



Nunavut







Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture

..... Ailsa Henderson



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

© UBC Press 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright (Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency), www.accesscopyright.ca.

16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free, with vegetable-based inks.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Henderson, Ailsa

Nunavut : rethinking political culture / Ailsa Henderson.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1423-2

1. Political culture – Nunavut. 2. Politics and culture – Nunavut. 3. Inuit – Nunavut – Politics and government. 4. Political participation – Nunavut. 5. Nunavut – Politics and government. I. Title.

FC4324.2.H46 2007

320.9719'5

C2007-904415-8

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083

www.ubcpress.ca



..... Contents

Tables and Illustrations	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
Abbreviations	xiii
1 Introduction	1
2 Politics in Nunavut	18
3 Inuit Political Culture	37
4 Political Integration in the Eastern Arctic	56
5 Institutional Design in the Eastern Arctic	85
6 Consensus Politics	112
7 Political Participation in Nunavut	138
8 Ideological Diversity in Nunavut	168
9 Transforming Political Culture in Nunavut	190
10 Cultural Pluralism and Political Culture	213
Appendix	221
Notes	223
References	228
Index	244





..... Tables and Illustrations

Tables

2.1	Regions and communities in Nunavut	26
2.2	Proportions of households living in poverty	27
2.3	Measures of health and employability	30
5.1	Administration of political development in the NWT, 1936-99	110
6.1	Candidate reasons for running in the 2004 Nunavut election	122
6.2	Issues identified by voters and candidates	124
7.1	Turnout in land-claim-related plebiscites, 1982-97	146
7.2	Turnout in federal elections, 1979-2006	147
7.3	Turnout in Nunavut communities and constituencies, 1995-2006	148
7.4	Adjusted turnout rates for Nunavut elections, 2004	150
7.5	Turnout for NTI executive positions, 1999-2006	151
7.6	Primary identity attachments among Nunavut residents	156
7.7	Aggregate predictors of turnout in elections	157
7.8	Individual predictors of turnout in 2004	161
7.9	Competition for elected office in Nunavut, 1999-2006	165
7.10	Current employment of territorial candidates and MLAs, 1995-2004, in percent	166
8.1	Political attitudes in Nunavut and Canadian provinces, percent agreeing	171
8.2	Postmaterialism in Nunavut, in percent	174
8.3	Predictors of political attitudes	184



viii ● ● ● ● ● TABLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS

8.4	Political and demographic components of political clusters	186
9.1	Expectations of Nunavut	202
9.2	Support for the NLCA and Nunavut, percent agreeing	203
9.3	Support for the NLCA and Nunavut by ethnicity, percent agreeing	204
9.4	Impact of NLCA on individual, 2001 and 2004	207
9.5	Impact of Nunavut on individual, 2001 and 2004	208
9.6	Impact of Nunavut on ability to govern better, 2001 and 2004	209
9.7	Nunavut will face financial troubles, 2001 and 2004	210

Illustrations

Map of Nunavut	facing page 1
Postmaterialism by ethnicity and age	176





..... Acknowledgments

The community of scholars studying politics in the Canadian Arctic is a small but supportive one. I am particularly indebted to several individuals who provided their collective insights into political developments in Nunavut. Graham White and Annis May Timpson have endured most of the chapters in their initial incarnation as conference presentations, and I have benefited tremendously from their insights and support. Their company at conferences has been a delightful constant and an important source of advice. As Annis May will note, I have not grown out of my numbers phase, despite her predictions. Alex Baldwin at the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut has provided thoughtful and very thorough comments on various chapters and ideas and has facilitated access to public documents. His initial three-hour legislative tour was the most comprehensive introduction to politics in Nunavut I could have enjoyed, and I am grateful for the kindness he has extended to my undergraduate and graduate research assistants. Jack Hicks, formerly of the Nunavut Implementation Committee and Nunavut Bureau of Statistics, operates as a one-man Nunavut archive and has been unfailingly generous with his institutional memory, time, and energy. I am indebted to Emily Andrew and Ann Macklem at UBC Press for their enthusiastic support and professionalism.

Much of the research for this manuscript was conducted while I was an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Wilfrid Laurier University. The department provided tangible assistance in the form of a one-semester research leave and top-up funding for travel and research assistants, and this, in turn, provided me with the time and resources to conduct my work. I also benefited tremendously from the research community that the department fostered, and the book is much improved thanks to their support. Funding for initial fieldwork in Iqaluit was made possible by a SSHRC post-doctoral fellowship and a Victoria College George Metcalfe fellowship.



A Wilfrid Laurier post-doctoral fellowship funded additional research trips to Iqaluit, Pangnirtung, Igloolik, and Yellowknife. Additional funding for research assistance was facilitated through the Northern Scientific Training Program, and research assistance was provided by former Wilfrid Laurier students Stephanie Blenkiron and Jenny Tierney. Thanks to their resourcefulness, work ethic, and professionalism, they were both very valuable assets. Their time in the north was facilitated greatly by those who provided housesits to unknown (but thankfully reliable) students: Terry Rogers and Amanda Ford, Rita Anilniliak and Shawn Strickland, Judy Anilniliak and Howard Chislett, Levinia and Ron Brown, Jack Hicks, Nancy Campbell and John Walsh, and Kim Cummings.

The quantitative analysis in this work would not have been possible without access to survey data. I would like to thank the Nunavut Bureau of Statistics and its directors Jack Hicks and Paul Harris for access to the Nunavut household surveys as well as Lucy Magee at the Department of Community, Government and Transportation for access to community voting data. I would also like to thank Pat Nagle and Fiona Christensen at the CBC and Doug Workman at the Nunavut Employees Union. The qualitative analysis would not have been possible without the interview subjects who generously took time out of busy work schedules to meet with me. This data collection was covered by a research licence issued by the Nunavut Research Institute in 2002. Those interviewed included Alex Baldwin, Jack Hicks, David Akeagok, Simon Awa, Okalik Curley, Rebekah Williams, Jim Bell, Hunter Tootoo, David Omilgoitok, Wilf Atwood, Lee Selleck, and Rick Bargery. My Inuktitut teacher Papatsi Kublu-Hill showed considerable patience with my awkward if earnest efforts. For those who provided more informal opportunities to discuss political events, I am indebted for their hospitality and company. These include Nancy Campbell and John Walsh, Mary Cousins, Michael Bravo, Alison Rogan, Eva Aariak, Lena Eviq, Kenn Harper and Lynn Cousins, Jonah Kelly, Hunter Tootoo, Victor Tootoo, Nora Sanders, Jimi Onalik, Don Ellis, Ken Lovely, John MacDonald, Sousan Abadian, Chris Aquino, and Marianne Demmer. Mary-ellen Thomas at the Nunavut Research Institute has been a useful sounding board for ideas, as have Gabrielle Slowey and David Brock. Birger and Marie Poppel in Nuuk, Karo Thomsen and Ono Fleischer in Illulisaat, Susan Soule in Anchorage, and Susan Woodley and Sheila Watt Cloutier in Iqaluit generously shared their homes and insights with me during my visits, and my stays with them are among the highlights of my research time in the North. Still others have provided company and support during



successive research trips and have become valued friends. These include Maria Inês Monteiro and Claude Beauchamp, Gillian Corless, Matt Corless, Letia Cousins, Chris Douglas and Neida Gonzalez, Sandra Inutiq and Walter Oliver, Gavin Nesbitt, Shawna O’Hearn, Mitch Taylor, David Veniot, and Kathrine Wessendorf. I am particularly thankful to my Apex neighbours Philippe Lavallée, Terry Rogers, and Amanda Ford, who provided wonderful company, countless shared meals, and a much welcome diversion, often in the form of iced coffee, net cleaning, a short kayak trip, or a sewing lesson when the research process began to wear me down. Terry and Amanda’s three brilliant children – Thomas, Sivu, and Matthew Ford-Rogers – and my regular house visitor Seepoola Shoo helped to provide an essential sense of perspective and reminded me often of the duty owed by the territory to its younger generation.

Previous versions of chapters were presented at the Nordic Association of Canadian Studies conference in Reykjavik (1999); the International Congress of Arctic Social Scientists in Fairbanks (2004); the First Nations First Thoughts conference organized by the Centre of Canadian Studies at the University of Edinburgh (2005); the Scott Polar Research Institute at Cambridge (2003); the Home Rule Government in Nuuk, Greenland (2004); and at the Toronto (2002), Halifax (2003), Winnipeg (2004), and London (2005) meetings of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA). The CPSA provided a welcome travel grant to the 2003 meetings. A previous version of Chapter 6 appeared as “Politics without Parties: Citizen Integration and Interest Articulation in Consensus Politics,” in *Canadian Parties in Transition*, 3rd ed., edited by Alain-G. Gagnon and A. Brian Tanguay (Peterborough: Broadview, 2007). The updated chapter is reprinted by permission of Broadview. Sections of Chapter 7 appeared in 2004 as “Northern Political Culture: Political Behaviour in Nunavut,” *Études/Inuit/Studies* 28 (1): 133-53. Sections of Chapter 8 appeared in 2007 as “Cultural Renaissance or Economic Emancipation: Predictors of Support for Devolution in Nunavut,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 41 (2): 1-23, and are reprinted with permission. Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders of material. If there are errors or omissions, they are unintentional and the publisher would be grateful to learn of them.

I was able to complete the book while serving as a visiting professor in Canadian Studies and Politics at the University of Edinburgh. Canadian Studies director Annis May Timpson and the centre’s administrative assistant Anna Doherty provided the essential resources and welcoming environment for



..... Abbreviations

ANOVA	analysis of variance
APS	Aboriginal Peoples Survey
BRIA	Baffin Regional Inuit Association
CEO	chief electoral officer
CES	Canadian Election Study
CLEY	Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth
COPE	Committee for Original Peoples' Entitlement
CORA	Canadian Opinion Research Archive
CPSA	Canadian Political Science Association
CRIC	Centre for Research and Information on Canada
DEW	Distant Early Warning
DIAND	Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
DNANR	Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources
DV	dependent variable
GN	Government of Nunavut
GNWT	Government of the Northwest Territories
ILCC	Inuit Land Claims Commission
IQ	Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit
ITC	Inuit Tapirisat of Canada
LISPOP	Laurier Institute for the Study of Public Opinion and Policy
NIC	Nunavut Implementation Commission
NLCA	Nunavut Land Claims Agreement
NNI	Nunavummi Nangminiqatunik Ikajuuti
NRI	Nunavut Research Institute
NSDC	Nunavut Social Development Council
NSO	Northern Service Officer
NTI	Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
NuHS	Nunavut Household Survey

NWT	Northwest Territories
OLS	ordinary least squares
OSR	Office of the Special Representative
PCs	Progressive Conservatives
QIA	Qikiqtani Inuit Association
RCAP	Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples
SLiCA	Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic
TFN	Tungavik Federation of Nunavut



Nunavut





1 Introduction

In 1993, Inuit in the eastern Arctic of Canada signed a comprehensive land claim agreement with two other signatories: the federal government of Canada and the territorial government of the Northwest Territories (NWT). Stretching from Greenland in the east to the Yukon territory in the West, the NWT was at the time the largest political jurisdiction in Canada and home to a diverse blend of indigenous groups, including Dene, Métis, Cree, Inuvialuit, and Inuit. With their land claim, Inuit gained title to 350,000 square kilometres of land, including subsurface mineral rights to 35,000 square kilometres, over \$1.1 billion in federal money to be transferred over a period of fourteen years; royalties from oil, gas, and mineral development on Crown land; hunting and fishing rights; and participation in land and resource management decisions through co-management boards. The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) also outlined provisions for a political accord, which provided for the creation in 1999 of a new territory in the Canadian Arctic. Meaning “our land” in Inuktitut, Nunavut is currently home to 30,000 residents, 85 percent of whom are Inuit beneficiaries of the Nunavut land claim.

This book explores the emergence of a distinct political culture in Nunavut, the norms of political behaviour, political values, and institutions that structure political relationships within the territory. It would be understandable for such a work to begin its description in 1999, with the first elections to the Nunavut Legislative Assembly, the opening of its doors, and the creation of a separate Nunavut bureaucracy. Such an approach would locate the birth of Nunavut political culture in the establishment of a distinct polity in the eastern Arctic. Political culture in Nunavut, however, bears the legacy of its past and, as such, is influenced by three separate cultures:

- 1 the culture of its precontact and contact Inuit population;
- 2 the culture of the Canadian political system into which this population was integrated; and
- 3 the territorial culture of the pre-division NWT.

Although these might seem linked to institutions rather than cultures, they are the product of, and agents in, a wider approach to political life. Each of these three cultures contains discrete approaches to political life and has influenced the achievement of the NLCA, the institutions established under the Nunavut Political Accord, and the attitudes, beliefs, values, and behaviours of the Nunavut electorate. These three cultures might be considered Inuit, southern, and northern, respectively, although these are only approximate labels. The federal government, for example, was undeniably a presence grounded in southern political practice, but it did, to different degrees, adapt to northern realities. The territorial government of the NWT, while based since 1967 in the north, also bears the imprint of southern political institutions. Neither of these is a monolithic, homogeneous, or pure example of “southern” or “northern” influence. Inuit varied in their reactions to the increasing contact with traders, missionaries, and government officials. Indeed, contact for different areas occurred at different times, and the method of contact itself structured reaction. By consulting diverse historical and contemporary sources drafted by both Inuit and non-Inuit, it is possible to identify general cultural approaches to political relationships that seem typical of these three influences. Political culture in Nunavut, then, bears the influence of these three cultures, each of which has been marked by adaptation to the other. Whether or not the end result is a unified, distinct political culture bearing the marks of both a Westminster political tradition and an Inuit approach to community decision making is the focus of this book.

Our traditional understandings of political culture suggest that political institutions both spring from and influence the behaviour of the citizenry. This organic relationship between the act of institutional creation and the continuing influence of institutions should not suggest that all members of the electorate have an equal say in the creation of institutions. More often than not, political institutions have been created by political elites with vested interests in certain outcomes or certain patterns of stability within the polity. In polities where elites share the same goals as the electorate, or in polities where non-elites possess the capacity to influence the design of institutions, the result can be a unified political culture. In polities where political elites

represent a distinct subgroup within the population – a subgroup whose members have little in common, either economically or culturally, with the rest of the population – the result can be an uneasy grafting of one group's institutions onto another's. Political culture research certainly provides us with examples of institutions selected by state elites and grafted onto polities whose economic or ideological realities provided them with a hostile home.

The process of institutional creation helps us to understand political culture in Nunavut. Here we have a population that had its own decision-making practices, if not formal institutions as we traditionally understand them. The institutions of Nunavut, however, bear a decidedly British influence. These institutions were not created by elites, leaders, decision makers, or power brokers within Inuit or northern society but by elites within the Canadian political system. Since the redrawing of territorial boundaries in 1905, we have seen two processes of adaptation in the north: one that occurs among institutions, which have only slowly and recently started to bear the mark of the population for which they were created, and one that occurs among residents. This second process of adaptation has occurred much faster than the first. Until now, however, we have not paid very much attention to the political adaptation of northerners. This is not to say that there is little research on the north. On the contrary, both southern academics and northern residents have addressed the Christianization of the population, the transition to a wage economy, relocation, and the establishment of settlements. What we have lacked until now, however, is research that focuses on the collision of different political cultures within the north.¹ Relying on a wealth of primary and secondary sources, *Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture* addresses three key research questions: (1) how has the pre-existing model of Inuit governance and the process by which Inuit were integrated into the Canadian political system influenced the current operation of political life in Nunavut? (2) to what extent does the institutional structure of political life affect the political behaviour of its citizens? and (3) is there a distinct political culture within Nunavut? Throughout this book, I track the emergence of a variant political culture within Canada, one in which opportunities for participation are plentiful but in which the costs of involvement – in time and money – are far higher than they are in southern Canada and in the two other territories.

Although sparsely populated, Nunavut has proven a fertile ground for researchers. The physical environment has attracted the attentions of scientists interested in species variation, glaciology, climate change, and mineral

deposits. Inhabitants of the eastern Arctic have also received considerable attention from social scientists. Typical research addresses kinship patterns, naming conventions, food sharing, knowledge transfer, taboos, games, songs, myths, and the material culture of Inuit. Such research is supplemented by the diaries and biographies of the explorers, traders, missionaries, nurses, teachers, miners, construction workers, and government employees who have travelled to the eastern Arctic for adventure or job prospects and who, upon returning home, decided to put their experiences to paper. Rarely has so much been written about so few. Given the wealth of information, one might wonder why an examination of political culture in Nunavut is useful or even necessary. This book fills a gap in existing political research on Nunavut, and there are three rather obvious reasons for the need to do so.

First, the creation of Nunavut is the result of the largest settled land claim in Canadian history. Considered as one of a number of experiments in quasi self-government for Aboriginal peoples, it holds obvious lessons for political scientists. How individuals adapt to institutional change, the sources of tension between public government and Aboriginal organizations, and whether citizens develop a greater sense of trust in political institutions are all issues that arise from a serious consideration of political life in Nunavut. In this approach to the study of Nunavut, residents of the north are viewed primarily as citizens in a contemporary polity rather than as members of a particular cultural group.

Second, the establishment of new public institutions provided an opportunity to create a new political culture. Inuit claims negotiators viewed the creation of a territory not just as a way to improve resource access but as a means to secure greater attention to Inuit values and culture. Coupled with the land claim, it provided the route to political and economic self-determination. The new territory could not only effect a cultural renaissance for eastern Arctic Inuit but it could also change the culture of political institutions. For members of the Nunavut Implementation Commission, the establishment of a decentralized bureaucracy provided the chief deviation from the structure of NWT political institutions. Positions with the Nunavut public service were to be distributed among the ten largest communities, spreading expertise and wealth throughout the territory. A second key deviation, articulated primarily since 1999, would see the improved integration of Inuit ways of thinking and problem-solving and of approaches to life. Has such an integration produced the intended rewards? In order to answer this question, I identify various institutional approaches to political culture, indicate

how they are shaped by individuals, and discuss how, in turn, they shape the rules of political life.

Third, Nunavut is something of an anomaly within the Canadian federation. It contains the fewest residents spread among the largest geographic area. It is the only jurisdiction in which Aboriginal people form more than three-quarters of the electorate. Indicators of health and education, however, point to worrying trends. The sheer dominance of government in people's lives – as an employer and a provider of housing, education, or income – must be acknowledged. These differences are useful for they highlight the multiple and overlapping influences on political life in Nunavut, and it is not always easy to determine whether events or patterns may be attributed to the predominantly Inuit population, to its territorial status, or to the fact that we are dealing with a sparsely populated Arctic environment. In addition, the markers that serve to distinguish Nunavut are not zero sum. The territory contains a predominantly Inuit population, but it is not ethnically homogeneous. Its institutions reflect the considerable influence of the NWT, but there are important distinctions. As the product of a land claim and political accord, this distinct polity provides an opportunity to examine the multiple influences on contemporary political culture.

Research linking Aboriginal politics to a wider theoretical political literature appears in two general groups. The first group approaches Aboriginal politics from a political economy perspective and, in so doing, explores inequalities of resources and power (Abele 1997; Wotherspoon and Satzewich 2000). Topics include the real and metaphorical processes of colonization (Green 2003), the integration of First Nations workers into a capitalist system (Kellough 1980), the impact of globalization (Slowey 2001), the position of First Nations women (Green 2003), and the internal colonialism that results from a fundamental inequality of access to resources and power (Hicks 2004). Research in this vein views self-government as a way, often imperfect, to correct for past injustices by providing access to the very things that Aboriginal groups have traditionally lacked in the political sphere; namely, resources and economic development (Alfred 1999; Billson 2001; Ladner 2001; Macdonald 2000; Russell 2000; Rynard 2000; Stabler 1989). A second group employs Aboriginal peoples (or Aboriginal culture) as an empirical example in a normative discussion of rights, citizenship, or belonging in contemporary liberal society (Kernerman 2005; Kymlicka 1995; Tully 1995a, 1995b, 1999). Viewed as national minorities, Aboriginal peoples are deemed worthy of certain collective rights. Self-government, in this research, is viewed as

a welcome component of multicultural approaches to constitutional recognition and as the moral motor for a system of differentiated citizenship, described by one political scientist as “citizens plus” (Cairns 2000). The position of culture within such research varies. The political economy literature integrates culture into a larger discussion of power, while the normative literature assumes that Aboriginal peoples have a specific and different cultural approach to political life from that of Euro-Canadians. Although it sees this approach as one worthy of recognition, it frequently fails to catalogue either the extent to which it exists or how it has matured.

Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture grounds itself in cultural explanations of political attitudes, behaviour, and institutions. If culture functions as a toolkit, informing individuals about the dominant beliefs, values, and approaches of a particular society, then political culture includes the dominant political beliefs, values, and approaches to political life that define a particular polity. Political culture has both a theoretical and practical significance. In practical terms, it is worth identifying the ideal cluster of attitudes and behaviour that allows democracy to flourish in some states while ensuring that it will flounder in others. This was certainly the interest of early studies of political cultures, from the more sociological approaches of Tocqueville to the more quantitative approach of political scientists writing in the 1960s (Almond and Verba 1963; Pye and Verba 1965). Political culture also helps us to understand the way individuals interact with the institutions that structure their daily lives, why certain modes of interaction are favoured over others, and why particular models of institutional design recur over time. Such insights are not necessarily immediately relevant from a policy perspective, but they help social scientists to better understand how individuals acquire certain beliefs and why they act the way they do.

Political culture is the product of empirical fact and perception. What citizens think of the state is, in part, a function of the way the state treats them through its rules and institutions. In part, though, attitudes toward the state are a function of perception divorced from fact. While Tocqueville was concerned with the quality of political representatives, contemporary political culture researchers are more likely to explore what individuals *think* of their political representatives – whether they trust them or think them worthy of deference, whether they find that they foster a sense of efficacy, whether they, as individuals, are satisfied with them – rather than the extent to which their representatives are performing effectively.

Research on political culture also addresses the relationship between institutions and values, including the capacity of institutions to create or sustain attitudinal and behavioural norms and the fit between externally imposed or internally developed institutions and citizen expectations. Although evidence has been mixed, much research argues that political cultures prove themselves resistant to change. In some cases, this is because the behavioural norms are so powerful that institutional reform provides an insufficient influence (Putnam 1993). In others, the attitudes provide a hostile environment for new institutions, producing the political equivalent of organ rejection. Within Canada, political culture research has focused on an earlier stage, on the establishment of political institutions in nascent cultures and their capacity to influence contemporary political culture. Fragment theorists argued for the impact of settlers from New France (Hartz 1964; Horowitz 1966) or of United Empire Loyalists (Bell 1970; Lipset 1968; Lipset 1990) on the Tory-tinged liberalism of Canadian political culture. More recently, the Charter is attributed with transforming Canadian political culture, engendering among its citizens (and political scientists) a rights-based approach to citizenship (Howe and Fletcher 2001). Here, institutions are both the product of one coherent political culture and a variable in the creation of another. If much of the comparative research on political culture suggests a certain skepticism about the capacity of institutions to shape attitudes and behaviour, Canadian research has tended to stress the ways in which coherent cultural fragments and the institutions they develop can have a long-lasting effect. Both Horowitz and Lipset warned that cultural influence was not automatic. Settlers must appear before the point at which political institutions congeal in order to exert influence on political culture. The only problem with these explanations – so tightly woven into our understandings of Canadian political culture – is that empirical research has shown influence to be overstated, if apparent at all (Stewart 1994).

The creation of Nunavut provides an opportunity to test three aspects of political culture. First, it allows us to examine the interaction of what we might identify as distinct cultural fragments in the eastern Arctic. We can identify the fundamental precepts of Inuit, federal, and territorial political cultures, the points on which they disagree, and how they have influenced and been marked by contact with each other. In the collision of cultures we can identify values that remained and became dominant as well as those that disappeared over time. By exploring the political culture of Nunavut, we can

test whether earlier cultural fragments provide an inheritance for the contemporary polity.

Second, the creation of Nunavut enables us to explore the relationships among different aspects of political culture. Nunavut provides a useful context within which to study the fit between institutions, on the one hand, and citizen attitudes and behaviours, on the other, precisely because its political institutions were so obviously grafted from one culture onto another. The state is, of course, a non-neutral agent, and research on Canadian politics has shown how the state at times validates a system that discriminates against Aboriginal people (Frideres 1991). Not only does the state act in the interests of certain groups within the polity but it also reflects particular visions of the ideal relationship between itself and its citizens. Within Nunavut, these views are evident both in the way the state sought to integrate Inuit and in the successive and conscious efforts to create political institutions that altered the relationship between citizen and state. Times of institutional change provide particularly fruitful opportunities to examine political culture for they show how different groups of individuals exert an uneven influence on the development of political institutions, allow for a before-and-after vision of the dominant political attitudes, and test for the capacity of reform to produce meaningful change in the aggregate attitudes and behaviours of the electorate.

Third, we can test for the capacity of federal systems to house variant political cultures. The state could be considered a homogenizing influence on political culture. If citizens are subject to similar laws or rules of participation, if policy seeks to make uniform access to education, health care, or social and economic rights, the result can be a state with few political cleavages. And yet, in their investigation of Canadian political culture, Simeon and Elkins (1974) identified significant regional variations in attitudes and behaviours. They attributed these to the unique activities of provincial governments and variations in the way the federal government treats its citizens. Both of these culture generators are evident in Nunavut. We can hardly find a better example of federal exceptionalism than the treatment of Inuit in the eastern Arctic, and much of the existing research on the north chronicles the extent and effect of institutional anomalies such as consensus politics. We also know that socio-economic realities serve as predictors of political attitudes and behaviour. If we know that economic situation, language, religion, and urban-rural environment can have an impact on people's political views; and if we know that the economic, linguistic, religious, and urban profile of

the north is different from that of the south, that the federal government has treated its citizens differently and that the territorial political institutions contain anomalous features; then we have an ideal opportunity to test for the generation of cultural boundaries. I contribute to each of these debates by exploring the generation and operation of political culture in Nunavut.

I also offer an opportunity to test the boundaries of cultural pluralism. In Canada, multiculturalism is the most obvious example of normative support for cultural pluralism. Culture, in this sense, is often linked to private expressions of difference; multiculturalism thus allows individuals to remain connected within an ethnic culture while enjoying full rights as Canadian citizens and full integration within Canadian society. It is decidedly pluralist in that it welcomes the existence and expression of multiple cultures. If governments can display positive support for cultures, or can abide by a policy of negative non-interference, then Canadian multiculturalism clearly supports cultural pluralism (Kymlicka 1995; Requejo 2005; Tierney 2004; Tully 1995b). This seems relatively straightforward when we associate culture with food, customs, or even visions of the good life. In a liberal state, all visions of the good life are considered fair game so long as they do not run afoul of the law. If we adopt a different definition of culture, if we see it as a political culture, concerned with public interactions between the state and citizens, then the management of cultural pluralism is rather more difficult because it involves rival visions of the role of the state.

There are, of course, different ways to embrace the pluralism of political cultures. In one scenario, we might decide that one political culture should take priority over others without infringing upon the ability of a particular group to express itself. This is possible in a federal state, where the state possesses one political culture while substate units, whether nations or not, possess their own political cultures, each of which is sustained and nurtured by domestic political institutions. Within a unitary polity, however, it is not immediately clear how these dominant and subordinate political cultures might interact. We might detect the existence of rival political cultures, each vying for supremacy. For Wildavsky and others this situation is entirely normal, the eventual political culture of any state formed by a jostling among its constituent cultures, whether public or institutional, mass or elite (Wildavsky 1987; see also Smith 1993; Mamadouh 1997). If we think of cultural pluralism not in terms of private cultural expression but, rather, in terms of political cultures – with each culture having a different vision of the role of the state, the interaction of citizens, citizens' rights, decision making, and the

goals of public institutions – then we begin to see how a polity might be come marked by rivalries between different political cultures.

An investigation of political culture in Nunavut is relevant, therefore, not only because of what it tells us about Inuit, northerners, or particular types of elections but also for what it tells us about cultures, about how one culture comes to dominate others. Those interested in the political cultures of advanced industrial democracies must deal with the fact that the period during which radical change occurred, during which the political culture settled, is far removed. In Nunavut, however, this is not the case: the process of cultural change is far more recent. As a result, it affords us an opportunity to understand the process by which cultures attempt to supplant one another, the challenges that they face, and the uneasy accommodation that exists when a population attempts to replace the dominant political culture with another one, however hesitant or contested those efforts may seem.

Methodology

Research on Canadian political attitudes and behaviours relies almost exclusively on the analysis of quantitative data taken from large surveys, data that are not readily available for the territories. Typical data sources include the Canadian Election Study (CES), the World Values Survey, and, occasionally, private polling data made available through data archives such as those housed at the Canadian Opinion Research Archive (CORA) at Queen's University or the Laurier Institute for the Study of Public Opinion and Policy (LISPOP) at Wilfrid Laurier University. Territorial residents are typically absent from these datasets.

The World Values Survey, by far the most comprehensive comparative study of public opinion, and one now conducted in over seventy countries worldwide, contains no northern respondents in any of the three surveys (1981, 1990, 2000) conducted in Canada. The CES, begun in 1964 to study political attitudes and behaviours during and after federal election campaigns, contained northern respondents in only one of its versions; for the 1997 election the CES team included ninety-seven respondents from the NWT out of a total sample of 3,949. We cannot distinguish between eastern and western residents of the territory, and only twenty-two out of ninety-seven indicated their ethnicity as Native or Inuit, far short of the 52 percent recorded for the general NWT population. Of the private firms, only two, the Centre for Research and Information on Canada (CRIC) and Environics, have regularly included northern respondents in their surveys. In its latest Portraits of

Canada survey, CRIC included three hundred northern respondents, one-third of whom were from Nunavut, in its sample of 3,204. Environics routinely runs a North of 60 monitor, composed entirely of northern respondents. This includes a more developed series of questions on voting and key issues facing voters. Although Environics archives its Focus Ontario and Focus Canada reports with CORA, it does not release its North of 60 monitor because it can continue to sell these data for profit. The paucity of available northern data no doubt facilitates its sale. If southern-based surveys rarely include northern respondents, northern surveys do not necessarily fill the gap for those interested in political attitudes and behaviour.

The 2001 Aboriginal Peoples Survey (APS) conducted by Statistics Canada contains very few attitudinal questions and none related to political attitudes and behaviour. The APS was the vehicle used to distribute the Canadian component of the Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic (SLiCA), a comparative survey of demographic data, behaviours, and social attitudes in the circumpolar world. Because Canadian investigators went into the field before the comparative survey was fully developed, the Canadian instrument lacks the attitudinal questions included in the Greenlandic, American, Swedish, Finnish, and Russian surveys (Andersen and Poppel 2002; Andersen, Kruse, and Poppel 2002). Between them, SLiCA and APS provide reliable data on why a respondent would leave his or her hometown, harvesting activities, and degree of satisfaction with language retention. They do not contain data on the degree of satisfaction with politics nor do they address a range of social and political behaviours.

Government surveys are often a useful source of information. The federal government commissions polls of Aboriginal Canadians, but these focus on the on-reserve First Nations population to the exclusion of Inuit and Métis respondents. Inuit organizations in particular have criticized the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs for equating Aboriginal issues with First Nations issues (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami 2004). Each of the territories conducts its own surveys, but only one includes more than a few attitudinal questions about politics. In the 2001 Nunavut Household Survey (NuHS), this is limited to whether one voted in the last election, how one feels about the NLCA, and whether one is satisfied with the progress of the territorial government. The absence of attitudinal data is not surprising as citizens might view government-commissioned surveys on past voting behaviour, views of the state, and satisfaction with the government as an intrusion. Within this general paucity of data, the 2004 Nunavut Household Survey is unique in its

coverage of political and social topics. Questions probe political interest, democratic satisfaction, voter turnout, efficacy, cynicism, deference, and postmaterialism. The survey replicates questions employed in the Canadian Election Survey and the World Values Survey and, therefore, makes it possible to draw a comparison between Nunavummiut and other Canadians. The 2004 NuHS thus enables the type of political culture research that is already common in southern Canada.

And yet Nunavut is unlike other Canadian jurisdictions. Before the arrival of missionaries or government officials, its predominantly Inuit population possessed distinct approaches to social relations, power, and leadership. The manner in which Inuit were integrated into the Canadian political system established avenues of participation and set up a system of goals and benefits that structured not only the process by which a claim was achieved but also the dominant patterns of political interaction throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The territorial institutions of the NWT have had an obvious impact on the post-division institutional framework of Nunavut. Each of these is integral to political culture in Nunavut and helps to explain contemporary attitudes and behaviour. For this reason, I rely on a range of evidence – historical and contemporary, qualitative and quantitative, aggregate and individual – that allows for both a thick and thin description of political culture in Nunavut.

The first half of *Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture*, which establishes the patterns of political culture prior to and during the establishment of a new territory, relies almost exclusively on qualitative data. These include material from the NWT archives at the Prince of Wales Heritage Centre in Yellowknife and semi-structured interviews with elders, transcripts of which are housed at the Igloolik office of the Nunavut Research Institute (NRI). The archival material covers the period from 1950 to 1982 and draws on the files of the Office of the Administrator of the Arctic, government departments such as the Northern Administrative Branch, religious organizations, the Carrothers Commission, and the previously classified files of the Drury Commission. The more than four hundred interviews conducted by the NRI, which often include repeated sessions with particular individuals, address topics such as childhood memories, myths, hunting practices, mobility patterns, exposure to religious authorities, and perceptions of social, economic, and cultural change. Conducted since the early 1990s, the interviews provide a comprehensive account of life among Inuit hunting camps and settled communities since the middle of the twentieth century. The majority of elders

interviewed would have spent much of their adolescence and early adulthood on a swath of land bound roughly by Repulse Bay to the southwest and Pond Inlet to the northeast, with hunting areas around present-day Igloolik and Hall Beach in the middle. As such, their experiences should be seen as an accurate reflection of life among the *Amitturmiut* and *Tununirmiut*. Exposure to *Uqqurmiut* Inuit in the south Baffin area and to inland groups in the Kivalliq was relatively limited. For this reason, the interviews have been supplemented by a wider range of primary sources, some of which are available through elders conferences or are published in collections of oral histories such as *Uqalurait* (Bennett and Rowley 2004). Secondary sources include personal memoirs and the research of academics and social commentators, primarily anthropologists, who have for decades travelled to the north in an effort to better understand Inuit society. These sources were supplemented by information acquired through semi-structured interviews that I conducted with territorial, federal, and local officials, MLAs, and journalists in Iqaluit and Yellowknife.

The second half of *Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture* relies on quantitative data covering attitudes and behaviours in Nunavut. These include surveys I conducted for the CBC and Nunavut Employees Union during the 2004 territorial election campaign as well as two databases that I created: the first on community demographic and electoral behaviour from 1995 to 2006 and the second on constituency political behaviour for 2004. My analysis also draws on three territorial datasets: the Nunavut add-on to the 1999 NWT Labour Force Survey and the Nunavut household surveys for 2001 and 2004, respectively. Together these datasets enable me to analyze the goals and previous employment of political candidates, predictors of voter turnout, dominant attitudes and behaviour, and evaluations of political development in Nunavut. These qualitative and quantitative data were acquired on ten research trips to Nunavut from 2002 to 2005 and an eight-month research leave in Iqaluit, with side trips to Pangnirtung and Igloolik, from January to August 2003. I gathered comparative information during a two-week visit to Greenland in August 2004.

This triangulated research design contains both strengths and weaknesses. It is tied inherently to definitions of political culture as the property of the aggregate rather than as something contained within individuals. Individual behaviour is treated as a symptom of political culture and merely directs us toward general themes within any given polity. This definition of political culture could be perceived as a potential weakness, as could the focus on

cultural explanations in general. My analysis assumes that rational or economic motivations of voter behaviour, for example, occur within a general cultural context that establishes the parameters of acceptable behaviour, the goals and benefits identified by citizens, and the dominant modes of their expression. Researchers more sympathetic to rational choice or economic explanations might find fault with this approach, preferring a purer calculus based primarily on cost-benefit analysis. In my analysis of political developments in Nunavut I rely upon a canon of comparative political science. In doing this I am aware that I am imposing a Western, scientific lens on political life in the territory. I do not give voice to an over-studied indigenous population but attempt to map and explain the competing cultural influences that have helped to shape political culture in Nunavut.

The methodologies employed have certain reliability concerns. I conducted my research either in English or through the lens of interpretation or translation. This trusts, for example, that the terminology employed by those translating the NRI interviews accurately reflects the intentions of the interview subjects. Qualitative and quantitative approaches each raise different concerns. Quantitative research is often thought to provide, at best, thin interpretations of culture. Questions designed by other researchers for other purposes cannot always contribute meaningful evidence to different research questions. For these reasons, I supplement statistics with more qualitative information. And yet here too we should exercise caution.

Anyone hoping to impute political values based on primary documents faces certain challenges. With interviews, imperfect recall is an obvious concern. In the case of the elder interviews in Igloodik, the cohort of interview subjects was asked to provide information about events that happened half a century ago. For any sample of subjects this would pose certain problems, but for this cohort, the fifty-year period in question covered the oft-quoted "stone age to space age" transformation of Inuit life. Comments about how young people no longer behave as they used to are influenced both by the same steady cultural transformation we find in other societies and by an unrelenting series of cultural transformations far greater than that experienced elsewhere in Canada. Teasing out which comments can be attributed to which transformation is not always easy. At the same time, we are dealing with a cohort of interview subjects whose role in society has been considerably diminished from what it would have been in a more traditional era. It would be reasonable in such a situation to emphasize the positive elements of traditional life and attach less importance to trials or difficulties.

Still other pitfalls relate primarily to the nature of the case study. We must avoid the temptation to reify Inuit culture and, thus, to assume a static interpretation. Practices among Inuit varied over time. Many of these accounts stem from the postcontact period, when interactions with traders were regular and exposure to missionaries was increasing. We must avoid using easy stereotypes, which are usually informed by an incomplete vision of various aspects of social life. As Trott (2001) notes, much that was written about Inuit in the mid-twentieth century portrayed them as rather happy and simple, a view reinforced by the staged photographs of smiling Inuit made available by missionaries. The stereotype of the adaptable Inuk is based primarily on how quickly Inuit took to improvements in hunting implements rather than, for example, to transformations in gender relations or child rearing. Reductionism masks considerable variations among both regions and individuals. Not all Inuit reacted to Christianity, the incursion of government officials, and the imposition of formalized education in the same way.

Structure of Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture

The first half of the book analyzes influences on contemporary political culture in Nunavut, while the second half analyzes the constituent elements of that culture. Chapter 2 identifies the dominant approaches to power, leadership, and social control in contact and postcontact Inuit society. Because Inuit society did not require public institutions of governance, I explore how decisions about resources and mechanisms for ensuring social control help us to understand Inuit political culture. I distinguish between spiritual and temporal agents of social control and chronicle the impact of Christianization on each of those agents. Chapter 3 explores the process by which Inuit were integrated into the political system. It addresses both the opportunities for Inuit involvement in the existing structures and the manner in which their participation was courted. That Inuit were treated not as though they were subject to the rules but as exceptions to them can be seen in the operation of elections, in differing visions of representation, and in the encouragement of democracy at the local level. At certain times, federal and territorial approaches to Inuit served to exclude them from further participation; at other times, governments courted and encouraged their participation. The integration process was twofold, in that state elites designed methods they thought would aid the integration of Inuit, but Inuit themselves had goals and plans on how best to become active Canadian citizens. At times these efforts were at cross purposes. I argue that federal and territorial officials were unprepared

for the speed with which Inuit adapted to the norms of political life; benevolent paternalism was replaced with surprise and frustration in light of often aggressive attempts on the part of Inuit to secure full political rights. While Chapter 3 addresses government decisions about people, Chapter 4 explores government decisions regarding the institutions structuring political life. It tracks the changing cast of characters who made decisions about institutional design, from federal administrators and territorial bureaucrats to legislative members and Inuit land claims negotiators. It focuses on disagreements among these actors not only with regard to the ideal institutional components of political life but also to the process by which an ideal institutional framework might emerge. I conclude the chapter by examining disagreements about institutional design during and after the 1993 land claim. Together, Chapters 2, 3, and 4 analyze an overlapping chronology of events in an effort to detect different cultural approaches and their potential influence on political culture.

The second half of the book systematically examines contemporary political culture in Nunavut. Chapter 5 addresses consensus politics, tracking its origins and impact on the behaviour of legislators both during campaigns and legislative sessions. It explores the subsequent costs to citizens of staying informed and becoming involved, and it identifies how, in the absence of political parties, political elites mirror behaviour in other political jurisdictions. Chapter 6 examines the behaviour of voters, focusing primarily on voter turnout in federal and territorial elections. It argues that the measurement of territorial turnout exaggerates levels of activity among political “spectators,” but demonstrates that opportunities for gladiatorial activity are far greater in Nunavut than elsewhere in Canada. Chapter 7 begins by measuring the extent of the north-south attitudinal divide before mapping the separate issue publics that exist within Nunavut political culture. It identifies the demographic foundations for political cleavages and then locates five attitudinal clusters within the territory, each of which appears to have integrated the discrete cultural fragments in Nunavut in different ways. Chapter 8 evaluates political developments in Nunavut. After discussing current academic and government assessments of the territory, I turn to the sole conscious effort to significantly modify political culture in Nunavut through the promotion and integration of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, or that which Inuit have long known. This raises the possibility of two success stories in Nunavut. Economic gains made by Nunavummiut could affirm that branch of political

economy research that argues that land claims and treaties offer a fundamental shift in power relations by providing resources to those long denied them. Rival explanations view the territory as an opportunity for cultural change. Using quantitative data, Chapter 8 concludes by identifying predictors of support for the NLCA and the new territory, whether economic or cultural. Each of the chapters in the second half of the book contributes to our understanding of political developments in Nunavut while offering a nuanced interpretation of how political culture operates.

Finally, the terminology employed in *Nunavut: Rethinking Political Culture* reflects northern conventions. The book subscribes to English naming conventions for place names, and thus uses “Igloodik” rather than “Iglulik” and “Pangnirtung” rather than “Paniktuuq.” Communities that have changed names, such as Iqaluit, Kimmirut, Qikiqtarjuaq, Kugluktuk, and Kugaaruk, are referred to by their current rather than by their former appellations of Frobisher Bay, Lake Harbour, Broughton Island, Coppermine, and Pelly Bay. The exception occurs when archival material contains quotations referring to original place names. For the sake of precision, references to people are given in Inuktitut. “Inuit” is used consistently as the plural of “Inuk.” Two people of Inuit ethnicity are referred to as “Inuuk.” The terms “Qallunaat” and “non-Inuit” are used interchangeably. The singular term is “Qallunaq,” while “Qallunaak” refers to two non-Inuit. “Nunavummiut” refers to residents of the territory and includes both Inuit and non-Inuit. Direct quotations from the interview material, particularly from the elder interviews, have not been corrected; quotations from written material, however, have been corrected for style or grammar. Where relevant, square brackets indicate editorial changes.