

MATERIAL CULTURE OF THE DAVIS INLET AND BARREN GROUND NASKAPI: THE WILLIAM DUNCAN STRONG COLLECTION. By JAMES W. VANSTONE. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1985. *Fieldiana, Anthropology New Series*, No. 7. viii + 136 p., 1 map, 106 illus., no index, bib. Softbound. US\$15.75.

Dr. James W. VanStone has produced a most valuable addition to the slim literature dealing with the material culture of the subarctic Indians. This time, he describes the artifacts collected by William Duncan Strong among the Davis Inlet and Barren Ground Naskapi. The collection was made for the Field Museum of Natural History, where Strong was employed, during the winter of 1927-28 and numbers more than 500 objects. For convenience of presentation VanStone has grouped the objects into a number of categories — shelter, hunting and trapping, fishing, transportation, tools, household equipment, clothing, personal adornment, religious objects, musical instruments, smoking, games and toys, decorative arts and drawings. In a concluding section, the author compares the material culture of arctic and subarctic caribou hunters and then ends with a note on Strong as a collector.

VanStone has written a clearly worded descriptive account. No attention, however, is given to Montagnais-Naskapi artifacts housed in other museums unless published. Some notice of what exists and where would have been a welcome addition. Furthermore, no mention is made to the work of those Quebec anthropologists who have dealt with the material culture of the Montagnais-Naskapi.

Other points might be raised — 90 km by 30 or 60 km is certainly not a "vast territory" for the Indians of the Labrador Peninsula (p. 2); "overkill" is a dubious explanation for game disappearance (p. 4); what species of "juniper" grew in the land of the Naskapi (p. 11)? I question that women held a pole between their legs when removing hair from caribou hide, and is it true the beamer was pulled, not pushed (p. 22)? two-headed drums are not necessarily smaller than the singled-headed drums of the Naskapi (p. 33); and why not give the native name of berry that Strong recorded and any other native terms for the artifacts he collected (p. 39)?

Although VanStone compares the Strong collection with Turner's observations made at Fort Chimo 45 years earlier (p. 44), he does not offer any explanation as to why the Strong collection comprises more "cultural elements" than reported by Turner. If change had taken place in the artifact inventory, he does not ask what factors might have been responsible for the increase in the number of "cultural elements." Also it would be interesting to know which artifacts collected by Strong were no longer in use.

VanStone makes reference to the adoption of certain items from the Eskimo (p. 14, 20, and 41). A section on the contact and interchange between the Naskapi and neighbouring Eskimo would have been helpful. Also some attention to the history of contact with the Europeans would have helped to gain a better understanding of the collection. For example, what proof is there that the "ridge-pole lodge" was acquired from Europeans (p. 41) or that the "carricole" was a French inspiration, aside from Birket-Smith's guess? And where did gloves (p. 11 and 21) and canoe bailer (p. 21) come from?

VanStone notes the retention of traditional ways by the Naskapi (p. 43) and argues that it was more than a continuation into the present of traditional land use patterns that was responsible. He implies that the Naskapi were not decimated by the kind of severe epidemics that he holds responsible for the loss of traditional material culture among the western subarctic Athapaskans. An interesting point, but he fails to consider the influence on Athapaskan culture of the many traders and prospectors who penetrated their country, in contrast to the few whites who ever ventured into the country of the Naskapi.

This monograph raises a serious problem for anyone who deals with ethnographic artifacts. Aside from the lack of documentation — even the information accompanying the Strong collection leaves much to be desired — many of the artifacts were made especially for Strong. Accordingly, it can be asked, how authentic are these items? And when can one detect that a particular item might be for the tourist or nothing

more than a hoax? Finally, did the collecting methods of Strong establish a tradition among the Naskapi who later supplied Speck with so many items made specifically for him?

In spite of the nitpicking, VanStone is to be congratulated for his pioneering work on the material culture of northern peoples, this time the Naskapi, especially when museum collections are being ignored by the majority of ethnologists.

*Edward S. Rogers
Department of Ethnology
Royal Ontario Museum
100 Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M5S 2C6*

OCEAN POLICY AND MANAGEMENT IN THE ARCTIC. Ocean Management Working Group, Canadian Arctic Resources Committee. Ottawa: CARC, 1984. x + 186 p. Appendices. Softbound. No price indicated.

This book results from a meeting of a Working Group on Ocean Management held as part of CARC's Third National Workshop on People, Resources and the Environment North of 60 Degrees, in June 1983. Background papers were presented on the Canadian regulatory structure as it affects the Arctic, international legal issues, Inuit interests and claims, and arctic marine transportation. A further paper provided a theoretical perspective on ocean management, and the Working Group held a discussion on arctic marine science policy. Each paper is reprinted together with excerpts from the discussion that followed.

The general theme for the Working Group was the need to establish an effective ocean policy for the Canadian Arctic. Ken Beauchamp, the Director of CARC's Arctic Ocean Programme, points out in an Introduction that "a comprehensive policy for the development and management of the arctic off-shore does not exist in Canada." The papers explore the need for such management, highlighting areas of critical importance in arctic policy-making — Inuit interests, marine transportation, and marine science. Generally the range of interests concerned in the development of an ocean policy for the Arctic are covered, although a paper on off-shore hydrocarbon development would have been a useful addition.

The contributions, written by acknowledged experts, are informative. Hal Mills gives a useful tour through the labyrinth of federal government bureaucracy concerned with the Arctic; Peter Jull and Nigel Bankes provide a clear account of both the nature of aboriginal claims to the arctic off-shore and the reactions by government to them; and Captain Tom Pullen writes about marine transportation in the Arctic with the authority that only an experienced arctic navigator can provide. The final paper, by Ken Beauchamp, sets out various models for the management of the Canadian Arctic Ocean, providing an opportunity for reflection about the future of ocean management in the Arctic.

Nevertheless, a question is left. Where do we go from here? The Working Group has outlined the problems, but the management options are presented at a rather theoretical level. No real sense is left of what a "comprehensive policy for the development and management of the arctic off-shore" might look like in practical terms. Moreover, how realistic is it to expect a "comprehensive policy" for the Canadian Arctic Ocean? Even the idea of management itself can be queried — as one participant observed during the discussion, the Arctic Ocean is a physical fact, not something that can be managed.

There are, of course, a variety of activities, functions and claims in relation to the Arctic Ocean that are interrelated or competing. Any attempt to regulate them must start from an overall perspective. But when it comes to the detail of management plans or regulatory schemes, each activity, function or claim must be dealt with piecemeal. One can determine policy in general terms, but regulation has to be specific.