advised decision. Accompanied by one other man, Haywood, he headed out across the young sea ice for Cape Evans. The two men were never seen again. The remaining Hut Point party waited until July 15 before crossing and arrived safely at Cape Evans. Ten months had passed since they began the final depot-laying journeys. In total, they had man-hauled sledges some 1500 miles, nearly twice the distance to Mount Hope and back.

In the final chapter, Richards describes his sighting of the *Aurora* on January 10, 1917. For the men ashore, the sight of the ship brought great joy, not only because of their own imminent rescue, but also for the fact that the ship had survived the blizzard that broke it away from Cape Evans nearly two years earlier. With Shackleton on board, the *Aurora* had left Port Chalmers on December 20, 1916. On January 10, 1917, as the ship reached the ice edge off Cape Royds, the crew sighted seven men with dogs and sleds coming from Cape Evans. The author recounts that the first man to reach him and the other men and shake their hands was Shackleton. The *Aurora* arrived in Wellington Harbour on February 9, 1917. Later that same year, the ship disappeared without a trace after leaving Sydney, Australia. Readers well versed in South Pole expedition literature may well say of the Ross Shore Party story, "three cheers for the dogs." Oscar died in the Wellington Zoo in 1939. Richards died in 1985 at the age of 91.

The Scott Polar Research Institute is to be commended for re-issuing Richards' account of his participation in the Ross Sea Party Expedition. A broader and more general readership of this work would have been well served by a new introduction to the book that was more historically inclusive than the brief statements provided by the author. One or more updated maps would also have been a great aid to the reader. Richards' book adds little to Joyce's 1929 account, which also served as the source for Shackleton's description of the Ross Sea Party in his book, *South*. The account of the Ross Sea Party remains vastly overshadowed by Shackleton's *Endurance* calamity. The fact that three men, and very nearly the entire party, died while carrying out their part of Shackleton's lofty trans-Antarctic plans may further explain the relative obscurity of this episode, as it somewhat tarnishes the heroic shine of Shackleton's efforts.

REFERENCES

JOYCE, E.M. 1929. The south polar trail. London: Duckworth.
SHACKLETON, E. 1919. South. London: William Heinemann.

Peter Schledermann
The Arctic Institute of North America
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive NW
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
T2N 1N4

HUNTERS AND BUREAUCRATS: POWER, KNOWLEDGE AND ABORIGINAL-STATE RELATIONS IN THE SOUTHWEST YUKON. By PAUL NADASDY. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2003. xiii + 325 p., maps, b&w illus., notes, bib., index. Hardbound, Cdn$85.00; Softbound, Cdn$29.95.

Setting out to dispel the myth that co-management and land-claim processes are working, *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon* is an important and sobering look at the nature of Aboriginal-state relations in northern Canada today. Because of the complex nature of the struggles and logic of engagement involved, Aboriginal peoples often pay a tremendous price for entering into co-management and land-claim agreements. Nadasdy's in-depth ethnographic analysis of Aboriginal-state relations in the southwest Yukon suggests that, far from being empowering, the participation of Kluane First Nations peoples in land-claim negotiations and on the Ruby Range Sheep Steering Committee has threatened the very fabric of who they are and how they relate to land, to animals, and to each other. They have had to adopt the unfamiliar languages, rules, and assumptions of wildlife biology and property law, in some cases translating their own cultural values and understandings into a "currency" that the state can use. By accepting western European assumptions about land, animals, and property, Kluane peoples have been forced to set aside their own ways of knowing and speaking. To engage bureaucratic representatives of the state in co-management and land-claim processes, Kluane peoples have had to learn, think, act, and organize themselves in very different ways and to develop bureaucratic behaviours and institutions modelled after the state. These new patterns have engendered a host of changes and tensions that undermine the very culture and ways of life that co-management and land-claim processes were supposed to protect in the first place.

Nadasdy's focus on the use of power and knowledge in co-management and land claims is both refreshing and long overdue, as he identifies many of the systemic barriers and insidious processes of assimilation inherent in these discourses. In fact, everyone currently involved in these processes should attempt to read *Hunters and Bureaucrats* before contemplating another decision. Unfortunately, because of the way the book is written, it may not be very accessible to those who could most benefit from its message (i.e., Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal parties to co-management and land claims). Nevertheless, much of what is said in this book will strike a responsive chord in the hearts and minds of most engaged in struggles to make these processes work.

Hunters and Bureaucrats is actually one book and a journal article. The "book" deals with the issue of Aboriginal-state relations in co-management and how the Kluane people have been forced into accepting the language and institutions of "wildlife management" to protect their

rights to and interests in animals, only to discover that such processes undermine their relationships with animals, while concentrating control over their lives in the hands of the state. Nadasdy is at his best when he discusses the integration/transformation processes to which Kluane peoples must subject their knowledge in order to participate in co-management. The focus on co-management accounts for some 80% of the volume's content, and alone would have made a significant contribution to the literature on Aboriginal-state relations in northern Canada. The "journal article" addresses basically the same process, but in the context of land claims and property rights. To engage in land-claim discourses, the Kluane people have also had to adopt very different ways of thinking and speaking. Moreover, they have "had to create and operate within bureaucratic structures that mirror those" of the state (p. 261). Yet, these institutions, which are built on very different assumptions about how humans should relate to the world, have helped to undermine the very way of life that land-claim agreements are supposed to preserve.

Although Nadasdy identifies many negative consequences of knowledge and power dynamics in co-management and land claims, his claim that such "processes…have gone largely unnoticed by scholars" (p. 9) is somewhat overstated. Many of the same processes witnessed by Nadasdy have been observed previously by other researchers (e.g., Caulfield, 1997; Feit, 1998; Spak, 2001; Stevenson, 1997, 1999). In the absence of more case studies, many of Nadasdy's points must be considered working hypotheses about how co-management and land-claim discourses develop and unfold. This is not to say that his assumptions are incorrect. Rather, incorporating other case studies into the discussion would have made his insights that much more effective and powerful.

Particularly interesting to me was the fact that Nadasdy did not consider whether there were any political motivations behind knowledge claims forwarded by Kluane participants in co-management. Kluane people insisted that there had been a catastrophic decline in the sheep population in recent decades, and that more drastic conservation measures (than what other committee members were proposing) were needed. This is generally at odds with my experiences with the Southeast Baffin Beluga Committee (SEBBC) and the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board, where Aboriginal parties generally advocate fewer hunting restrictions, not more, even if they agree that there are fewer animals available to hunt than before. Granted, Kluane people were not implicated as factors in either creating or contributing to the decline, as was the case in the above examples. Nevertheless, a discussion addressing the possible political motivations behind the Kluane people's use of their knowledge, and the urgency for more drastic management actions, would have resulted in a more balanced and informed piece about the role of politics in co-management discourses. Back in 1978–80, when I was working in Kluane National Park as a seasonal archaeologist, sheep hunting by outfitters formed the basis of many an informal conversation with Kluane people. Although Aboriginal opposition to this activity was expressed as concern for the sheep upon which they depended for many values, it was also viewed as an infringement of their rights, and the sense that I got was that they would do anything within reason to stop it. Why would Aboriginal peoples not use their knowledge for their own advantage when most other parties to co-management do this, at least unconsciously, all the time?

Much of what Nadasdy has to say on knowledge-power discourses in co-management regimes has been recognized before, not only by anthropologists (e.g., Caulfield, 1997; Feit, 1998; Stevenson, 1997, 1999; Stevenson and Webb, 2003), but by Aboriginal peoples themselves:

> Our traditional ecological knowledge is too often taken out of context, misinterpreted, or misused. What wildlife managers, biologists, and bureaucrats understand … is interpreted within their own knowledge and value systems, not ours. In the process, our special ways of knowing and doing things … are crushed by scientific knowledge and the state management model. … With various culturally inappropriate or irrelevant concepts such as "wildlife management", "stock", ... " harvest", … "total allowable catches" [and] "quotas", the state management system is a form of intrusion that threatens to crush the "tried and true", the dynamic, evolving and effective systems of local management and the ... knowledge that informs those systems. (Kuptana, 1996)

It is one thing for anthropologists to recognize the roles of state-sponsored wildlife management in perpetuating existing Aboriginal-state power relationships. However, these messages take on an added significance and a sense of urgency when they originate with Aboriginal peoples. Nadasdy should have at least been aware that Aboriginal leaders were raising similar concerns years earlier, especially since remarks identical to Kuptana's (e.g., those of Ingmar Egede) were made at a conference whose proceedings he cites (Roberts, 1996).

Throughout *Hunters and Bureaucrats*, Nadasdy takes special pains, using concepts such as "respect," "balance," and "reciprocity," to flesh out the appropriate relationships between Kluane people and the animals (i.e., sentient non-human beings with power) upon which they depend. This is why his uncritical application and extension of the concept of "wildlife management" to Kluane people seems so curious, and runs counter to much of what is said in *Hunters and Bureaucrats*. While we are told that it is inappropriate to conceive of humans as controlling the hunt, the concept of "managing animals" is not subjected to the same scrutiny. Many Aboriginal elders that I know would simply think it absurd that humans could manage animals. While I am sure that this is just an oversight on the author's part, this omission underscores just how embedded western European cultural constructions have become in the thought and speech of even the most critical social

scientists. If Nadasdy, culturally sensitized as he is, can fall into this trap, what hope is there for the rest of us? In recent essays (e.g., Stevenson, 1998, 1999, 2000; Stevenson and Webb, 2003), I have asked researchers working with Aboriginal peoples to be far more critical of the implications of imposing their cultural conventions and constructions on the Aboriginal peoples in contexts of traditional knowledge integration and co-management. It is vital for researchers who are "cultured" in the western scientific tradition, and who work with peoples of different cultures, to critically examine the cultural biases, values, and assumptions inherent within their own knowledge claims and institutions, and how these may disarm Aboriginal knowledge and management systems and their related institutions and practices. Because of their uncritical acceptance of their own "truths," researchers frequently and unwittingly become agents of cultural change and assimilation for the authoritative knowledge systems and institutional structures in power (Stevenson and Webb, 2003).

The most disappointing thing about *Hunters and Bureaucrats* is that Nadasdy does not consider any real solutions to the status quo. While he does advocate the devolution of wildlife management to local First Nations (p. 268), he also understands just how difficult this project would be. However, it is simply not enough to state that while "all manner of hypothetical alternatives" could be suggested, "… these seem completely unrealistic, with no grounding in social reality" (p. 269). Nadasdy may very well be right, i.e., it may take a "radical rethinking and restructuring of Aboriginal-state relations" to effect real change. But to give up before trying, I feel, is misguided and fails to understand what this country is all about. So where do we go from here? Is the future as bleak as Nadasdy implies?

I, for one, believe that, existing institutional barriers and inequitable Aboriginal-state relations aside, there is good will on both sides to nurture the conditions and institutions of social equity and justice to which we all aspire. So how do we create the space for Aboriginal peoples to effectively engage the state in land-claim negotiations and co-management processes? One solution was presented to us by First Nations peoples hundreds of years ago, in a device known as the two-row wampum (Degiya'göh Resources, 2004). According to the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy), their ancestors developed the concept of the two-row wampum so they could peacefully co-exist and share resources with the Europeans. The two-row wampum embodies the principles of sharing, mutual recognition, and respect: it is based on a nation-to-nation relationship that acknowledges the autonomy, authority, and jurisdiction of each nation. The two rows symbolize two paths or two vessels, each with its own laws and customs, travelling down the same river of life together, neither trying to steer the other's vessel.

Inuit and biologists with whom I worked on the SEBBC effectively used the concept of the two-row wampum in 1993–94 to resolve fundamental knowledge disagreements about the status of beluga in the southeast Baffin and to provide a solid foundation for future cooperative management actions (Stevenson et al., 1994). The simple acts of agreeing on common goals and management actions, while avoiding knowledge imposition and integration efforts, created the space necessary for Inuit to bring their own ways of knowing, thinking, and speaking about animals to the co-management table. The SEBBC process was unusual to the extent that it had an anthropologist, cognizant of asymmetrical knowledge-power relations in co-management processes, to mediate a solution to the problem. However, most co-management or land-claim tables are not so fortunate. Many Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal parties to co-management and land-claim processes simply do not have the "professional literacy" (Howitt, 2001) to overcome their own cultural conditioning or to effectively represent the interests of these projects in cross-cultural power discourses. University graduates in fields such as biology, law, forestry, natural resource management, and business administration are not acquiring the understandings, knowledge bases, and skill sets they need to critically examine their own knowledge claims and to work creatively with Aboriginal peoples to achieve social justice and true co-existence. By not providing these essentials to graduates, our post-secondary educational institutions are failing Canadian society. Producing university graduates with the "right tools for the job" should eventually result in the development of policies, practices, and processes that will create the space required for Aboriginal peoples to participate effectively in co-management and land claims.

Hunters and Bureaucrats might very well become one of the most important books ever written about Aboriginal-state relations in northern Canada, and it should open the gates to a flood of literature that sets out to de- and reconstruct co-management and land-claim processes. That said, I wish that *Hunters and Bureaucrats* had been written in a style that would have made it much more accessible to the very audience that it needs to reach, i.e., everyone currently engaged in co-management and land claims.

REFERENCES

CAULFIELD, R.A. 1997. Greenlanders, whales and whaling: Sustainability and self-determination in the Arctic. New Hampshire: University Press of New England.

DEGIYA'GÖH RESOURCES. 2004. Guswenta (Kaswentha) two row wampum. http://www.degiyagoh.net/guswenta_two_row_htm

FEIT, H.A. 1998. Reflections on local knowledge and wildlife resource management: Differences, dominance, and decentralization. In: Aboriginal environmental knowledge in the North: Definitions and dimensions. Quebec: University of Laval, Groupe d'études inuit et circumpolaires. 123–148.

HOWITT, R. 2001. Rethinking resource management: Justice, sustainability, and indigenous peoples. New York: Routledge Press.

KUPTANA, R. 1996. Indigenous peoples' rights to self-determination and development: Issues of equality and decolonization. Keynote address to International Seminar on Development and Self-determination among the Indigenous Peoples of the North, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 5 October 1996.

ROBERTS, K., ed. 1996. Circumpolar Aboriginal People and co-management practice: Current issues in co-management and environmental assessment. Proceedings of the Workshop on Circumpolar People and Co-management Practice, 20–24 November 1995, Inuvik, Northwest Territories. Calgary: The Arctic Institute of North America.

SPAK, S. 2001. Canadian resource co-management boards and their relationship to indigenous knowledge: Two case studies. Doctoral thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto. 248 p.

STEVENSON, M.G. 1997. Inuit and co-management: Principles, practices and challenges for the new millennium. Paper presented on behalf of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference at the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission's Conference on Sealing, St. John's, Newfoundland, 25–27 November 1997.

———. 1998. Traditional knowledge in environmental management? From commodity to process. Sustainable Forest Management Network Working Paper No. 1998:14.

———. 1999. What are we managing? Traditional systems of management and knowledge in cooperative and joint management. In: Veeman, T.S., Smith, D.W., Purdy, B.G., Salkie, F.J., and Larkin, G.A., eds. Science and practice: Sustaining the boreal forest. Proceedings of the Sustainable Forest Management Network Conference, 14–17 February 1999. 161–169. Edmonton, Alberta: Sustainable Forest Management Network, University of Alberta.

———. 2000. No, it's not just like gardening: Colonial discourse and traditional ecological knowledge in the modern world. Paper presented at the Canadian Indigenous/Native Studies Association Annual Conference, 28–31 May 2000, Edmonton, Alberta.

STEVENSON, M.G., and WEBB, J. 2003. Just another stakeholder? First Nations and sustainable forest management in Canada's boreal forest. In: Burton, P.J., Messier, C., Smith, D.W., and Adamowicz, W.L., eds. Towards sustainable forest management in Canada's boreal forest. Ottawa: NRC Research Press. 65–112.

STEVENSON, M.G., INNES, S., and KILABUK, M. 1994. Co-management plan for southeast Baffin Inuit and beluga. Winnipeg: Department of Fisheries and Oceans and Iqaluit: Nunavut Wildlife Management Board.

Marc G. Stevenson
Aboriginal Program Manager
Sustainable Forest Management Network
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T6G 2E9