

Wenzel provides an historical overview of the seal protest, describing two phases of what he calls the seal war. The first phase was conducted by men against seals on a global scale beginning in the middle 1800s; industrial sealing methods resulted in the near depletion of the stocks by the 1940s. The second phase, according to Wenzel, was initiated in the mid-1950s by activists who found the renewed seal hunt repellent. Both phases receive a fairly even-handed recounting by Wenzel.

Having set the stage for the collision of interests between the Inuit hunting culture and the animal rights movement, Wenzel's advocacy stance comes to the forefront. The reader winces no less the second time than the first when Wenzel repeats again Stephen Best of the International Wildlife Coalition claiming ownership of Inuit culture because his tax dollars paid for it. Tables of data are presented showing the negative effects of the seal protest on Inuit income. The link between seal hunting and Inuit culture is stressed, with the animals rights movement described as "at best, grudging" in its appreciation of that link.

The arguments raised by *Animal Rights, Human Rights* about this particular confrontation over resource use and/or abuse have wide-ranging implications, echoing as they do conflicts between sports hunters, traditional Aboriginal resource users, animal rights advocates and commercial interests. That the issues are raised in a partisan and emotional manner does not detract from their overall importance, though some of the presentation of data seems at least questionable; figure 4.4, for example, shows sealskin prices plummeting *before* major protests despite Wenzel's claim of the essential culpability of such protests. In a similar sceptical vein, one might be led to wonder of Wenzel's adaptation thesis just what constitutes adaptation, and what constitutes forced acceptance of activities because of lack of available alternatives. One can only make so many silk purses out of sow's ears. But with its empathetic description of Inuit life, its unresolved arguments and its incomplete data, *Animal Rights, Human Rights* is practically guaranteed to raise heated arguments in academic, social and political circles when read for the sake of further discussion.

John Thornton

---

John Goddard. *Last Stand of the Lubicon Cree*. Vancouver/Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 1991.

John Goddard is one of several journalists who have recently produced accounts of Indian controversies. These books, if widely read by the

public, may be of great significance by informing people about why there are court cases, blockades and occupations occurring in Indian country. The potential for misinformation and poor communication within Canada is immense, and accounts like *Last Stand of the Lubicon* should be commended for opening the door a little for better understanding.

Goddard's account of the struggles of the Lubicon Lake First Nation over the past century is well-written, blending a strict accounting of history with crafted portraits of the leading personalities. By putting a personal face on events, Goddard holds the reader's interest. Some of his previous magazine and newspaper articles about the Lubicon have been noteworthy in bringing the background of the struggle to public attention – something often omitted in media accounts. Goddard scrupulously recounts the difficulties faced by the band in getting government recognition after they were missed by the Treaty 8 delegation in 1899. In doing so he brings to light one of the most widespread continuing controversies between Indian bands and federal and provincial governments: the control over status and membership.

Once the treaties were signed, the Department of Indian Affairs took over the guardianship of Indian status through the *Indian Act*. Treaty Indians who had signed treaty or taken annuities became “status” Indians under the strict rules of the *Act* and the field policies of individual Indian agents. In a region where people of full and mixed ancestry hunted and trapped together, and lived similar life-styles, the arbitrary designation of status and non-status categories by blood-line created longstanding rifts that continue to plague Indian populations. The long delay faced by the Lubicon between finally being recognized as a treaty band and getting reserve lands – still not obtained – can largely be attributed to attempts by agents to rearrange band lists and deny treaty and Aboriginal entitlements to large numbers of people.

Goddard moves chronologically through Lubicon history, documenting their fights through the courts, through negotiations, through blockades and boycotts. As he does so, he demonstrates that the membership issue is part of a larger political struggle between Indian bands and the federal government that is their “protector.” Land claims and treaty rights disputes are highly adversarial, with lawyers and others advising the two sides over both principles of the federal trust role and the interpretation of these principles.

In this instance, Goddard's account of the conflict centres on the role of two individuals, Chief Bernard Ominayak and his advisor Fred Lennarson. The story as related is really theirs; Goddard gives the readers

insights into how they work, separately and together. The backdrop is the myriad of federal and provincial officials who parade through the story, each playing a small role in a giant industry of battle through court and boardroom.

The story of the Lubicon people is one that every Canadian should know about; its tragedy is everyone's tragedy, as is its spirit. There is a tendency for people to read books like this and confirm some existing negative perceptions of Indian people, particularly perceptions of poverty and destitution. Goddard tries to show the causes of poverty and how groups of people fight it. His story is openly biased toward Ominayak's and Lennarson's story; he does not give us many insights into what the community behind the men would say if their story was being told. Nor do we know the full story behind Indian Affairs' version of events; this was not Goddard's purpose. Yet, we know from the reaction to the book by Indian Affairs that there is, as in all controversies, another side. It would be interesting, someday, to have a book that does attempt to show both sides, their principles, beliefs, actions, strategies. Only then can we better understand the legacy of colonialism in fostering the "Great Divide," the cowboys and Indians of the modern age.

Perhaps the greatest drawback of the book is not the bias, which Goddard does not hide, but his failure to document his sources. Although there is a section on sources that reveals Goddard's use of primary and secondary materials, specific bits of information are not referenced. A story as significant as this deserves ongoing investigation and cross-checking, and readers would find it difficult to do so given the lack of citations.

The next chapter in the story of the Lubicon Lake people will also have to be written someday. Since the publication of the book, the story has not yet yielded a reserve or the promised economic development. The federal government and the Lubicon remain divided over the nature and size of compensation to the band for oil revenues retained from their lands by other governments. A recent federal offer was rejected by the Lubicon in the summer of 1992, partly because inflation has undermined the real value of the offer. Disputes over band size continue, as do those with logging and oil companies moving onto Lubicon territory. The band continues to assert sovereignty by will alone. Hopefully, the next time, they will tell the story themselves.

Peggy Brizinski

---