

implemented by field workers in the course of research would have been a useful addition to the text.

Chasing the Dark is about getting researchers, government, and the broader public interested in the ANCSA 14(h)(1) collection. Its aim is to prevent the loss of cultural knowledge, since “information in written formats, recorded on film, or contained within discrete physical objects can also be lost ... often due to lack of public awareness, poor management or simply neglect” (31). One can only hope this publication will be seen as an opportunity to advance our collective understanding of the Alaskan past, and our place within it.

Notes

1. The term “Aboriginal” is here applied broadly to the original people of North America. To be consistent with the terminology used in *Chasing the Dark*, I will use the term “Native” to refer to the original inhabitants of what is now Alaska.
2. Available land means federal land that is “vacant, unreserved, and unappropriated” (7).
3. Pratt, K. (2010). Selected research and management problems related to the ANCSA 14(h)(1) collection. *Newspeke*, 23(4), 1.

Joshua Gladstone, School of Public Policy and Administration, Carleton University

***Inuit Education and Schools in the Eastern Arctic.* By Heather E. McGregor. Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press, 2010. 220 pp. Illustrations, reference notes, bibliography, and index.**

Inuit Education and Schools in the Eastern Arctic explores the history of Inuit education and effects of changing power relationships. Its sensitivity to cultural nuances might be attributed to the fact that author Heather McGregor, although a *Qallunaaq* (non-Inuit person) by Inuit definition, was born in Yellowknife and spent most of her childhood and youth in Iqaluit where she still resides.

In the first two chapters, McGregor outlines her objectives and carefully explains her research methodology, sources of information, and various counter-arguments in this well-documented examination of an important and timely issue. She then divides the history of Inuit education chronologically into four distinct periods under the headings of “Traditional,” “Colonial,” “Territorial,” and “Local.” The chapter on the traditional years sets the stage for subsequent periods by describing the manner of educating young children before any prolonged Inuit contact with the “white man,” when it

was the responsibility of parents and elders to impart knowledge of survival skills and cultural values.

The second phase is aptly defined as the colonial period, which saw the gradual introduction of government schools following the Second World War, in key settlements that had grown up around Hudson's Bay Company trading posts and/or RCMP detachments. This was a time of increasing government intervention that resulted in rapid changes in Inuit lives and eventual collapse of their former nomadic hunting practices. According to McGregor, Inuit education during this period was marked by paternalism, with the objective of assimilating young Inuit into the Qallunaat world by teaching them "how to live in a white man's society" (54). Many of these new ideas were foreign, if not contradictory, to Inuit cultural traditions.

The territorial period in Inuit schooling, as described in the book, began on 1 April 1970, when the responsibility for education was transferred to the Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) based in Yellowknife. Along with the transfer came the first initiative to incorporate Indigenous culture and language into the school curriculum, supported by a greater acceptance of multiculturalism throughout Canada. The *Survey of Education* published by the GNWT in 1972 appeared to distance itself from the assimilation priorities of religious-based residential schools by actively promoting the protection of Aboriginal cultures and providing teachers with the incentive to design their own programs of study according to the needs of their respective communities. While the new policies led to the training of Inuit as classroom assistants and eventually as teachers, McGregor argues that the former paternalistic attitudes inherent in the federally designed programs still persisted and that implementation of new policies simply integrated a degree of Inuit culture into the existing, southern Canadian designed curriculum—in her words, "a soft form of cultural and linguistic assimilation" (105).

Ironically, one study conducted during this period revealed that in spite of concerns about loss of parental control and knowledge of survival skills, many Inuit believed that learning English was essential for their children to gain jobs now held by Qallunaat. For the most part, their expectations were overly optimistic. The vocational residential school at Churchill in Manitoba, however, provided an opportunity for Inuit youth to discuss possible improvements to the education system and to the governance of the Eastern Arctic. Inspired by these informal discussions, a new generation of Inuit leaders emerged, eager and determined to change the status quo.

The fourth phase in the history of Inuit education is described as the "Local Period," beginning in 1982 with amendments to GNWT's *Education*

Ordinance, which reorganized the system by creating regional school boards “to facilitate local control over educational decision making”(116). Three years later, the Baffin Divisional Board of Education (BDBE) became the first to be incorporated and assumed a leadership role in establishing new policies and programs throughout the territory. Among the changes were increased recruitment of Inuit educators, more teaching units in Inuktitut, the introduction of Inuktitut textbooks, and classes for grades 11 and 12 in every community. By 1998, all residential schools in the Arctic had closed.

For the most part, Inuit efforts to regain control over their children’s education paralleled their negotiations for land claims agreements and recognition of Aboriginal rights, which in turn led to the eventual creation of Nunavut. Hence, it caught educators by surprise when the new government of Nunavut (GNT) disbanded the local school boards, partly as a cost-saving measure, and instead centralized responsibility in the Department of Education Authority based in Iqaluit. In her concluding chapter, McGregor points to the irony of the situation:

The creation of Nunavut was intended, and expected, to increase the level of Inuit control over their future. In terms of education however, the changes introduced resulted in centralized power and diminished local and regional capacity. (152)

She goes on to suggest that closure of the regional boards had its roots in the negotiations of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NCLA), at which time Inuit leaders did not consider education a priority compared to wildlife harvesting and participation in the development of a resource-based economy. As a consequence, education did not receive the necessary funding provisions to ensure full participation in government services and other employment opportunities, setting the Nunavummiut apart from many First Nations and the Inuit of Northern Quebec who considered educational funding central to their land claims agreements.

This revelation, along with the detailed description of former Justice Thomas Berger’s 2006 report on the Nunavut Project, provides new insight into the cause and potential outcome of the current situation. According to Berger, the lack of sufficiently educated Inuit to fill employment opportunities in Nunavut has created a crisis, one “magnified by the advent of global warming in the Arctic and the challenge of Arctic sovereignty”(159). By drawing the connection between education and Inuit participation in Nunavut’s future economy, Berger presented a direct challenge to the federal government to renegotiate the funding agreement to enable Inuit employment to reach the level set out in Article 23 of the NLCA.

Although at times repetitive, this well-researched contribution to Nunavut history is a “must read” for all northern educators, politicians, and government officials.

Shelagh D. Grant, Adjunct Faculty, Canadian Studies; Research Associate of the Frost Centre for Indigenous and Canadian Studies, Trent University

***Living with Wildness: An Alaskan Odyssey.* By Bill Sherwonit. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2008. 220 pages.**

“We only truly love and value—and protect—that which we know.” This central thesis draws together, with varying degrees of success, the inquiries, discoveries, and testimonials that compose *Living with Wildness*. Bill Sherwonit chronicles a personal journey toward a more intimate knowledge of home, which in his case is the city of Anchorage, its Hillside neighbourhood, and the nearby wilderness of the Chugach State Park. He describes a cultivation of alertness to the wildness around him that leads to a deeper contemplation of the wildness within him, ultimately drawing upon the Wild Man archetype of the mythopoetic men’s movement inspired by Robert Bly’s *Iron John*. From counting frog calls on the muddy banks of a roadside pond near the airport, to shooing a black bear from the frozen piles of mouldering sunflower seeds under his birdfeeders, the best of *Living with Wildness* is the pleasant ramble through the minutiae of Sherwonit’s personal awakening to a sense of purpose and guardianship. When the focus widens philosophically to a broader social context, however, the book becomes sluggish with uncertain and often contradictory ideas about the relationship of humanity to its neighbours, trading its good-naturedly astute questions for self-consciously imprecise answers.

Living with Wildness begins with a long list of arrivals: Sherwonit’s first few summers in Alaska in the mid-seventies when “something shifted and opened up”; his introduction to nature writing and the literature of place; his purchase of a home in the Hillside neighbourhood of Anchorage; and the sudden awareness of the first of his “teachers,” the black-capped chickadee. In these early chapters, Sherwonit describes an openness, a readiness to be moved by what is around him that, coupled with a humble awareness of how little he understands, lends an immediacy to his observations and a full translation of his wonder and surprise. Sherwonit’s observations are specific and explicit and his immediate responses to those observations are sensory and emotional. The proximity of these responses to the stimuli of his experiences lends a sincerity to the first third of the book that allows