muskox on the island (Nagy 2004). As predicted by the Inuvialuit, the muskox population increased tremendously and the caribou abandoned the island in the 1980s. Nagy states that it is likely that the Inuvialuit tried to keep the muskox population low to keep the caribou population steady.
Community members stated that when the caribou population first declined it was hard to adjust. Some community members prefer caribou meat to muskox, and stated that they never really ate muskox until the caribou declined. In fact, many community members had never seen muskox until their numbers began to increase. Community members recalled the first time they saw a muskox:

We had lots of caribou and we ate mostly caribou. I remember seeing my first muskox…. I think it was when I must have been fourteen or so. It was at the forks [north east of Sachs Harbour] we were. So we went and shot a couple. First time I ate muskox. First time I had ever seen muskox (Earl Esau, personal communication, August 27, 2014).

No muskox that time. When I first start remembering, I never see muskox…. I never know about muskox…. It’s really strange how much they look like that. The first time, when I was, when I see a muskox I was so scared (Jean Harry, personal communication, June 15, 2015).

Plate 37: Early sea ice break up in Sachs Harbour, spring 2015.
There is a sentiment among community members that caribou is special to their identity and culture. Consuming caribou is seen as an integral part of being Inuvialuit and having a higher caribou population and a lower muskox population is seen as the norm. Although community members are grateful for the consumption of muskox and highly respect the animal, the consumption of muskox meat and their high numbers was expressed as something community members had to “get used to”; however, community members adapted to the changes and in some cases used them to their benefit. When muskox populations were at their highest community members took part in a commercial muskox harvest, which was phased out in the 2010s. Additionally, some women in the community learned to spin and knit qiviut (musk ox wool). The Banks Island musk ox population is currently declining. Recently many muskox have died from erysipelas bacteria. Conversely, the caribou population is now on the rise. The fluctuating populations can put stress on the community as caribou and muskox provide a major part of their diet.

### 4.2.3 Community Strategies for Coping with Challenges

Although community members often express concern over the current state of knowledge transmission within the community, they are confident that they will overcome the challenges discussed above and continue to pass down their historical, traditional, and cultural knowledge. On a larger scale, many community members feel that the IFA and the IRC do a good job of protecting their heritage, knowledge, and land. Through the IFA and the IRC the Inuvialuit have greater control over their children’s education and they are able to ensure that Inuvialuit history and language are taught in school. The IRC also provides many cultural and language programs and resources through the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre. Inuvialuit land and resources are protected under the IFA to ensure that animal populations remain healthy and community members can continue to participate in traditional activities on the land.

However, some community members pointed out that although they are happy to have larger scale initiatives protecting their culture and heritage, the challenges should be overcome on a smaller scale. A few community members even mentioned that the IFA
hindered advancement in some ways. To them, the agreement provides too much in the way of social services and has taken away people’s independence. This attitude is demonstrated in the following excerpt from an interview with Roger Kuptana (personal communication, September 2, 2014):

**Roger:** I think the Inuvialuit settlement tries a lot to inform people of the past but I think really when you come down to it I don’t really know how good the settlement is. People here think they are getting ahead on paper, but every day, day-to-day living, I don’t see them any further ahead than they were before signing the agreement. In fact, it could be worse. People were better off fifty years ago than they are now.

**Laura:** Why do you think that is?

**Roger:** Well, people were trapping, hunting and trapping and working for themselves. They felt a lot better. Now they’re . . . it seems like they have no more motivation to do anything because they are not getting anywhere.

**Laura:** So you think it provides too much, maybe?

**Roger:** It could be, yeah. Also, nowadays you could see where people, some people’s attitude is, “How much can I get out of this deal?” rather than “How can I work towards bettering things?” You know. “How much can I take?” Let’s put it that way.

Many community members felt that language revitalization and knowledge transmission needs to start at home and the gap between Elders and youth needs to be closed.

With respect to environmental changes, community members feel that their ancestors had always adapted to their environment and that they will, too. After all, survival has always been a part of the Inuvialuit way of life. Berkes and Jolly (2001) investigated Inuvialuit adaptations to climate change and noted several strategies that the Sachs Harbour community members outlined for adapting. These included becoming more aware of new
safety hazards, adjusting travel routes and times for hunting, and monitoring weather and ice conditions more closely.

The key to considering how the community will overcome these challenges is understanding that Inuvialuit knowledge is not simply content. Inuvialuit knowledge, like all other forms of knowledge, is a process (Berkes 2009), whereby it adapts to challenges and integrates new information. As will be discussed further in Chapter 5, the some community members believe that archaeological knowledge can contribute to Inuvialuit knowledge of the past to help overcome some of these challenges.

4.3 Community Knowledge and Archaeology

My research worked to understand how archaeological knowledge could best complement Inuvialuit understandings of the past. To answer this question I focused on trying to better understand Inuvialuit historicity, which I outlined above and in Chapter 3. I also focused on recording various aspects of community knowledge.

Throughout my fieldwork I recorded the locations of archaeological sites identified by community members; knowledge of artifacts excavated from Banks Island; oral histories; and traditional land use. Community members identified many unrecorded archaeological sites on Banks Island and confirmed that there are sites located throughout the island.24 As stated previously in Chapter 3, archaeologists have only surveyed limited areas of Banks Island and this limitation leads to biased interpretations of Banks Island’s past. Confirming that there are sites located elsewhere on the island shows how incomplete current archaeological understandings of the island are and may indicate that the dominant archaeological narrative that states Banks Island has been alternately occupied and abandoned over the last 4500 years is flawed, and that some of the proposed periods of abandonment have been over-exaggerated. Further archaeological survey is needed on the island to learn what time periods these sites are from.

24 A few community members expressed concern over revealing the locations of these sites, therefore I have not included that information in this dissertation.
The 2014 excavation of OkRn-1 produced approximately 400 artifacts. In 2015, I brought up a sample of unidentified artifacts from the excavation. Elder Edith Haogak helped to identify five of these artifacts and offered possible suggestions for a few others (Appendix A). Perhaps the most interesting of her identifications was artifact OkRn-1: 1315, which she identified as part of a toy sled. Another community member stated that these toys are still sometimes made in the community and can be used to teach children how to tie knots. Edith was also able to confirm some of the IAP team’s tentative identifications.

The Agvik excavation also produced 94 slate uluit and ulu fragments and 44 pieces of unworked slate. These objects formed an unusually large proportion of the artifact assemblage (more than 20%) so in 2015, I brought a sample of the uluit to Sachs Harbour to gain community input on their interpretation and record community knowledge of uluit (Appendix B). When Edith Haogak examined the uluit she identified one as a knife blade rather than an ulu. She also pointed out that there was caribou hair on one as well, and warned me to avoid cleaning it. She stated that she used slate uluit with a piece of hide as a handle when she was a small girl. She remembered how she and her mother would search for the right kind of rocks to make uluit from. She stated that these rocks could be found at Nelson Head and Mercy Bay. She also talked of how they would sometimes find copper on the land and make uluit from it. She said that they mostly found it on Victoria Island but sometimes found small quantities on Banks Island. She said when they started to have more access to European goods they began making uluit out of the lids of tin cans because they were very sharp. Similarly, many community members said that people used to make uluit out of old saws.

Community members who engaged with the uluit from Agvik found them especially interesting because they still use uluit today. Charleton Haogak (personal communication, June 18, 2015) stated that uluit are the most important tool the Inuvialuit have and many find them iconic of their culture. Uluit have sentimental value and are often passed down within families and given as wedding presents. Women showed a lot of pride when they showed me their uluit. Women usually have multiple uluit of different sizes for different tasks. Larger uluit are used for working on larger animals and smaller uluit for smaller
animals. Sewing requires the smallest uluit. I was also told that in some cases a duller ulu is needed. Community members gave suggestions of what each archaeological ulu was used for. These community members also stated that there are different styles of uluit used in different parts of the Arctic (see Appendix B). The information that community members gave me about uluit could be beneficial to archaeological interpretations because it gives a clearer idea of where materials were gathered, how uluit were made, and possible uses of different sized uluit. Additionally, many community members were pleased that they were able to engage with the artifacts and share their knowledge of them.

During interviews I also recorded traditional place names (Appendix C), traditional land use, and oral histories. Traditional place names and land use knowledge has provided the IAP team with information about where sites could be located, the seasonality of those sites, and possible activities that would have taken place there. Oral histories have provided us with undocumented histories of the island and better context for our interpretations. This information is being built into a Google Map, which will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Recording community knowledge was important because it involved local people in the research process and built bridges with community members. It also provided me and other archaeologists with context and interpretations that we would not have had access to otherwise. Community knowledge clearly benefits archaeologists in countless ways. However, in order for the application of community knowledge to archaeological projects to be useful to the community, research results have to be disseminated to them in meaningful ways. Without proper dissemination, the exchange of knowledge is only going one way and it could be argued that archaeologists are continuing to take advantage of local people and their heritage for their own gain. Although being able to engage with artifacts and share historical knowledge can provide personal or emotional benefits to community members, the potential lasting benefits of their participation are not being fulfilled unless the information they provide and the interpretations that they help develop make their way back to the community.
Ultimately, this aspect of my project has focused on applying community knowledge to archaeological interpretations and privileges archaeological research questions. Although this application is meaningful and interesting to community members, attention should be drawn to ways archaeological knowledge and Inuvialuit knowledge can be brought together more evenly—especially aspects of Inuvialuit historicity other than oral histories and traditional knowledge.

Other ways of knowing and learning about the past can be difficult to understand within the Western academic understanding of history because they are not discrete forms of knowledge that can be picked apart to have information extracted from them. However, these are important aspects of Inuvialuit historicity, and if Western academics want to make meaningful connections and collaborate with a community, they need to be understood and respected in their own right as viable understandings of the past. They need to be seen as more than traditional or heritage practices. They need to be seen as a concrete way of passing down historical knowledge.

Re-examining Western academic knowledge can contribute to this end. Some archaeologists have conceptualized a dichotomy of Indigenous knowledge and archaeological knowledge (e.g. McGhee 2008). Wilcox (2010) points out that this dichotomy is both counter-productive and inaccurate. It misrepresents both Indigenous and archaeological knowledges as homogenous and static, when in fact both bodies of knowledge are adaptive and heterogeneous, encompassing many different understandings. The two are also not mutually exclusive. I previously stated that Western academics mostly study the past intellectually and know the past in their minds. This statement actually over simplifies Western academics and their knowledge. It is more productive to say that within an academic forum Western academics primarily convey their understandings intellectually through things like lectures and publications. Learning about and knowing the past through doing is a common practice, which many Western academics probably engage in. This element of academic knowledge is likely overlooked because within Western academia there tends to be a dichotomy of history versus heritage. History is often understood as accounts of events that happened in the past, which can be studied to find the truth of the past. Heritage is things (structures, ideas,
songs, etc.) from the past, which are valued enough to save for future generations (Heritage Perth 2016). This dichotomy separates what some academics believe to be real (history) and what they believe to be influenced by nationalism, identity, or sentiment (heritage) (Lowenthal 1998; Seixas 2013). Because of the personal nature of learning and knowing the past through doing, it would be considered heritage within this framework. However, this dichotomy does not really reflect Indigenous understandings of the past, or even Western ones for that matter. It is now widely thought by post-modernist theorists that all understandings of the past are socially constructed (Latour 1993); therefore the distinction between history and heritage is not necessarily useful. In fact, it limits our understandings of the past.

When I first went to Sachs Harbour in 2013, I was struck by all of the talented seamstresses. I became even more interested in sewing within the community when people told me that they learned about the past through sewing. My Hungarian grandmother was a fantastic seamstress. She learned how to sew at a young age and throughout her life she had many jobs, including being a seamstress in a Toronto factory and a sewing machine consultant at Eaton’s. Unfortunately, her skills were not genetic. Despite loving it, I am terrible at sewing. My grandmother taught me some of the basics when I was younger, along with embroidery. Although she was probably extremely frustrated during these times, these are some of my favourite memories of her. These lessons were often accompanied by stories about her family and accounts of my family history. It was always exciting when my grandmother and mother would show me embroidery pieces made by my ancestors. I have never been devoted to sewing but every so often I try a new project (with varying degrees of success). When I do sew, I remember family stories and I feel connected to my grandmother. I know my past in a way that cannot really be described in words. Despite the different context, I also felt this connection while I was being taught Inuvialuit sewing in Sachs Harbour. By reflecting on my own experiences learning about the past outside of academia, I feel I was better able to understand learning and knowing the past through doing among the Ikaahukmiut. Archaeologists need to reflect on how imposed academic divides shape their understandings of what constitutes history, and ultimately to rethink these divides.
For archaeologists to meaningfully apply their knowledge to Inuvialuit understandings of the past, they will need to broaden their understanding of what archaeology is. Archaeological research is traditionally viewed as survey, excavation, and artifact analysis. Factors like ethnographic research, the application of Indigenous knowledge, museum practices, and heritage studies, which were traditionally thought of as outside of the realm of archaeological research are now becoming integral parts of archaeological projects. For example, while working in Cambridge Bay, Griebel (2010) found that simply involving local people in excavation was not a particularly effective way of promoting community engagement in the research. During a series of focus groups with Elders, Griebel (2010: 78) noted “Many elders spoke of the importance of physically recollecting the past, be it through a place, artefacts or the motions of remembering via mnemonics.” He recognized that there might be more effective ways of applying local knowledge to archaeological research and set up a series of projects that broadened what archeology encompasses, including the Qajaq Revitalization Project that involved Elders and youth living on the land and building a traditional qajaq (kayak). The IAP has been working towards this, for example the IAP organized a trip to the PWNHC in 2015. During this trip, community members saw how artifacts were cared for and learned how to make digital replicas of some of the artifacts from Banks Island.

In order to build a community-based archaeology project of Banks Island that effectively uses both archaeological and Inuvialuit understandings of the past, archaeologists need to look past divides within academia. They need to understand that the divide between what is considered “heritage” and what is considered “history” limits our understandings of the past. Additionally, they need to look outside the realm of what has been traditionally considered archaeology to build more inclusive projects that are relevant to descendant communities.
Chapter 5

5 Community Diversity and Establishing a Community-Based Project

Communities are often easily defined by political, ethnic or geographic boundaries and are assumed to have common interests and homogenous value systems. However, upon closer inspection communities are often revealed as complex, multifaceted, and heterogeneous. What people assume to be a single community is often comprised of several communities or sub-communities with fluid memberships. This makes identifying and effectively defining a community difficult, even for people who are part of the community, and raises challenges for community-based research.

Although many social scientists have heavily criticized monolithic understandings of community, this concept remains under-problematicized by most archaeologists. A few archaeologists (Atalay 2012, Pyburn 2009, Zimmerman 2005; Zehra Rzvi 2006) who work on community-based projects have pointed out the difficulties of defining and understanding a community, and the obstacles that diversity within a community can create for community-engagement. Since its inception, a goal for the IAP was to foster community engagement and consultation in its research processes in order to work towards a community-based project. Part of my research encompassed consulting with community members about their experiences with and opinions of previous archaeological work, their opinions of whether archaeological work should be carried out, and if so, to identify areas of interest and how the community would like to be involved in the research. This chapter explores diversity within the Ikaahukmiut community, how this diversity may influence community understandings of the past and archaeology, and the ways researchers applying community-based approaches can account for diversity.

5.1 Defining Community

One of the most problematic aspects of community-based archaeology is that the communities with whom archaeologists work with are poorly defined and understood by
the archaeologists. Sonya Atalay (2012: 90) argues: “CBPR [community-based participatory research] participants need to define, scrutinize, and complicate what we mean by the term community, particularly since critiques of CBPR point to the complex nature of communities and the ways scholars define them.” In particular, Atalay highlights two key questions: *How do we define the word “community”?*; and, *who determines membership and how?*

The term “community” is highly contested and many social theorists have essentially argued that the term is useless. In 1955 Hillery documented 94 different meanings sociologists attributed to the term “community”. With so many different definitions the term is elusive and it is argued that community “has become a common-sense word with no theoretical potential for analytic use” (Baumann 1996). Williams (1976: 14) points out that the problems with the meanings of community are “inextricably bound up with the problems it is used to discuss.” Within any society different social cleavages can be identified, and the dominant society can ascribe community status to any one cleavage that is considered relevant in any one context (Baumann 1996: 23).

Despite these issues, the term “community” is still widely used in social science research. If we want to rehabilitate “community” as an analytical tool, we have to identify what criteria we are using to draw boundaries around people and understand why we are creating those particular boundaries. We need to recognize who that is going to include and perhaps more importantly exclude, and the implications that this will have for our research. With mindful definitions, “community” can still serve as a useful analytical tool for engaging with different groups of people. It is important to be conscious of our broader definitions of community and our more refined definitions of a particular community. I use Atlay’s (2012: 90) definition of community: Community is a “term to refer to a unit of identity that is reinforced through social interactions and characterized by a degree of common identity, shared experiences, and/or geographic proximity.” Among other things, communities can be based around geographic locations, position within an institution or social structure, cultural identity or relationship, and personal group alliances (Atalay 2012: 92).
The way we define the community that we work with will impact the outcomes of our research. It is important to remember that communities that have been defined politically or by the government, may not be the best way to define those that archaeologists are working with. Baumann (1996) points out that political definitions are often used to categorize and control people. In some cases, ethnic minorities, which governments often view as “problems”, are given “community” status by the dominant society to help them govern those minorities. This is something that archaeologists working in colonial/post-colonial situations need to be very cautious of. By using definitions that have been ascribed to a particular group of people by colonial authorities, we may inadvertently perpetuate existing colonial power relationships instead of working towards minimizing them.

Failure to problematize the concept of community can lead to a range of consequences. By incorrectly identifying the stakeholders in a project, archaeologists may employ inappropriate methods or develop projects that have no relevance to the community they are trying to work with. As stated in Chapter 2, archaeological sites and materials mean different things to different people and different communities (Deltou 2009; Zimmerman 2005). By assuming there is only one community, choosing to work with only a single component of a community, or failing to recognize the diversity of a community, an archaeologist can alienate other groups of people. Once we define a community, we are automatically defining who is not part of it, and whose needs will not be addressed through an archaeological project. Archaeologists need to be reflexive and critically aware of the social and political implications of their definitions.

Some archaeologists have suggested letting the people we work with define their community. Asking community members “What is your community made up of?”, “How would you describe your community?”, and “How would you define your community?” (Pyburn 2009). But whose definition do you use? These questions may lead to diverse answers, and unfortunately, in many cases the archaeologist, in collaboration with community members, will ultimately need to navigate through multiple definitions to compose a final definition of the community.
5.2 Diversity within Sachs Harbour

In Chapter 2, I defined the community that I worked with as the Ikaahukmiut community, a diaspora community whose members share a common connection to Banks Island and its past. When trying to understand and define the community I asked community members what they thought it meant to be Inuvialuit and how they would characterize Sachs Harbour. This definition was purposefully broad, so that I could identify diversity in opinions and understandings of archaeological research and how belonging to sub-communities may influence them.

Usually when researchers who work on Banks Island consult with the community, they consult with the Sachs Harbour HTC and the Community Corporation, as these boards are meant to represent the community and its interests. However, some community members who did not participate on the boards told me they felt that the boards did not always communicate with them properly or fully represent them. This highlights the importance of not just consulting with community boards, but the broader community as well, when trying to implement community-based approaches.

Many archaeologists (e.g. Pyburn 2009; Zimmerman 2005; Atalay 2012; Zehra Rizvi 2006) have noted that the communities with whom archaeologists work are often comprised of several smaller communities. Additionally, people can be part of several communities and their membership is often fluid. Many smaller communities can be identified within the Ikaahukmiut community, but as Baumann (1996) discusses, community status can be ascribed to virtually any social cleavage so I had to identify and focus on what I felt were the most relevant to my research project. These interweaving sub-communities are communities based on cultural background, family group, and education and employment background. All of these communities are impacted by generation. Sub-communities based on cultural background are communities of people that identify with the locations where their families originated and the associated cultures (i.e. Inuinnaqt, Siglit, or Uummarmiut) (Plate 38). These sub-communities are more important to older generations, as younger generations more often identify as simply being from Banks Island and see themselves as Inuvialuit. Family-based sub-communities differ from communities based on cultural backgrounds because family-
based sub-communities are based on family ties and have a lot to do with socio-economic status and past inter-family relationships. Young generations often do not find these sub-communities as important, and Elders are respected regardless of their family ties. For the purpose of my work I have also identified sub-communities based on education and employment backgrounds as these greatly impact the way people understand the past and their opinions of archaeological research. Another sub-community can be drawn for people who hold strong traditional beliefs. This community is influenced by generation, as Elders are more likely to hold strong traditional beliefs; family group, because families decide what traditions are being passed on; and educational background, which may influence how people feel about and understand traditional beliefs. Affiliation with these sub-communities often influenced people’s understandings of the past and how people felt about archaeology, their opinions of what should be studied, and whether they wanted to participate in my research or IAP activities.

Plate 38: The first meeting of the Western Inuit and the Copper Inuit on Banks Island. Photo Credit: Mrs. Peter Sydney/Library and Archives Canada/ PA-027690. From left to right: The first five people are unknown. The next are Paul Adam and Old Chiksi [Gerard Siksigaaluk?], and behind them is Susie Tiktalik. Continuing to the right are Fred Carpenter and the next three behind are unknown. Leaning on the sled is Tom Chicksi, and to the first on the right is Susie Tiktalik’s husband (Usher).
Diversity and understandings and opinions of Archaeology

During the consultation aspect of my research I asked community members about their opinions of whether archaeological work should be carried out, and if so, to identify areas of interest and how the community would like to be involved in the research. Responses were not always straightforward; many were complex and could even be considered contradictory. Some responses were influenced by the sub-communities that individuals belonged to, while other responses were simply based on personal interest.

On a few occasions I was told that archaeological research should not be conducted on Banks Island. On the first occasion, I was told this informally. The community member told me that I should go back down south and “tell Ottawa” that archaeologists should not come to Banks Island. Their reasoning was that disturbing sites goes against traditional Inuvialuit teachings not to touch artifacts or disturb old sites because it could cause bad luck, bad weather, bad dreams, or even illness. This community member declined to do a formal interview. On the second occasion, Charleton Haogak (personal communication, June 18, 2015) told me as well that it goes against what he was taught by Elders. He also mentioned that his Elders already taught him their history so archaeology was not needed. On another occasion, a community member, who at times was supportive of the IAP, stated, “The way I see it too, you know, whatever is on the island it is nice and quiet right now. It would be nice if it stayed like that. I feel like that anyway. Rather than have other people come and dig around, and whatever” (anonymous, personal communication, 2015).

A few community members commented that they were not sure of any benefit archaeological research could have. Bridget Wolki (personal communication, August 14, 2014), who had strong traditional beliefs about not touching artifacts, stated: “I don’t know what big impact it will, archeological digs will do. I’m not saying it’s bad, I’m not saying it’s good. It’s happening. But maybe finding the way, how we lived back then, might help us in the future. I don’t know.” In the following excerpt from an interview with Beverly and Lawrence Amos (personal communication, September 17, 2014),
Lawrence discusses his uncertainty of the benefit archaeology could have for him, while Beverly speaks of the emotional benefit learning about her ancestors has for her:

**Lawrence:** Yeah, I don’t know how it is going to benefit me, like you know, how is it going to benefit our people? The work, sure I know it is interesting stuff.

**Beverly:** It doesn’t make you feel good inside? I’m not talking about other kind of benefits, but right here (points to heart).

**Lawrence:** Yeah. That’s, well that’s the best part.

**Beverly:** That’s one of the only main parts, eh. Make you appreciate how, what they went through and how strong they are, so you would be more thankful.

The primary reason for community members to be against archaeological research seemed to be traditional beliefs that artifacts should not be disturbed. Some community members are also against or uncertain of archaeological research because of a distrust of researchers caused by the way some earlier archaeological research was carried out on the island. For example, Lawrence Amos has a strong interest in archaeological research but because previous research was not conducted in consultation with the community and results were not disseminated, he was unsure if it could benefit him personally. It is likely that additional community members, who chose not to speak with me because of their feelings, were against having archaeological research conducted. Some interviewees may also have felt this way but were uncomfortable telling me.

Most community members I spoke with were in favour of or interested in archaeological research. Some community members felt that the knowledge that could be gained from archaeological research could contribute to their own knowledge of the island and their history. A few community members, like Beverly Amos (above) commented on the emotional responses they have to seeing artifacts that their ancestors used. For example, during the IAP trip to Yellowknife, Elder Jean Harry talked about how she enjoyed
seeing snow goggles excavated from an archaeological site on Banks Island because they reminded her of her father who used similar ones.

Some community members spoke of a disconnect between youth and Elders and saw archaeology as a way to bring them together. Additionally, many people, especially those who went through the residential school system, talked about the challenges for passing down community knowledge (discussed in Chapter 4) and felt that archaeology could be one way to supplement their own knowledge and help regain some knowledge that has been lost due to these challenges:

Yeah, there is a big gap from residential school to now. Because they were trying to bring back everything back that we lost to a part to where there was a big gap in-between where our parents never taught. So there is like a whole generation of kids that don’t know how to teach them and having this [research] helps. Having all of this information and stuff helps us teach our kids, I think, better. Like how things used to be done long ago (Doreen Carpenter, personal communication, September 9, 2014).

Community members had a variety of ideas and opinions about what archaeologists should study and how they should go about their research. A few community members suggested that archaeologists should study all time periods and geographic regions to ensure a comprehensive study of the island; however, most community members had more specific interests. Some community members were interested in the oldest sites on the island because they wanted to know more about this aspect of the island’s history that their oral histories do not cover. Some community members were more interested in more recent sites.

Community members also listed a variety of geographic regions that they thought should be investigated. Many community members suggested that archaeologists work in Aulavik National Park. This suggestion may stem from the fact that the majority of the recorded sites on the island are located within the park boundaries and therefore community members are aware that there are a lot of sites there. Other community members suggested the east coast of the island, as they knew there were people who lived
there long ago. Other community members suggested sites that they knew of close to
town, such as the Thule site at Cape Kellett.

It was also important to a few community members that archaeologists focus on
Inuvialuit history. They felt that if government money was funding archaeological
research, then it should be used responsibly and in ways that would benefit the
community. For example, Beverly Amos (personal communication, September 17, 2014),
who works for the ICRC, was critical of the money that went into the Canadian
government’s search for the *HMS Investigator*, which was located in Mercy Bay in 2010:

> The only one I don’t agree with is trying to dig up ships from underwater…. It costs so much money and could be used elsewhere. And it’s not, well it is part of our history but a lot if it is from Europe too. So, why? I don’t understand it. Some stuff is just going overboard. It’s okay if it is funded by individuals or foundations, or I don’t know, you get money from rich people. But not from the government. You know how people right now are committing suicide, and alcoholics, drug addicts. You know like anywhere else, like on Banks Island. Mercy Bay, there are planes and people going up there like there is no end to money. And then what are they going to do with that stuff? Like, “Oh! Look what we found! We are so good!” like. We don’t need necessarily need to go to that expense to prove our history… it costs too much. It should be used for our future instead.

Most community members felt that graves should not be studied. However, at a
community meeting in 2013, one community member suggested that graves should be
recorded by archaeologists because this would give information about where people
travelled and settled on the island, and could also be used to inform community members
and researchers of areas that should be avoided. On separate occasions, two community
members also mentioned to me that they were interested in genetic testing of human
remains. Nevertheless, community members are mainly interested in the study of
dwellings and settlements.
Community members have also expressed interest in research being conducted by IAP graduate student Jordon Munizzi. Munizzi uses stable isotope analysis to understand historical changes in the diets and movements of muskox and caribou on Banks Island over the last 4500 years. Through this analysis he will look at how such changes have affected and will continue to affect human-animal-environment interactions on the island. During interviews, two community members said they found this research particularly interesting because with the current fluctuating caribou and muskox populations they see it as relevant to their daily lives.

Some community members thought it was beneficial to have archaeologists record sites and preserve artifacts because of the adverse effects climate change is having on archaeological sites in the arctic. Organic artifacts that were previously preserved in permafrost are now deteriorating because of melting permafrost. Melting permafrost is also causing slumping, which is speeding up the deterioration of archaeological sites. Increased coastal erosion caused by a lack of summer sea ice, increased storms, and melting permafrost is causing archaeological sites to wash into the ocean (Anderson 2014). These effects are a concern for many community members because they feel that once these sites and artifacts are lost, their potential to teach future generations about the past is gone forever. Archaeology is seen as one way to help mitigate the potential loss of sites and artifacts, as exemplified by the following quotes:

And erosion, that’s a bad thing too. [Archaeological sites are] gone forever once it’s gone from the sea. So, yeah it’s, it concerns me… I’m saying yes [archaeological sites should be examined if they are eroding]. (Norm Anikina, personal communication, May 15, 015)

It’s good if people like Lisa and her group did archaeology and like, do excavation and taking pictures like you guys are doing and photographing, like doing write-ups and stuff. Just to keep the history at least we can, you know, figure out who and what was there before us. At least you would have that history and if there is erosion we would have known that there was
something, or somebody living there (Betty Raddi-Haogak, personal communication, June 1, 2015).

I like that they’re trying to keep them so they don’t get washed into the water or, you know, get lost, so that our children and grandchildren can see them….So, I am happy for the work that you guys are doing right now to get things going and have the community see the artifacts from their land (Beverly Amos, personal communication, June 9, 2015).

People’s feelings about the degree to which sites should be studied also varied. Some community members were in favour of full excavation as they thought that was the only way to really learn anything (Plate 39). A few community members thought that taking artifacts to the south to be stored in museums was beneficial because they would be properly taken care of there and could be used as a resource later. However, almost everyone felt that archaeologists needed to let the community know what they had found and a few community members suggested having replica artifacts made. A small number of community members suggested that artifacts be reburied after they are examined or kept in the community and that archaeologists could have replica artifacts.

Some community members also suggested that archaeologists do not need to excavate archaeological sites, but could instead record sites and take photos. They felt this way because they did not want to have archaeological sites disturbed because of their traditional teachings. In 2014, the IAP conducted magnetometer surveys of sites at Cape Kellett and Agvik. Magnetometer survey is a geophysical technique that records minute variations in the earth’s magnetic field, which occur as a result of local changes in magnetization. Past human activities can create these variations in a number of ways.

---

25 Heating and burning increases magnetism by converting weakly magnetic hematite, which occurs naturally as iron oxide in soils, into a strongly magnetic form, maghemite. Bacteria associated with organic waste deposits in middens increases magnetism by creating reducing and oxidizing conditions to convert magnetic minerals into more

These surveys are non-destructive and can help to better see structures and even identify new features that are not visible on the ground surface. Additionally, they can show underlying frost wedges. On sites that are close to actively eroding shorelines, like Agvik, when temperatures rise and permafrost melts, these wedges form weak points along which the coast is likely to erode. Therefore, from these surveys archaeologists can see which archaeological features are at the greatest risk. Results of these surveys were shown at community meetings in 2014 and 2015. Some community members told me that magnetic forms, or soil bacteria itself can be magnetic. Moving topsoil also changes magnetization. Topsoil is magnetically enhanced compared to underlying soils so digging a hole will decrease magnetism while piling up topsoil will increase it (Fassbinder et al. 1990; Fassbinder and Stanjek 1993; Lindford 2006).
they found these types of studies interesting. People also pointed out that there are many artifacts from Banks Island stored in museums in the south and archaeologists should make them accessible to community members, either through museum visits or digital and physical replicas.

Community members all agreed that local people need to be involved in archaeological research and they had many suggestions for how to do this. Perhaps the most important suggestion was to talk with Elders to help interpret archaeological sites and artifacts. This is especially important because it shows respect for the knowledge of Elders. People also suggested that archaeologists speak to community knowledge holders for information about animal movements and good hunting and fishing areas and the location of archaeological sites. Community members thought that this would help archaeologists locate sites and determine what activities were taking place there. They also felt that speaking with community members about sewing could be beneficial because, as one community member put it, “everything had to be sewn”, from tents to clothes to dogsleds (Kim Lucas, personal communication, 2014). They felt that learning about Inuvialuit sewing would help archaeologists better identify artifacts. Community members also suggested that learning different patterns and sewing styles could help identify where the occupants of a site originated from if clothing was found on the site. The suggested contribution that sewing could make to archaeological research is important because women’s activities and knowledge are often overlooked in favour of knowledge of land and animal movements, which are typically associated with men. Community knowledge can undoubtedly make substantial contributions to archaeological research and can make research more interesting to local people. Additionally, working with local people to interpret and construct the past shows that archaeologists understand and respect them as legitimate knowledge holders.

Community members also thought it was important to hire local people, both as wildlife monitors and as archaeological field assistants. Bridget Wolki (personal communication, August 14, 2014) explained why hiring wildlife monitors is important: “You need wildlife monitors now because now there’s grizzly bears on the island. In summertime the [polar] bears wander the island or the land and [it] just [provides] work
opportunities.” Community members thought that it was important to hire youth and train them in field methods because it provides them with employment, teaches them new skills, and may encourage them to pursue higher education:

Having young people involved right there and then have . . . help them or mentor them to try and help them further their education. Even if it’s not exactly the field that you hope. At least they would be doing something. You know and then they could go back to it (Beverly Amos, personal communication, September 17, 2014).

Some people also suggested that if there was an excavation close to town the archaeologists could hold a community day and invite local people to the site to see the excavation and learn what is there. The IAP employed wildlife monitors and an Inuvialuit anthropologist/archaeologist for the 2013 and 2014 field seasons and employed two local youth for the 2014 excavation. One community member also suggested that some of the work I was doing in town could be done by a local person who would work as a community liaison.

As stated above, community members are interested in what happens to artifacts after they leave Banks Island. A few community members suggested that we plan a trip to a museum for community members to show them where the artifacts are kept and how they are cared for. In 2015, the IAP brought a group of youth and Elders to the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (PWNHC) in Yellowknife, NWT to see their collections and make 3D scans of artifacts that could be shared with other community members (Plates 40 - 41).

It is very important to community members that the research is disseminated to them. Researchers are usually required to submit reports at the end of their project to the HTC and the Community Corporation; however, these reports can be difficult to understand and often do not make their way beyond the boards to the rest of the community. Community members felt that the community meetings the IAP held at the beginning and end of each field season were particularly important as it gave them a chance to ask questions and speak directly with researchers. However, not everyone in the community
is able to attend community meetings for various reasons so other methods were suggested. The internet is an important mode of communication for people in Sachs Harbour. Most community members use Facebook in particular to communicate with one another, share photos, and keep in contact with friends and families who live in other parts of the ISR and beyond. In the beginning of the 2013 field season, community members suggested that we create a Facebook page about the project. Some also suggested that we build a website. We started the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project Facebook page during the 2013 field season and work on a website is currently underway. Some community members, however, do not have internet access or use Facebook, so people also recommended that the IAP send out flyers outlining the research objectives and results. Home visits were also suggested as a means of disseminating information to those community members without access to social media.

Plate 40: Elder Jean Harry examines snow goggles similar to the ones she remembers her father using at the IAP trip to the PWNHC, 2015.
Plate 41: Elder Lena Wolki examines a kamik similar to the ones her mother made during the IAP trip to the PWNHC, 2015.
Sub-communities and opinions about archaeology

Although many opinions community members had about archaeological research were based on personal interests or preferences, many of the responses given during the consultation process were influenced by the community members’ involvement in or affiliation with sub-communities. Cultural background had a heavy influence on what some people were interested in researching. A few community members of Inuinnait background suggested that more recent sod houses on the east side of the island should be investigated and that archaeologists should try to make links to families residing in Sachs Harbour. Other community members were interested in the schooner and trapping eras that brought their ancestors to the island from the mainland; however, one other community member suggested that some people may not want archaeologists to look into recent history that involved their families as it would be too personal and having their family history made public would be uncomfortable. As discussed in Chapter 3, it also influenced the types of narratives about Banks Island’s past as these are experience-based and families that came from the mainland experienced the past differently than those of Inuinnait background. Younger generations who do not identify as much with where their families originated, tended to be more interested in research that focused on the deeper past. Cultural background did not seem to influence people’s traditional beliefs about not disturbing archaeological sites or touching artifacts.

Some families seemed more serious about traditional beliefs and Older Timer laws than others. People from these family groups either were not interested in archaeological research at all, or were, but did not want excavation of archaeological sites. Some of them also did not want to touch any artifacts. However, in some cases younger generations adhere less strictly to those beliefs than older family members. In one case, I was showing a mother and her adult daughter the uluit from Agvik, and the mother would not touch the uluit while the daughter was not worried about touching them. Family groups also influenced what traditional knowledge was being passed down and how, which influences some peoples’ understandings of the past. Each family group has its own ideas of what information is important to pass down to the next generation. Furthermore, each family group has a differing level of capacity to pass down traditional and historical
knowledge. For example, some family groups may have held onto traditions more than others, or some families may not have the funds for hunting equipment or gasoline to participate in activities that teach younger generations. Additionally, in a few cases, the perception that IAP team members were aligning too closely to certain family groups caused members of other family groups to feel alienated from or disinterested in the project.

Educational background also influenced people’s opinions of archaeology. The sub-communities within this category include people with a higher degree of formal education, and those without. Additionally, another sub-community can be drawn based on those who went through the residential school system. Those with higher levels of formal education, or those who received education through work experience with heritage organizations like the ICRC, IRC, or Parks Canada, tended to be in favour of archaeological research. For example, John Lucas Jr. (personal communication, August 28, 2014), who worked for Parks Canada and was the HTC chairperson outlined some of the reasons he was in favour of archaeological research:

> It actually benefits the community in a lot of ways. Like one thing about… why I have been trying to promote archaeology projects, they do spend a lot of money up here. Like they pay for people to bring the camp out and things like that. Hire monitors. And that’s one of the priorities as the HTC chairman… I’m the chair of the HTC … is trying to get employment for membership. And that’s one of the priorities, is trying to get people to make money. That is one of the benefits of having archaeology up here. And also seeing what’s up here. That definitely benefits the community as a whole. People want to know what was here 500, 1000 years ago. So, it does benefit the community in a lot ways.

This may primarily be because they had a better understanding of what archaeologists do and how artifacts are cared for in the south. They also had a better understanding of research processes and the responsibilities of researchers and the rights of community members. Community members who had more knowledge of the academic study of
archaeological sites had more specific ideas of what should be studied. For example, David Haogak (personal communication, September 16, 2014), who works for Parks Canada, had the following suggestions:

Pre-Dorset. There’s some sites that are really . . . we don’t have too many in the world so we have, I believe one, or two maybe on Banks Island. I think those sites should be checked. And some Thule sites. Especially, well there are certain places that have been excavated already. But, they can be re-examined. … Muller-Beck from Germany he did his work in the 70s, he did the Umingmak site on Shoran Lake. I think that should be re-looked at. I think archaeology was still young when they were doing that.

In some cases, this group also seemed less hesitant to participate in archaeological activities or handle artifacts because of traditional beliefs. Although they may have still believed in Old Timer laws about not disturbing sites, some saw themselves as “less superstitious” and were not worried about archaeological excavation. Additionally, a few community members who did not want to touch artifacts or sites themselves, said that it was alright for archaeologists to do it because “it is their job.” It seemed that in these cases they understood archaeologists as people who take care of artifacts for the benefit of people, as opposed to someone who takes artifacts from sites simply to have it for themselves.

Although Elders tend to have a strong belief in the Old Timer law not to disturb sites to respect those who came before, many were actually very supportive of the IAP. A few Elders shared with me their hopes that archaeology would get youth interested in the past. For the most part, Elders showed a very strong interest in artifacts. When they handled artifacts there was often a sense of longing for “the old days,” which was also often present when they reflected on the past. During my visits with Elder Lena Wolki (personal communication, 2014), she often stated: “It was hard life, but it was a good life.”
5.3 How can archaeologists account for diversity within the community when working on a community-based archaeology?

Ikaahukmiut community members have diverse understandings of the past and opinions of archaeological research. In some cases different sub-communities influence this diversity. In others, diverse understandings and opinions are based on personal preference and experience. In order to establish an effective and inclusive community-based archaeology project, archaeologists will need to engage with and navigate this diversity. To do this, a community-based archaeology of Banks Island should be built with two main guiding principles: respect and there is more than one way to do something right. There is a need to respect traditional beliefs, apply community knowledge, and address community concerns.

The first principle upon which a community-based project should be built is the Inuvialuit guiding principle of respect. It is not enough for archaeologists to know Inuvialuit traditional beliefs, understandings of the past, and opinions of archaeological research. Archaeologists have to respect them as valid understandings and apply them to their research even if they seem to oppose archaeological interpretations. This may mean broadening our understandings of what archaeology is and tearing down the divide between history and heritage to create conceptual spaces that allow all understandings to be valid (Lyons 2011). In order to minimize imbalanced power relationships and build a more equitable partnership there must be respectful consultation and conversations between archaeologists and community members throughout the research process. An important aspect of this is acknowledging the ways that previous research has alienated and disenfranchised the community. Researchers need to respect that it will take time and effort to (re)build relationships between themselves and the community and committing to that time and effort. The community’s needs to (re)build this relationship have to be respected.
My definition of the community that I worked with was intentionally broad so that I could document diverse understandings of the past and opinions of archaeological research, which I believe worked well for my project. In theory, this definition left out few people that may feel invested in my project. However, this definition may be too broad to be practical for a more focused research project, as trying to account for too many diverse opinions and understandings could make a project unproductive. It is likely that when planning an archaeological project some understandings and opinions may not be accounted for. For example, if archaeologists decide not to excavate in the future, community members who feel strongly that excavation needs to happen to gain the most information about their past may feel that they are not represented by the project. Archaeologists need to be aware of this and be respectful of the ways their community-based research may still be excluding certain understandings or opinions.

Inuvialuit knowledge, like most Indigenous knowledges, is experiential and therefore nothing is true for all people, places, and times (Castellano 2000; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010), which underlines the second guiding principle: there is more than one way to do something right. Within discussions of community-based research it is often acknowledged that there is no one cohesive theory or method for community-based projects. Indigenous peoples are not a homogenous group; they have their own histories and their own ways of understanding, engaging with, and relating to the past. Therefore, the selection of appropriate methods and theories in an archaeological project that applies community-based strategies is dependent on the group of people who are involved, as well as the context in which the project is being carried out (Atalay 2008: 29-30). The degree to which a community is involved in the designing and implementation of research projects is also dependent on the needs, interests, and capacity of the community. There may be some projects where the community has most of the control over the project, and there could be some projects where the researchers do. Both could be considered community-based approaches as long as they are established in the way the community sees fit. Therefore, it may be beneficial to think of community-based research as a spectrum and something that evolves over time. Presently, Sachs Harbour does not have the capacity (financially or in terms of person power) to establish a project where the community takes the lead. A community-based archaeological study of Banks Island
will therefore likely still be established primarily by archaeologists. A community-based project could, however, work towards capacity building within the community in order for the community to gain more control over the project. The first step to this would be educating more people about what exactly archaeologists do, how research permitting and funding work, and their rights as community members when determining what kind of research will be conducted. This could be done through community meetings, home visits, and flyers distributed to the community.

This guiding principle can be further applied to archaeology in general. As discussed in Chapter 4, archaeological research is traditionally regarded as survey, excavation, and artifact analysis. As more diverse voices enter the field, our understanding of what archaeological research encompasses is expanding. Factors like ethnographic research, the application of Indigenous knowledges, and museum practices, that were once thought of as outside the realm of archaeological research, are now becoming integral parts of archaeological projects (e.g. Griebel 2010). Just as the IAP included many research endeavors that fell outside of the realm of traditional archaeology, future community-based projects on the island should as well. By expanding what archaeology is, we can include more diverse opinions and understandings.

Engaging with different perspectives will not only mean rethinking what constitutes archaeology, it also requires developing new modes for presenting research to make it accessible to our Indigenous partners. For presenting my research I have found that the interactive, digital map form is quite useful (Figure 7). I have created a Google Map with colour-coded pins to indicate that they either contain place name information, traditional land use information, or archaeological information. Users can click on the pins to access information from interviews and archives, historic and contemporary photos, videos, and 3D models of archaeological features. I sent a private link to community members who participated in my research to get feedback. While most responded positively, one community member expressed concern over showing the locations of archaeological sites on the internet. They were concerned that the sites would be looted and that it would attract more outsiders to the island. To alleviate this concern, the final map could either not show the locations of archaeological sites, or purposely offset the locations of the
sites by several kilometers. The map will eventually be part of the IAP website, but first further consultation with community members is needed to determine who should have access to the map (everyone or just beneficiaries?) and whether or not all of the information currently on the map or planned for inclusion is appropriate and accurate. The intent of the map is give the community access to the information gathered during my research, which they may not have ready access to currently.

These kinds of maps have been used often in archaeological and traditional knowledge projects in the arctic (e.g. Arctic IQ: Arviat Archaeology and Oral History Project, Inuit Siku (Sea Ice) Atlas, Pan Inuit Trails) because they are a good way to organize information. For my research it is important to organize historical information in a non-linear fashion. When you have a linear chronological organization of events, the earliest events are often seen as more important. A linear narrative of Banks Island history could appear to privilege some understandings of the past over others. Organizing information geographically puts less emphasis on temporality. As discussed earlier, Inuvialuit Elders in Sachs Harbour often locate events from the past geographically rather than temporally. Therefore, using a map to display information about Inuvialuit history is a very logical choice. Another strength of the map is that the geographical organization gives more equal weight to Inuvialuit and archaeological understandings.

Applying community-based approaches does not mean just negotiating between archaeological and Inuvialuit understandings of the past and aims in shaping a research project. We also have to negotiate and navigate differences within the communities we work with. This begins with cautiously and correctly identifying the community, and being aware of diversity within this community. Unfortunately, negotiating may mean that not everyone’s views are represented; however, everyone’s views need to be respected. Archaeologists can work towards respecting everyone’s understandings by creating time and conceptual space (Lyons 2011) to have conversations with all community members who want to participate and allowing them to articulate how different beliefs and understandings can be respected. To establish inclusive projects that include multi-vocal understandings of the past, archaeologists need to broaden their
understanding of their discipline and recognize that there is more than one way to do archaeology.

Figure 7: Screen shot of Google Map representing Inuvialuit knowledge of Banks Island.
Chapter 6

6 Reflections on Community-Based Approaches and the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project

This chapter examines some of the larger challenges I came across while conducting my research and that the IAP faced in applying community-based approaches. This overview is not exhaustive, as I have tried to focus on the challenges that most closely relate to the research process and the information in this dissertation. I think it is important to note that I also foresee future challenges, mainly regarding representation and access and ownership of information, as I begin to publish on my research and disseminate research findings more concretely to the community.

6.1 Logistical Challenges

When I spoke to community members about challenges for developing a community-based project, many of them listed logistical challenges, mainly financial limitations, time, and distance. These certainly are major challenges for community-based projects, especially ones in the Canadian Arctic. Although there were some community members who thought researchers had unlimited funding, most did recognize that travelling to Banks Island and conducting research costs a lot of money. For example, Norm Anikina (personal communication, September 5, 2014) stated, “I am thinking one [challenge] right now would be the money is really hard to come by to fly people up here, you know, such a long ways to Sachs Harbour. Even flying from Inuvik it’s costly. The cost is, you know, really expensive.” Community-based projects can accumulate more costs than traditional research projects. On top of traditional research expenses money has to be spent on things like space rentals and food for community meetings, honoraria for traditional knowledge holders who participate in research, hiring local people, and modes of dissemination such as website development and artifact replicas. Additionally, to have meetings with the HTC and Community Corporation in Sachs Harbour each board member has to be paid a standard rate, which is approximately $250. Many more costs arise throughout community-based projects that are difficult to predict. These costs need
to be considered prior to applying for funding and be part of the budget, and funding agencies need to recognize that these are legitimate research expenses.

Although time and distance are factors in most community-based archaeology projects, they are particularly challenging for arctic research. Field seasons are short because of brief arctic summers, and southern universities are very distant from northern field sites. Community members recognized these challenges to community-based research. Long periods away from the community can make it difficult for researchers to build relationships and can put strains on progress that was made during field seasons. When asked about challenges for community-based approaches, David Haogak (personal communication, September 16, 2014) stated, “[archaeologists] just come and go but then there’s no face to face after that until you come back the next year. There is a lot of time. Distance and time. That’s too bad.” Researchers have to be committed to these relationships even while not in the field. The IAP uses our Facebook page as a link to the community during the winters by posting updates from the lab sharing the progress of the graduate student researchers, as well as links to other northern heritage studies and news articles. Though we do struggle, given the many other commitments of team members, to make regular posts. I also used Facebook to continue to build relationships with people in the community while back down south as it allowed me to chat with them regularly and keep people updated with my research and personal life. Although Facebook was an invaluable tool for my research, I quickly found that I had to adapt my privacy settings and better sensor some of my posts to maintain professional relationships with community members. Some researchers have two accounts in order to keep their personal Facebook profile separate from their professional one.

6.2 Community Understandings of Archaeologists and Research

Archaeologists have to work with the community’s current understandings of archaeologists and research. In most contexts, archaeologists implementing community-based approaches have to answer for the transgressions of previous archaeologists. As outlined earlier, many Ikaahukmiut community members feel that previous archaeological work on Banks Island has negatively affected them, leading to concerns
regarding current research. There is also a widespread sense that, with only a few exceptions, researchers from a wide range of disciplines do not inform the community of their findings. This is especially troublesome when community members see researchers testing for toxins in their water and the animals they hunt for subsistence. When they are not informed of the results, community members understandably feel that the research does not benefit them, and place little trust in researchers and the research process. This can be a discouraging and frustrating context to work within. Researchers have to accept the colonial legacy we have inherited, and commit the time and effort that is required to help (re)build relationships with community members for community-based research to succeed. We need to acknowledge the imbalanced power relationships embedded in traditional research processes (and perhaps also some community-based research processes) so that we can begin to move beyond them.

Some community members are not well informed on research processes. A few community members asked me how the IAP got permission to work on Banks Island. They were not aware that our license and permit applications have to be approved by the Sachs Harbour HTC and Community Corporation. After explaining this to them, they often stated that they had never heard anything about our projects before and that there was little communication between the boards and the rest of the community. This miscommunication shows that not everyone in the community feels that they are represented by the community boards and highlights the importance of not only consulting with community boards but with other community members as well. In a few cases, misunderstandings of the licensing and permitting processes and miscommunication between the boards and the community caused animosity towards us by some community members who thought we had not asked permission to be there. Community-based approaches are supposed to be about empowering community members, and this may mean empowering them to say no to archaeological research. In Sachs Harbour, archaeologists should work to ensure that community members are well informed of how the permitting process works and that they do have the power to deny research permits.
Most narratives of the evolution of community-based research approaches in archaeology revolve around archaeologists listening to community concerns over previous research practices and working to establish projects that answer these concerns and work towards benefiting the community. However, some projects that apply community-based approaches have been accused of using these approaches to simply garner community support so that they can continue “archaeology as usual” (Connaughton 2014: 545).

Despite the theoretical goals of community-based approaches to change the status quo, it has been argued that they are simply working to maintain them (La Salle and Hutchingson 2016). During my research, one community member suggested that the IAP was reaching out to the community so we could get permission to dig and that it was just another way to ensure our goals as archaeologists would be reached. In a sense they were not wrong. We needed community support to attain permits to carry out our research and we would most likely not get them if we did not work to include the community. However, this was not our main goal. As a research team we genuinely wanted to develop projects with the community that would be of interest and useful to them.

However, given that not many researchers on the island have applied community-based approaches, it is understandable that this approach was met with skepticism. The only way to work past this skepticism is to keep coming back to the community, continue to ask for and apply community input, and disseminate research results.

On a few occasions during my work, some community members were critical of choices made by the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project. These community members suggested we use our research funding for things such as improving housing. On one occasion a community member suggested that we hand out money to community members because “the university is rich.” It is easy to understand why some community members were under the impression that we were “rich” and that we had extra money at our disposal. We had the privilege of flying up there, sometimes on chartered flights and sometimes with charter helicopters at our disposal, to do research on topics that do not directly benefit us. Their comments reflect a lack of understanding of the stipulations on research funds, and grossly overestimated the amount of money we had to work with. All researchers know that funding is limited and working in a remote area such as Banks Island the funding goes quickly. Researchers are accountable to funding agencies to use
grant money for the purposes that were outlined in our applications. Although I agree that government funds might be better used in Sachs Harbour for a range of social programs than for an archaeological project, our research funding cannot be diverted along those lines. This understandably frustrates community members and contributes to some negative feelings towards researchers. However, I think a better communication of research processes and funding procedures to community members could help to ease some of the tensions.

6.3 Competing Priorities and Perspectives

A few community members also said that they felt that a lack of interest in the past was a challenge for building a community-based archaeology project. When I asked Roger Kuptana (personal communication, September 2, 2014) what challenges he thought there were for developing a community-based project, he replied, “Challenges? Well, I think a lot of these. Well, I think what it is… these people should show a little more interest in what their ancestors did. That’s probably one of the bigger challenges.” Although there are people who undoubtedly are not interested in archaeology or history, it is likely that there are other reasons why there appears to be a lack of interest among some community members.

In some cases community-members may be interested in archaeology; however, they just may not be interested in the project that is being offered to them. The IAP was initiated by southern researchers, and in the beginning focused on southern and academic research goals while looking to the community for direction. Although some community members were interested from the start, community interest in the IAP grew as the project developed based on community ideas and concerns.

Additionally, community members have their families, jobs, friends, and other responsibilities; therefore, participation in a research project can be an extra burden. Furthermore, some of the challenges discussed in Chapter 4 that make it difficult to pass down traditional knowledge also make community participation in research projects difficult. Coping with transgenerational trauma, the effects of the residential school system, poverty, and a system that provides inadequate health care and housing, leaves
little energy and few resources for committing to research projects. These challenges are not unique to Sachs Harbour, although they present themselves differently within different communities. This makes it difficult to find people within the community to take on more of a partnership role. The population of Sachs Harbour is quite small, but there are many positions on boards and within the local government that have to be filled to keep the community running. This means that many of the people who would be good community liaisons or community partners for a project already have their hands full with other responsibilities. It seems that in most cases there is an interest but many community members currently lack the time and resources to make more of a commitment to a research project.

Some perceived disinterest in archaeology could actually reflect some community members’ lack of comfort with academia and educational institutions, as these have been places where they have been the target of racism, discrimination, and prejudice. Many community members told me that they did not learn local or Inuvialuit history in school (although this is changing with the current curriculum) and that they were disinterested in and offended by the “southern”, “American”, or “European” history they were taught in school. Additionally, the current education system puts high school students from the community at a disadvantage in multiple ways. According to community members, students who cannot stay with family members in Inuvik are not always provided with appropriate housing and are not given the support they need to succeed in high school. Furthermore, once students finish high school they are unable to attend most post-secondary institutions without first upgrading their education because the NWT education does not meet national standards. Some community members who attended post-secondary institutions in the south told me that it was challenging because not only did they face racism from their peers (and sometimes their instructors), but they also had to navigate an institution that discouraged Indigenous ways of knowing. These circumstances may have led some community members to be unwilling to participate in an academic study of the past initiated by researchers from a southern educational institution.
It is hard to not feel discouraged when community members seem apathetic about your research. There were many occasions where people did not want to speak with me or said they would do an interview and never showed up. As a researcher in the field, my project often felt like the only thing in my life, but as La Salle and Hutchings (2016: 171) state, “being an archaeologist is just a job. Being Indigenous is not.” Ultimately, researchers have to be conscious and respectful of the fact that many community members have more pressing issues to worry about than an archaeology project. It would certainly be naïve to think that an archaeology project could put an end to the challenges community members living in Sachs Harbour face, but, as discussed in Chapter 5, some community members do feel that learning more about the past and their heritage can help them cope with and ease some social challenges within the community. The only way that can be accomplished is to develop and build a project with the community based on their needs, opinions, and ideas.

6.4 Archaeological Ethnographic Approaches

Archaeologists are increasingly using archaeological ethnographies as a method to engage with descendant communities and various stakeholders as part of community-based approaches. Archaeological ethnographies can make significant contributions to research projects, but they should be applied cautiously.

Many of the critiques of archaeological ethnographies centre on improper ethnographic training and understandings of sociocultural anthropological thought among the archaeologists conducting such work. Breaking the barriers between fields is an important step in addressing this issue (Edgeworth 2010). There are some universities in North America where anthropology and archaeology are separate departments. Even when, as in the majority of cases, they are part of the same department, often there is still a strict divide between the two fields. Holtorf (2009) argues that academic gatekeeping makes it nearly impossible to be an expert at both sociocultural anthropology and archaeology because the definitions of these practices are too narrow.

I obtained an M.A. in archaeology at Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador (MUN), which has separate archaeology and anthropology departments.
Although my time at MUN was positive, I found that the divide between disciplines was often a disadvantage to my research. My project used oral history research and archaeological survey to investigate the history of Sandwich Bay, Labrador. I received no ethnographic training prior to my fieldwork, which undoubtedly would have been beneficial. Additionally, there were some department members that did not understand why I was in an archaeology department and seemed uncertain of the value of my project.

The Department of Anthropology at the University of Western Ontario (where I also completed my undergraduate degree) encompasses archaeology, biological anthropology, sociocultural anthropology, and linguistic anthropology, while also having a cross-cutting focus on First Nations research. This has allowed me to better navigate the barriers between anthropological subfields and receive training in both archaeology and sociocultural anthropology while allowing me to understand anthropology as a holistic discipline where rigid divides should not be encouraged. Despite the holistic aims of the department, there are still boundaries between the subdisciplines. I feel this divide both with the training I received, which leans to the socio-cultural anthropology side, and socially among department members who often want to label people as either “anthropologist” or “archaeologist.” These labels may seem inconsequential but they can and have impacted the way others perceive my research. For example, some Ikaahukmiut community members were confused as to why an archaeologist was talking to community members. Others who perceived me as an anthropologist did not fully grasp my connection to the larger Ikaahuk Archaeology Project. These strict ideas of what archaeologists do and what anthropologists do limit the possibilities for more holistic research projects. I intentionally promote myself as an archaeologist because I think it can make people rethink the kinds of research archaeologists can conduct.

McGill (2010) suggests that instead of archaeology students taking courses in ethnographic methods targeted at anthropology students, courses dealing with archaeological uses of ethnography, ethics, and public education should be offered to help students develop this specialization in community-based archaeological approaches. Conversely, anthropologists often ignore how archaeological understandings can benefit their practices. Holtorf (2009: 311) explains that archaeological ethnography is the
“blurring of these boundaries that has created a new and rich field of investigation and academic practice.” It is important for both anthropologists and archaeologists to be aware of academic boundaries created by the North American education system and how this affects their understandings and research. It is time for departments to adapt their programs to include better training for community-based approaches. Public archaeology classes such as Sonya Atalay’s at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and MA programs in community archaeology like the one offered at Bishop Grosseteste University are becoming more commonplace.

Despite the ability and intention to help empower descendent communities and non-archaeologist stakeholders, a major concern for me with the use of ethnographic research in projects that aim to “decolonize” archaeology is that these methods could easily further alienate and marginalize disenfranchised people. As discussed in Chapter 2, socio-cultural anthropologists have their own colonial legacy that often reproduces power imbalances in their research. Archaeologists who appropriate ethnographic methods without properly understanding how they can be damaging to Indigenous people are more likely to reproduce power imbalances. Ethnographic methods such as interviews and participant observation can be alienating and intrusive. During my research, I often found that community members seemed uncomfortable during interviews. In accordance with The University of Western Ontario’s Non-Medical Research Ethics Board’s guidelines, I made participants aware that their participation was optional, they did not have to answer a question if they did not want to, they could stop the interview at any time, and they could drop out of the project or retract statements at any time. Nevertheless, it was clear that many participants were uncomfortable with some questions they willingly answered and with being recorded. Additionally, many answers that they gave “on the record” were very different from or even contradicted what they told me while not being recorded. These issues with interviewing as a method demonstrate why archaeological ethnographies have been heavily criticized for relying solely, or too heavily on interviews. Engaging with the community outside of interviews is important because people are more honest “off the record.” Additionally, it allows researchers to better understand the context of the answers community members give them.
When the goal of a project is to rebuild relationships with communities that have been negatively impacted by archaeological research, perhaps more “formal” research is not always the answer. When I asked one community member if they would do an interview with me. They declined but said that they would talk to me and answer my questions as “a regular person.” In some cases, honest conversations might be more beneficial than ethnographic interviews, which can convey the impression that researchers are only interested in benefiting from the community, rather than helping to benefit the community. Lyons (2011: 84) highlights the importance of creating a conceptual space for open and constructive discussions to the success of meaningful collaborative research projects. For my research, I often found having open and genuine discussions over tea more useful than interviewing.

Although “participant observation” proved invaluable to my research as it better contextualized some of the answers given during interviews and allowed access to information some community members either could not put into words or did not want to openly discuss during interviews, it can still be intrusive and alienating. Crapanzano (2010: 57) states, “However sensitive we are to our informants, we have to recognize that [anthropological] fieldwork is at some level always a violation.” Participant observation can also make people feel like their culture and knowledge are being taken advantage of. I worked hard to approach participant observation as community participation, volunteering at community events, cooking and baking for Elders and community members, and making time for non-research related visits with community members. Although I cannot say for certain how community members feel about me and my research, I think this participation helped build trust and relationships between myself and the community.

Archaeological ethnographies can be an important tool for collaborative research projects. However, archaeologists, especially those who lack proper training and experience, should use ethnographic methods cautiously. For ethnographic methods to be beneficial to a project, archaeologists must have a sound and reflexive understanding of how archaeological knowledge, anthropological knowledge, and stakeholder knowledge is produced and understood. These may require better communication between
disciplines as well as less restrictive definitions of what constitutes anthropological research and archaeological research. Archaeologists should also be as reflexive about how ethnography can impact a community as they are about archaeological research. It is important for archaeologists to identify and address the concerns outlined above to ensure that these issues do not become embedded in their research processes. Archaeological ethnographies can be seen as a “best of both worlds” hybrid that understands that the past and the present are one in the same. Although these methods can be beneficial, consultation and honest conversations between stakeholders are still key to the success of collaborative projects.

Community-based approaches are important for re-building relationships with descendant communities and developing research projects that are relevant to descendant communities and culturally appropriate. However, these approaches come with unique challenges that require more attention than they have been given. When archaeologists first began applying community-based approaches, they were met with some backlash from positivist archaeologists who argued that these approaches would hinder scientific interpretations and the goal of archaeology would become appeasing descendant groups and stakeholders, rather than scientific inquiry. As a result many of the publications dealing with community-based approaches in archaeology largely focus on theoretical aspects, arguing the ethical and moral importance of such approaches, and highlighting the ways community knowledge and participation can benefit archaeological interpretations and the discipline as a whole. Although there are notable sources (e.g. Atalay 2012; Pyburn 2009; La Salle and Hutchings 2016; Supernant and Warrick 2014) that outline some of the challenges these approaches can have and non-positivist criticisms, most archaeologists who work on projects that work to engage a community do not write publications about failed attempts to work with the community and the challenges and difficulties that inevitably arise (Pyburn 2009; La Salle and Hutchingson 2016). Until recently, the obligation to prove to other archaeologists (and funding bodies) that community-based approaches are important and beneficial to the discipline, has
reduced the number of archaeologists willing to publish reflexive and self-critical analyses of their attempts to engage with local communities.

There are no standard or easy solutions to the challenges that come with community-based approaches as the ways they present themselves differ between communities. An important first step to working with these challenges, however, is for archaeologists to better acknowledge them and face them head on. Archaeologists need to be aware and understand both the current social context and the history of the community they are working with, and the history and legacy of the methods they are trying to apply. This will help archaeologists negotiate the transgressions of previous researchers, misunderstandings of funding and research processes among community members, social challenges within the community, and the appearance of lack of community interest.
Chapter 7

7 Moving Forward

Previous archaeological and ethnographic research in the Arctic has supported the marginalization and disenfranchisement of Inuit peoples by promoting ethnocentric ideas of Inuit identity and by alienating Inuit people from the material remains of their past and from the production of knowledge about their past. Anthropological research (both sociocultural and archaeological) has always been tied to politics, especially in the North. A growing number of Indigenous and community-based archaeology projects in the North represent an attempt by archaeologists to adapt to recent changes in the political structure of the Arctic. These projects require archaeologists to broaden their methodologies, often through the use of ethnographic methods, and to understand and include other ways of knowing the past. Inuit peoples have always known their culture and history and it is now time for southern researchers to recognize and be receptive to this by promoting and engaging with Inuit knowledge.

There have been numerous archaeology projects on Banks Island. Some of the projects are thought of fondly by community members who remember them or were involved in them. However, community members have little to no knowledge of the majority of these projects and many community members see the lack of consultation by previous archaeologists as damaging to their community. They are not aware of what has been removed from their ancestral land and do not have access to the knowledge that has been produced from these excavations. Furthermore, community knowledge, which could have helped interpret excavations, has been overlooked by archaeologists. Additionally, traditional Inuvialuit teachings, which many community members have strong belief in, forbid disturbing old campsites and dwellings and removing artifacts because it can cause bad luck in hunting and trapping, bad weather, bad dreams, and illness. Although some people in the community are against archaeological research, there is enough community interest to warrant further archaeological initiatives that apply community-based approaches. To develop culturally meaningful research projects archaeologists need to reflect on how archaeological knowledge is produced, characterized, and maintained. As stated in Chapter 3, dichotomies are common in Western thought. Archaeologists should
reflect on the ways perceived dichotomies shape their understandings and research, particularly the dichotomies of archaeology/anthropology, Indigenous knowledge/archaeological knowledge, and history/heritage.

Ethnography is becoming increasingly important to community-based approaches as it helps archaeologists better understand community opinions of archaeological research, desires for archaeological projects, community knowledge of the past, and the social and historical contexts archaeologists are working within. However, poor ethnographic training and limited understandings of socio-cultural anthropology are major criticisms of these approaches because they can lead to a failure to correctly identify the community, the reproduction of unequal power relationships, and misrepresentation of Indigenous people and their knowledges. By dissolving the divide between anthropology and archaeology, archaeologists can receive better ethnographic training.

It is important to Ikaahukmiut that Inuvialuit knowledge be used to help interpret archaeological findings. However, there is a perceived dichotomy among archaeologists of Indigenous verses archaeological knowledges that suggests the two are inherently different, competing, or incompatible. This conceptualized dichotomy fails to recognize knowledge as fluid and adaptive. An important part of applying community knowledge to archaeological knowledge and vice versa is understanding how historical knowledge is produced and maintained within the Ikaahukmiut community. Inuvialuit knowledge is experiential which leads to diverse understandings and narratives of the past. This means there is no overarching community narrative of Banks Island history. Inuvialuit historicity encompasses oral histories, as well as different kinds of knowledge that archaeologists may label outside of the realm of archaeology, including environmental knowledge and geographical knowledge. Community members learn about and teach the past through oral histories as well as through doing. This includes both traditional activities like hunting and sewing, and non-traditional activities like photography and participating in Facebook groups. Within academia, these activities are often considered heritage activities rather than ways of knowing history. This dichotomy separates what some academics believe to be real (history) and what they believe to be influenced by nationalism, identity, or sentiment (heritage) (Lowenthal 1998; Seixas 2013).
Archaeologists often see themselves as people who study history, whereas academics involved in museum studies study heritage. However, post-modernism recognizes that all understandings of the past are socially constructed; therefore, the divide between history and heritage is unproductive. By dismantling this dichotomy archaeologists can better apply community knowledge while also broadening their ideas of what constitutes archaeology. By stepping away from traditional views of archaeology as survey, excavation, and artifact analysis, archaeologists can develop projects that include ethnographic approaches, the application of Indigenous knowledge, museum practices, and heritage studies, which may more effectively involve Indigenous people and represent their knowledge.

Despite its small population, Sachs Harbour is very diverse and encompasses multiple sub-communities. This diversity can lead to both diverse understandings of the past and diverse opinions of archaeological research. Accounting for diversity is difficult. Archaeologists need to begin by mindfully defining the community they work with. One approach to this is asking community members what their community is made up of and how they would define their community (Pyburn 2009). Although it may be impossible to include all understandings of the past or address all opinions of archaeological research and what should be studied and how, it is important for archaeologists to acknowledge and respect diversity. If certain understandings or opinions cannot be included archaeologists should make time to speak with people who hold these understandings or opinions (if they wish to speak with archaeologists) and acknowledge that they are not being included.

A community-based archaeology of Banks Island needs to respect traditional beliefs, address community concerns and apply community knowledge. Although some community members were in favour of having excavations carried out on Banks Island, other community members still believe strongly that archaeological sites should not be disturbed. Presently, I would encourage archaeologists not to excavate. Community members may change their minds in the future and want excavation, but presently I think it is best to respect traditional beliefs, especially because there is much knowledge to be gained through other means of studying the past.
There should also be a commitment to recognizing community concerns for passing down traditional and historical knowledge within the community. If developed properly with the community, a community-based project could help to address some of these concerns. After the IAP’s excavation of OkRn-1 was completed, the local youth who were hired to work on the excavation both stated that there were not enough traditional activities during the excavation. The community already holds culture camps where youth and Elders spend time on the land telling oral histories and taking part in traditional activities. Instead of applying traditional activities and knowledge within an archaeological excavation, archaeology could be applied to these existing camps. A project designed to bring youth and Elders out on the land that applies archaeological knowledge to Inuvialuit knowledge may combat the community-perceived lack of interest in the past among youth and the disconnect between youth and Elders. Additionally, this type of project could have an Inuvialuit language component where youth learn the Inuvialuit names for landscape features, old tools, and archaeological features such as sod houses, kayak rests, and caches. At these camps participants could apply non-destructive analysis of archaeological sites, such as traditional survey or magnetometer survey to ways community members already pass down historical knowledge.

Another avenue for future community-based research for Banks Island is to do more research on and dissemination of previous excavations. One of the community’s primary concerns is that they do not know what happened to previously excavated artifacts and what the interpretations of previously excavated sites were. Additionally, they were not able to apply their own knowledge and interpretations to this excavated material. Making these artifacts and site interpretations accessible to the community should be an important focus for future research projects.

During the IAP trip to the PWNHC, Charles Arnold gave a presentation to the trip participants about some of the archaeological sites on Banks Island. During the presentation, Bridget Wolki asked him if he had ever worked near Masik Pass. He said he
had, and she asked him if he remembered coming across a family there. Charles Arnold was in fact the archaeologist that Bridget remembers from her childhood. He explained that he saw Bridget’s father raise his gun (apparently to see what Charles was through the scope) and he was worried that he may be mistaken for an animal. Wanting to show that he was human, he turned his coat inside out to display the orange lining. After nearly 40 years, Bridget Wolki got the opportunity to see artifacts that Arnold had excavated that summer and learn what his team had found. Traditionally consultation and engagement was regarded as outside of the scope of archaeological research, which has resulted in a lack of trust in archaeologists among northern communities, and alienated Inuit people from certain aspects of their past. By broadening our understandings of what archaeology is, archaeologists can apply other approaches to studying the past, such as archaeological ethnographies, to develop projects that are culturally relevant to Inuit people and better reflect Inuit epistemologies. Many community members feel that the way the IAP has progressed is positive, as they finally have the opportunity to know and make use of what archaeologists are finding. Although there is still more work to do, particularly in bringing the results of the project back to the community, it is a step in the right direction.
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Appendix A: Artifact Identification

The following artifacts were identified by Elder Edith Haogak on June 6, 2016.

Figure 8: Artifact OkRn-1: 193. Used for attaching packs to dogs.
Figure 9: Artifact OkRn-1: 45. Piece of slate knife blade.

Figure 10: Artifact OkRn-1: 1319. Fishing lure for jigging.
Figure 11: Artifact OkRn-1: 1326. Broken spear point (may have meant harpoon but mistranslated).

Figure 12: Artifact OkRn-1: 1351. Possible game piece.
Figure 13: Artifact OkRn-1: 148. Spool for sinew.
Figure 14: Artifact OkRn-1: 1315. Piece of toy sled.
Figure 15: Toy sled similar to the one OkRn-1:1315 was likely part of. The red box indicates the part of the sled that OkRn-1:1315 is from.
Appendix B: Uluit

This appendix demonstrates some of the community understandings of uluit and suggestions for the uses of some of the uluit excavated from OkRn-1 in 2014.

Community Understandings and Knowledge of Uluit

Making Uluit:

She says that that is not made by tools that we have right now. A long time ago they have only rocks for filing and making them smooth. Ok, those, that’s how come she was going like this just like filing it with the rock…. Said with the files they have right now, they never use that kind. They use rock for making it sharp (Edith Haogak, translated by Jean Harry, personal communication, June 6, 2016).

She said when she was little she was small and she tried to help her mom, her mother using this [slate uluit], it was really dull for her…. I guess they find really hard rocks like that to make these two kinds…Yeah. Really hard, hard rocks. Not soft rocks that we have around here. They must find the special place to find these kind for tools…. She said you don’t see them around here. She see them alright but not around here. She said there’s a little cliffs with I guess must be thin, I can’t say it you know like those little split like layers like that…. She said you can’t. You won’t find this kind of rocks just anywhere. You have got to go somewhere where it’s very special to get tools like that, rocks…. She said they have to look really hard to find them in that little bank or cliffs and if she, if they see rocks it’s full of lichens, you know what I mean, lichens, those coloured lichens, she said they dig, they dig and dig and they find some rocks like that. You don’t find them just anywhere. She said they are so glad when they find that kind of rock…. Nelson Head, when they reach around there they start looking for those kind of rocks and down on the other side parts, Mercy Bay. You know there is a hole in that, she said as soon as they reach that part or that part of that they start looking for stones like that to make tools (Edith Haogak, translated by Jean Harry, personal communication June 6, 2016).

They don’t have a cloth or anything so they use caribou skin [as handles]. You know wrap it there so it won’t be too hard to use. Right there. You know just like we use oven
mitt to help (Edith Haogak, translated by Jean Harry, personal communication, June 6, 2015).

She said that when they first start getting cans or tins, the lid from cans, it's round so they bend it in half and use it for a handle like that [to make uluit]. And they make nice tools with metal or steel. I can't even. I think it’s steel, right. Yeah….She said those cans, those, they are really, like really sharp. Cause see they are not really sharp these days. But these cans, tin cans that’s really sharp. Don't have to sharpen them (Edith Haogak, translated by Jean Harry, personal communication, June 6, 2016).

She said that before this, after this I mean. After they start finding in the land, copper. You know copper?... They start finding those they start making tools. They use them for nailing stuff they make. But she said it’s like really sharp and they start making those. It’s easy to make I guess. Not like this…. Oh, I forgot to say. They found a place to get copper. They don’t, it’s not all over the place. It’s to that place to get copper they have to travel quite a ways, I guess to get it….She said only in Victoria there is some but they found some around here too but not like over there, over in Victoria (Edith Haogak, translated by Jean Harry, personal communication, June 6, 2016).

When I was in Inuvik my teacher had this one, we have classes and in my workshop class we were making ulus from my daduk’s [grandfathers’], Sam Lennie, he was actually, he’s an Elder and he actually helped us to see how they are made and stuff. It was very interesting. We used the blade was from a saw and the, and we actually used bones, but I forgot what kind of bones but I could ask him another time (Mariah Lucas, personal communication, June 10, 2016).

Ulus now are made of saw blades. Hand saw blades. I used to watch my dad cut the out, the blades and then later on he would work on them. Put a handle on them…. Yup [sometimes they used the handle from the saw]. They use that or muskox horn or some people use drift wood. But my dad always use muskox horn. Or the saw blade handle. The saw handle…. Some people use caribou antler for their ulus but mostly, nowadays the ulus that are made with caribou antler are just for show or sale…. I don’t know [if it is
because they are not as strong]. You know the thing about caribou now is, they are on the endangered species list so I don’t think we could even shift them out of the territories. Even if you had they wouldn’t give you a permit for that. The caribou antler anyhow, and the whalebone. Some people use whalebone, caribou antler. Anything almost for handles (Paul Kowikchuk, personal communication, June 2, 2016).

I have seen the handles. Well the soft metal. I noticed the ones that make them like the soft metal. That’s like from saws. You know those old big saws….And then they use either caribou bone or any kind of, I think usually it is caribou bone. Like the handle. The handle (Sharon Green, personal communication, May 2, 2015).

**Value of Uluit:**

I always had an ulu as long as I can remember. And my mom had them too. And I think I would be kind of lost without it because I use it all the time. Because with a knife you can’t really cut meat cause you have to cut the geese or flesh the hide a certain way and you can't use a knife. So for me it is important to keep using them and having them around and it is good to see people making them and still selling them today. You know, my grandfather did. My dad also made ulus. I want to see it continue so we could have ulus…. I think so. I had a wedding gift from my dad and he gave me and ulu and Charlie passed I gave it to one of my best friends which is like you know putting that part of my life to rest and putting Charlie to, you know rest too, and you could always get another ulu but it's like in life you got to put some things to rest. You gotta get on with your life. So that is the way I look at it (Betty-Raddi Haogak, personal communication, June 1, 2015).

Yeah. Some of the ones [uluit] that I have are from my mom. I already gave some to my children…. Yes [I do think uluit have sentimental value]. I think they do. So the ones I had they were from an Elder, that were my mom's. She had them made when she was maybe newly married. Around that time, so the Elder that made them is long passed on. So those are really special (Beverly Amos, personal communication, June 9, 2016).
She said, Their mothers give them to their daughters. Sisters give them to their sisters. They try not to use them. They save them to save them. Keep them for souvenir. Some of them use them but mostly save them for souvenir (Edith Haogak, translated by Jean Harry, personal communication, June 6, 2016).

Well, for the womens I guess, like you know, most of, most of the ones she has are given to her by certain old people that have passed on or whatever, the ones that used to make them. Then they eventually, kept by one person, by one woman only. Cause you know the guy that made it is deceased or whatever. They kind of, you know all the time she has a bunch of ulus but she favours some (John Lucas Sr., personal communication, May 26, 2015).

You cut. You clean. And you basically do anything with this. This is the main one, eh. This is the most important tool an Eskimo can have in my eyes. Because this is what I use when I cut up the wildlife I harvest whether it is a muskox or a caribou. Everything but the white fox. You have to use a really pointy knife on that. But yeah (Charlton Haogak, personal communication, June 18, 2015).

They are for our people. Without them I guess it would be pretty hard to survive…. Yeah. It's one of our essential tools that we use for the women. Even the men use them as well (Norm Anikina, personal communication, May 23, 2015).

They are well needed up here. Yeah. They make life way easier than just ordinary knife. Way easier (Paul Kowikchuk, personal communication, June 2, 2016).

Yeah. I have actually two. Or three. One is Norm's mom's one. One we got from one Elder we got to make before he moved away. And one from an Elder that has passed on. The one that he made is a small one. I use that one just to cut fur or thread…. I don't even want to use it yet. I just, it's like a treasure right now (Sharon Green, personal communication, May 2, 2015).

I was surprised to get the ulus made for me and I made use of them. When I left Paulatuk I left my ulus there. I just, I don't know. I wanted them to stay in the same community. I
have kids there so I am sure they must have them (Sharon Green, personal communication, May 2, 2015).

Yes, mostly the women now. Like when they are making dry fish they fillet out the fish and then they use the ulu to cut down the middle. And then they use it for working on snow geese. Cutting up snow geese after they are done plucking them. And then they use them for flushing animals, like flushing the polar bear hides, the fat off the polar bears. Wolf skins, and there are still a few women in town who work on seal skins in the summer, so they use an ulu to flesh them out. An ulu is pretty well a women's instrument (Trevor Lucas, personal communication, May 28, 2015).

**Age girls learn to use an ulu:**

Usually when a person is really young they have an ulu handed down to them from older people (Anonymous, personal communication 2015).

I don't know. I always remember using one. I bet my mom was using one before she could even walk. You remember using an ulu the first time? (Bridget Wolki, personal communication, June 11, 2015)

I bet that's what they use for cutting my umbilical cord. We had no scissors long ago. But we already had scissors when I was born (Lena Wolki, personal communication, June 11, 2015).

I think I was eight…. I actually made one about five years go…. Yeah, and that is the first ulu I have ever owned. I always borrowed my mom's (Mariah Lucas, personal communication, June 10, 2016).

I'm saying maybe between three to five years old. Maybe. Starting at that age (Norm Anikina, personal communication, May 23, 2015).

Well, me. I was like in my 20s when I finally start learning. And that was late for me. Usually they are in their early teens. I didn't have a mom to show me everything. So I
learned from my aunties and older ladies (Sharon Green, personal communication, May 2, 2015).

*Men and Uluit:*

We do some times to have quak, frozen meat. Yeah. They are much better. You put more pressure on an ulu then you do a knife (Paul Kowikchuk, personal communication, June 2, 2016).

Not really. Most of them I know these days use knives (Trevor Lucas, personal communication, May 28, 2015).

*Different uluit for different tasks:*

Yeah, so there is the small one for cutting fur while you are sewing and the big one is for fleshing bears or whatever, foxes and cutting up meats (Betty-Raddi Haogak, personal communication, June 1, 2015).

Yeah. Yeah. Use them for cleaning hides and eating and we have different kinds of ulus for different use. I use them every day (Beverly Amos, personal communication, June 9, 2016).

I have different ulus to work on different stuff. Like just for one purpose. I have an ulu for fleshing polar bear, I have an ulu for fleshing foxes, a different ulu for fleshing stuff. Different ulu (Anonymous, personal communication, 2015).

Yeah, the size, eh. For work you use big ulu. For sewing you use little one (Lena Wolki, personal communication, June 11, 2015).

My mom does actually. She has one ulu for the fat and one for meat because she uses like, the sharper it is for the skin the easier it is to take off the fat. And for the meat it is just like cutting into pieces (Mariah Lucas, personal communication, June 10, 2016).
The big ones are for fleshing skins, polar bear, seal, fox, wolves, muskox. Then there’s this tiny ones that ladies use for sewing. They cut the skins with them. Yup (Paul Kowikchuk, personal communication, June 2, 2016).

Yeah. Different sizes. She uses a bigger one for flushing polar bear. The smaller one for cutting up snow geese kind of thing (Trevor Lucas, personal communication, May 28, 2015).

**Different Styles of Uluit:**

Yeah, in the east they have the long skinny handle and then I guess the handle is bone or wood and us is more flat and not so long handle. With bone or what you call wood (Betty-Raddi Haogak, personal communication, June 1, 2015).

Different everywhere you go. Like, you know Western Arctic, Central Arctic, Eastern Arctic. Cause some of them are shaped like over there, they kind of shape them way different than over here. Like the ones around here are like this. You know. Different (John Lucas Sr., personal communication, May 26, 2015).

My ulus are made of metal and some bone handles and one with a wooden handle. It’s from Resolute Bay there. It’s style is very different from ours. I am happy. My mom got it for me from Resolute Bay and I cherish it. My dad, I got one from my dad. My mom had her friend in Whitehorse make some ulus and she gave me one and I am happy for that one too, so…. The one I got from Resolute Bay too is very different from mine. It’s just, my Western ones, one side is just sharp and the other side is just. But I notice on mine there’s an edge on both of them. One drastic and one just enough to sharpen it (Bridget Wolki, personal communication, June 11, 2015).

I notice more towards Kugluktuk and Cambridge Bay there, their ulus come straight out and kind of high, high shaft for the handle. Where's ours, we get low shaft and ours would go the whole complete, use the whole metal part. Whereas the East they like, they kind of shape it a little different. I don’t know why that is. Maybe just their style of….
See our, the Inuvialuk region when my mom and dad and my mom’s would always come to a point like this. And she had a little handle. Whereas for the East, they would just kind of, maybe I am exaggerating this but. It would just be more significant like this. Just more of a moon-shape I guess where ours is like a triangle-shape. I don't know why that is (Norm Anikina, personal communication, May 23, 2015).

**Figure 16:** Uluit styles based on community knowledge and Kobayashi Issenman (1997: 62). A. Inuinnait/ Ulukhaktokmiut; B. Pallirmiut; C. Greenland Inuit; D. Alaskan; E. Baffin Island/Eastern Canadian Arctic Inuit; F. Aivilngmiut; G. Tuktoyaktuk/ Inuvialuit
Community Suggestions for Uluit Use

**Figure 17:** Artifact Ok Rn-1: 79. Elder Edith Haogak identified caribou fur on this ulu. She suggested it was used to flesh caribou hides.

**Figure 18:** Artifact OkRn-1: 413. Elder Edith Haogak suggested this ulu was used for fleshing polar bear hides and seal skin.
Figure 19: Artifact OkRn-1: 335. A few community members suggested this ulu would have been used for butchering meat.

Figure 20: OkRn-1: 120. Community members suggested this ulu was used for sewing.
Figure 21: Artifact OkRn-1: 318. Community member suggested it was used for foxes.

Figure 22: Artifact OkRn-1: 405. Community member suggested it was used for geese.
Appendix C: Traditional Place Names and Land Use

Figure 23: Map of Banks Island showing the locations of place names from and land use information from Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional Place Name</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kellett Point</td>
<td>Popular spring camping location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lena Lake</td>
<td>Named after Lena Wolki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25 Minute Lake</td>
<td>Name expresses that it takes 25 minutes to travel there from Sachs Harbour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kudlak Lake</td>
<td>Named after Frank Kudlak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kuptana Lake</td>
<td>Named after William Kuptana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Middle Lake</td>
<td>Popular trout and char fishing spot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fish Lake</td>
<td>Popular trout and char fishing spot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Emegak Lake</td>
<td>Named after Mark Emegak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Edith Lake</td>
<td>Named after Edith Haogak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Blue Fox Harbour</td>
<td>Named for the schooner Blue Fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sea Shell Point</td>
<td>A place to collect sea shells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Angus Lake</td>
<td>Named after Angus Elias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CJ Creek</td>
<td>Named after Charlie and Betty's son, CJ Haogak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cape Kellett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lennie River</td>
<td>Named after Lennie Inglangasak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Apiana Creek</td>
<td>[Maybe Apiana Creek? Named for Joe Apiana???]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bertram Hill</td>
<td>Named after Bertram Pokiak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Easter Creek</td>
<td>Named after Wallace Lucas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wallace Creek</td>
<td>Named after Wallace Lucas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Raddi Lake</td>
<td>Named after Raddi Kuiksaq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Capron Lake</td>
<td>A popular fishing location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Swan Lake</td>
<td>Name may indicate a good swan hunting location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Haogak Lake</td>
<td>Named after Charles Haogak. Area used for trapping and fishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Atitook Lake</td>
<td>“No Name” Lake. Siglitun dialect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Atitook River</td>
<td>“No Name” River. Siglitun dialect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Imnakyuak</td>
<td>Expresses that there is a big cliff. Siglitun dialect. A place good for polar bear hunting. A good source for slate to make uluit (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sandhill River</td>
<td>“Submitted October 22, 1954, by chief cartographer as a descriptive name used by T. H. Manning on noted on Banks Island” (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>De Salis Bay</td>
<td>Many families moved to Sachs Harbour from this camp during the 1950s and 1960s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lennie Harbour</td>
<td>Named after Lennie Inglangasuk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Imnaqpaaluk</td>
<td>Name expresses that there are big bluffs. Called “Big Bluff” in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sik Sik Point</td>
<td>“Squirrel” Point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sik Sik Lake</td>
<td>“Squirrel” Lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sik Sik Hill</td>
<td>“Squirrel” Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Manniliqqik (Egg River)</td>
<td>Name expresses that this location is a place to gather eggs in the Kangiruartiarmiutun dialect. A place for collecting eggs, goose hunting, and making dry geese in spring. Geese were hunted with a snares made from caribou sinew (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Big River</td>
<td>“The river locally known as Big River, it being one of the biggest rivers on Banks Island and the biggest within normal hunting range of the Banks Island [Inuvialuit]” (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Moose Island</td>
<td>“Supplied by T.H. Manning. Called Moose Island by the [Inuvialuit] because something happened to a dog named &quot;Moose&quot; there. The island is an important camping ground and it supports the largest Eider Duck Colony on Banks Island” (PWNHC, NWT Placenames Database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sea Otter Island</td>
<td>Named after the schooner the <em>Sea Otter</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sea Otter Harbour</td>
<td>Named after the schooner the <em>Sea Otter</em>, which wintered there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bernard River</td>
<td>Named after explorer Peter Bernard, mailman who delivered mail to the crew of the Canadian Arctic Expedition. Caribou hunting in the summer (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Storkerson River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sea Otter River</td>
<td>Named after the schooner the <em>Sea Otter</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nasogaluk River</td>
<td>Named after David Nasogaluk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>North Star Harbour</td>
<td>“Probably named for the fishing schooner North Star, used in the Canadian Arctic Expedition, 1915-16; owned from 1917 by Natkusiak, who moored south of Cape Alfred, Banks Island 1917-21. North Star was wrecked ca. 1932. A second North Star of Herschel Island, 57-ft. sloop, was owned by Fred Carpenter from 1935-1967” (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Satchik River</td>
<td>In the 1930s and 40s many families stayed in Satchik, including Jim Wolki and his family. The name means “further from here.” (Nagy 1999: 82-83).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ikkuq (Robillard Island)</td>
<td>Kangiryuarmiutun dialect. Expresses that somebody took the island off of the land and moved it (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kaersok River</td>
<td>Might mean “to fight” (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cape Wrotesley</td>
<td>“Named after Lord Wrottesley, Baron Wrottesley (1798-1967), President of the Royal Society, 1854-57. The most northerly point of Banks Island named by Robert McClure, 1851” (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Upingivik</td>
<td>“A place to stay in the summer” (Betty-Raddi Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nangmagivik Lake</td>
<td>“to carry”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Amagok River</td>
<td>“Wolf” River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mahogany Point</td>
<td>&quot;More driftwood was found on this point than anywhere else on the north coast of Banks Island except the side of Mercy Bay. About half of it was mahogany from the wreck of the HMS Investigator&quot; (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Hitilik</td>
<td>“A cave” in Kangiryuarmiutun dialect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Kangiryuarmiutun Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Kugavikyuaq (Thomsen River)</td>
<td>Expresses that it is a really strong River (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Muskox River</td>
<td>“In 1952 a Muskox, the first recorded on Banks Island for 40 years, was seen near this river, and in 1953 a group of over 100 skulls was found in the angle between it and Thomsen River” (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>“Named in honour of Charles W. Green, 3rd Officer, leader of an expedition on the northeast coast of Banks Island from the D.G.S. Arctic under the command of J. E. Bernier while stationed on Melville Island in 1910” (NWT Place Names Database, PWNHC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Kange River</td>
<td>“'A feature extending towards the interior.' An [Inuvialuktun] word. This well expresses this river's path over the Devonian Plateau of north-eastern Banks Island” (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Tiqilraa</td>
<td>Expresses that this is the corner of the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ikiqtunaaryuk (Johnson Point)</td>
<td>Expresses that this point is not very close but it is not very far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Nunagiyaak (Princess Royal Islands)</td>
<td>Expresses that there are two little islands. Camping spot when crossing from Victoria Island to Banks Island. Family would stop there to dry out their clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td>Kangiqhuaryuk (Jesse Bay)</td>
<td>Kangiryuarmiutun dialect. Expresses that this is a little bay. Settlement used in August. People made winter clothes at this time (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td>Nakhaluk River</td>
<td>Kangiryuarmiutun dialect. Translation: Big Valley River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td>Coal Mine Bluff</td>
<td>Coal seams found in the cliff face were utilized by Inuvialuit wintering on south east Banks Island during the 1940s and 1950s (PWNHC, NWT Place Names Database).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td>Siogak River</td>
<td>“Sand” River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td>Lucas Knoll</td>
<td>Named after the Lucas family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td>Sunguqpagaluk River</td>
<td>Expresses that this area is a “big green area” (Betty Raddi-Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td>Saningayualuk River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td>Frank's Cabin</td>
<td>Frank Carpenter's trapping cabin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td>Oski Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td>Kaligaluk River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td>Sunnguqpaaluk Hill</td>
<td>Expresses that this is a “big green area” (Betty-Raddi-Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td>Nahauyaryuak</td>
<td>Kangiryuarmiutun dialect. Expresses that this area looks like a great big hood (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Granny Lake</td>
<td>Named after Susie Tiktalik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Usher Lake</td>
<td>Probably named after Peter Usher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Imnaugaluki Creek</td>
<td>Expresses that there are little bluffs in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Singigyuak Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Nagiyuligaluk Hill</td>
<td>Expresses that there are lots of muskox horns in the area (Betty Raddi-Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Robert Lake</td>
<td>Named after Robert Kuptana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ukalikpialuk Hills</td>
<td>Expresses that there are lots of rabbits in the area (Betty-Raddi Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Stuck Lake</td>
<td>Named because the Lucas family was stuck there while travelling (John Lucas Sr.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Wine Lake</td>
<td>Named because a wine bottle was found there (John Lucas Sr.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Char Lake</td>
<td>Named because it is a good place to fish char.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Trevor Lake</td>
<td>Named after Trevor Lucas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ingaluaqqattaryuaqq Kangi(qhua)</td>
<td>Kangiryuarmiutun dialect. Expresses that this river is long and windy like an intestine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Unknown Name</td>
<td>Spring settlement area, good because close to ocean. Good fishing, fished through natural holes in the ice on the lake (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Unknown Name</td>
<td>Spring Settlement area, good for collecting eggs and hunting ducks, seals, seagulls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Unknown Name</td>
<td>Fishing in the spring before going in land to hunt caribou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Unknown Name</td>
<td>Hunting area (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Petrified Forest</td>
<td>Used wood from petrified forest to make fires for cooking and keeping warm (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Tuaq Lake</td>
<td>Kangiryuarmiutun dialect. Expresses that a chisel got stuck there (Edith Haogak).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Martha Point</td>
<td>Goose hunting area. Possibly named after Martha Kudluk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Picnic Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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