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ABSTRACT

VALUES PROJECTED IN NATIVE-ORIENTED
NATIONAL FILM BOARD OF CANADA PRODUCTIONS

by

David Andrew Brown

This study examined the portrayal of native Canadians in films of the National Film Board of Canada. The issue was cast in the context of the historical conflicts between the federal government and aboriginal people in Canada over issues of power, culture, language, economics, spirituality, land claims and the environment. It also examined how this adversarial relationship affects, and is affected by, past and present public opinion and past and present media portrayals of natives.

Because the literature suggests that the dominant values of the society of which a film-maker is a member will be projected in his or her films, the study compared values emphasized in native-directed and non-native-directed films.

A review of the literature concluded that the dominant traditional native value orientation was predominantly humanistic and that the dominant contemporary native value orientation is also humanistic. It also suggested that the dominant contemporary North American non-native value orientation is material.

Through content analysis, which employed a variation of Rokeach's value inventory, this researcher discovered that native-directed films emphasized humanistic values and non-native-directed films emphasized material values. These findings were consistent without regard to two other variables, length of the production and decade in which the production was released.
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PREFACE

We must all be aware of the extraordinary, perhaps insuperable difficulty of assessing the quality of a culture of which we are a part or of assessing the quality of a culture of which we are not a part. In using other cultures as mirrors in which we may see our own culture we are affected by the astigma of our own eyesight and the defects in the mirror, with the result that we are apt to see nothing in other cultures but the virtue of our own.

— H. A. Innis

The sap of the tree is the blood of my brother.

— Chief Seattle
CHAPTER 1

I. INTRODUCTION

The issue under investigation is the portrayal of native Canadians in films made under the auspices of the National Film Board of Canada (NFB). The issue has been cast in the context of the historical conflicts between the federal government and native Canadians over issues of power, culture, language, economics, spirituality, land claims, and the environment. As recent events in Quebec demonstrate, many of these conflicts continue to the present day.

All sources of opinion and information are elements in a process of consensual validation where similar notions reinforce each other in the minds of the public. Therefore, this study also examines how the adversarial relationship between natives and the government affects, and is affected by, past and present public opinion and past and present media portrayals of natives. Specifically, it will address NFB films because the NFB, as a government-funded agency that disseminates information via media productions, is one element in the consensual validation process. Significantly, it should be noted that the current study was undertaken from a non-native perspective.

Examination of the films will focus on values projected in the films for, as Rokeach (1973) suggests, values are the basis of human thoughts and conduct, that is, of human behaviour. Values influence all types of behaviour and attitudes and they are used as standards to determine which beliefs and modes of conduct should be preserved and which should be changed (Surlin and Squire, 1987, p. 11). Also, values are “more generalized and more durable” than “patterns” of institutions in terms of elements of a culture (Kluckhohn and Strodtebeck, 1961, p. 29). Accordingly, Surlin (1988) notes the impor-
tance of studying value systems in order to understand culture, life-styles, and attitudes. Similarly, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961, p. 28) maintain that value orientation and variations in these orientations, being the most significant "cultural variation," are "the central feature of the structure of culture." Further, they suggest that determining a society's "ethos," its "system of meanings," is more fruitfully accomplished by examining the interrelatedness of variations in value orientations within the society as opposed to studying only the dominant values. Because this study compares native-oriented films made by natives to native-oriented films made by non-natives, significant, then, is the assertion that native values represent a variation in value orientation in Canadian society.

Because Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961, p. 364) contend that "culture exists...in the behaviour, attitudes, motives, and perceptions of 'reality'" of individuals, their "interaction systems," and the artifacts which they, alone or together, manufacture, it is assumed that some aspect of culture, specifically values, of native and non-native film-makers will be present in the "artifacts" (films) which they create. The filmic treatment of natives in the films will provide an indication of the values underlying this treatment which will, in turn, be perceived by non-native viewers and incorporated into their existing knowledge of natives either to reinforce or modify their existing opinions toward this group. By determining what values are projected in native-oriented NFB films, one may infer whether the film is reinforcing, or portraying as in decline, traditional native lifestyles.

Because it is believed that films of a longer duration afford directors opportunities to examine subjects in greater detail, the researcher suggests that longer films have the potential to affect audiences differently than films of a shorter duration. Therefore, it is important to examine possible differences between values emphasized in long and short films.

This study is premised on the belief that the values traditionally held by native Canadians, and the value orientation of most natives at present, differ from those held by
the majority of people in Canadian society (who are non-natives). The latter values will be referred to as the dominant values in Canadian society. These dominant Canadian values are largely materialistic whereas traditional native values are predominantly humanistic or social. It should be noted that, while we all hold both material and social values, significant for this study is which values are given priority.

The premise that contemporary native values are different from dominant non-native values has led this researcher to expect differences between values emphasized in non-native-directed and native-directed films; native-directed films will emphasize humanist values while non-native-directed films will emphasize material values. Also, because of the dynamic nature of native-government relations in Canada and shifting public opinion, it is expected that the values emphasized in these films will change over time, the variations being dependent upon the time period in which the films were created.

II. CONCEPTS

In the interest of clarity, a number of concepts must be defined. Foremost is the definition of a Canadian Indian. There is some disagreement (even among indigenous peoples) as to what to call the aboriginal people of Canada. Some maintain that they should be called “natives,” instead of “Indians,” on the grounds that early European explorers named the people they saw on the continents upon which they landed Indians because they were en route to India and expected to find “Indians.” Consequently, there is resentment toward the use of this Caucasian-originated term (Friar and Friar, 1972). However, present day Indians, especially status Indians, object to the term “native” because they feel that this term, particularly when employed in policy-making, is detri-
mental to their interests. Use of the term "native" categorizes status Indians with other people indigenous to Canada resulting in all aboriginal people being treated like another ethnic group. This, in turn, undermines the special rights and "constitutional status" of registered (status) Indians (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. xv). Yet, the term "Indians" is misleading in that it implies a collective, that Indians are aware of the problems and concerns of Indians in other regions of Canada, and that they act as an organized whole (Weaver, 1981, pp. 15, 18).

Adding to the confusion is the definition of aboriginal people in previous legislation. For example, a Supreme Court decision in 1939 defined Inuit as Indians with regard to the British North America (BNA) Act, thereby giving the federal government jurisdiction over them; however, Inuit are dealt with separately by the federal government and are not included in the Indian Act (Frideres, 1988, pp. 90, 91). Indicative of the change in terminology employed in government policy and legislation, while the term "Indian" has been used in the Constitution since 1867, constitutional references since 1982 have been to "aboriginal people" (Opokokew, 1987, p. 5). Compounding the problem, miscegenation has made the distinction between natives and immigrants ambiguous as in the case of Metis.

Basically, there are four native groups: status Indians, non-status Indians, Metis, and Inuit. As the terms "aboriginal people" and "natives" seem to be more acceptable at present, they will be given preference when referring to status Indians, non-status Indians, and Metis in general. Any specific references to one of these groups will use the individual terms. Because Eskimos and Aluets have been considered "racially, linguistically, and culturally distinct from American Indians" (Newcomb, 1974, p. 23) and are in a different situation politically than Indians (Tanner, 1983, p. 4), and because there are a vast number of NFB films dealing with Inuit separately from other native groups, they are not included in this study. Thus, the term "native" will not refer to this aboriginal group. Any references to them will use the term "Inuit."
While recognizing the sometimes vast differences among individual nations, some generalization is necessary at this point. Accordingly, the term "native" will be used when referring to all Indian tribes in general. A list of tribes which may be addressed is provided in Appendix 1. The regions or "culture areas" (Sub-Arctic, Northwest Coast, Plateau, Plains, and Eastern Woodlands) in which these tribes are located, and thus the tribes that are included in this study’s definition of native Canadians, are shown in Appendix 2.

Historically, there were thousands of native bands in Canada. Those that lived in a similar environment adapted to their environment in much the same way (Newcomb, 1974, p. 21). Therefore, their cultures, their complete ways of life, comprised of "language, knowledge, beliefs, habits, customs, institutions, rituals, games, tools, [and] dwellings" (Newcomb, 1974, p. 18) are apt to be similar. While this has provided some justification for classifying native tribes in the regions noted previously, the concept of "culture areas" is, nonetheless, problematic. The classification of a culture area places people in a particular time period, yet this varies among areas. For example, the Eastern Woodlands region is commonly represented at a time just prior to the appearance of Europeans on the continent, while the Plains region, which did not evolve until the 1700s, is usually represented by the culture of the 1800s (Newcomb, 1974, p. 22). Also problematic are the lines dividing areas because some tribes in adjacent areas were quite similar. One should be aware, therefore, that the concept of "culture areas" is only a mechanism for classification (Newcomb, 1974, p. 22).

Nevertheless, more substantial distinctions among natives can be made at this time, specifically between status and non-status Indians. Status Indians have their names registered with the Indian and Inuit Affairs Programme (IIAP) and come under the legal jurisdiction of the Indian Act. Further, status Indians have membership in a band, a "political-administrative unit" which is formed by the federal government. Non-status Indians are status Indians who have lost their status either by marrying a non-Indian or
through enfranchisement, or are the children of these persons.

A differentiation can also be made between status Indians and treaty Indians. Because not all Indians signed treaties with the government, only about 57% of status Indians are also treaty Indians (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. xv). Metis are the children of an inter-racial (Indian-white) marriage. Non-natives, then, are those people residing in Canada whose ancestors were not indigenous to Canada.

Next it is necessary to define values, value systems, humanistic (social) values, materialistic values, instrumental values, and terminal values. As Vogt and Albert (1966) note, there is a plethora of definitions of “values” in the social sciences and this creates problems concerning the appropriateness of the definition one uses. Accepting the existing pluralism, this researcher is employing Rokeach’s definition of values as a working definition. A value, as Rokeach defines it, is “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or contrary mode of conduct or end state of existence” (Surlin and Squire, 1987, p. 10). A broad definition of value orientation is “a generalized and organized principle concerning basic human problems which pervasively and profoundly influences man’s behavior” (Kluckhohn and Strodtebeck, 1961, p. 341). More specifically, a value system is an enduring structure of conduct or end states “along a continuum of relative importance” (Surlin and Squire, 1987, p. 11).

A list of terminal and instrumental values may be found in Appendix 3. Rokeach derived the terminal values from a list of hundreds of concepts. The list of concepts was created from a search of the literature and from interviews. The list was reduced through the elimination of concepts with synonymous meanings and ones that were too specific (Rokeach, 1973, p. 9). The instrumental values were derived from a list of 555 personality traits. Again, values considered synonyms with other values were eliminated. Selection was based on the values deemed important in American society; values considered minimally correlated, and values that would be “maximally discriminating” across a
number of demographic variables, including social status, race, and age (Rokeach, 1973, p. 9).

Basically, instrumental values are those concerned with "desired modes of conduct" and terminal values are concerned with "end states of existence" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 77). Thus, instrumental values are "means-values" while terminal values are "end-values" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 7). Rokeach (1973, pp. 7, 8) distinguishes between two types of terminal and instrumental values. The two kinds of terminal values are: "personal" and "social." The personal values are usually self-centered or intrapersonal while the social values are basically society-centered or interpersonal. Attitudes and behaviour will differ depending upon which values are given priority. The two kinds of instrumental values are: "moral" and "competence." Moral values are usually associated with instrumental values having an interpersonal emphasis. The competence or "self-actualizing" values have a "personal rather than interpersonal focus" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 8). The relationship between terminal and instrumental values is best described, according to Rokeach (1973, p. 12), as "two separate yet functionally interconnected systems, wherein all the values concerning modes of behavior are instrumental to the attainment of all the values concerning end states." Further, he suggests that one is not necessarily conscientiously aware of the instrumental nature of a value and there may not be a "one-to-one correspondence" between an instrumental and a terminal value (Rokeach, 1973, p. 12).

The classification of values into either "material" or "humanistic" was accomplished by Surlin and Squire (1987). From the values listed in Appendix 3, the terminal values described as "material" are: A comfortable life, A sense of accomplishment, Pleasure, and Social recognition. "Material" instrumental values are: Ambitious, Capable, Independent, Responsible, and Self-controlled. The terminal values considered "humanistic" are: A world of peace, A world of beauty, Equality, Inner harmony, and Wisdom. The instrumental "humanistic" values are: Broadminded, Cheerful, Forgiving, Helpful, Imaginative, and Loving. Surlin and Squire (1987, pp. 11, 12) arrived at this
classification by looking at the relationship between the Rokeach values and a variety of research literature which used Rokeach values in association with a number of attitudes and orientations. The values were classified by first classifying the attitudes and orientations as either material or humanistic. Accordingly, the values largely associated with a humanistic orientation were deemed humanistic values and the values associated with a material orientation were classified as material values. “Material” values were values considered “primarily related to goals in the material realm, and those values that relate to oneself and one’s private world” (Surlin and Squire, 1987, p. 11). “Humanistic” values were values deemed “primarily related to humanistic, non-material goals, and those values that relate to the collective experience and relations with others” (Surlin and Squire, 1987, p. 11). From this, twenty of the thirty-six values were classified as either material or humanistic, leaving sixteen unclassified values.

It is important to note here that there is some disagreement regarding the classification of Responsible and Self-controlled as material values. There may be some difficulty with conceptualizing these two values as material values for acting humanely toward others, being helpful, forgiving, loving and striving for wisdom and a world of peace necessitate some measure of responsibility and self-control. This is supported in Alberle’s (1951) analysis of a Hopi Indian. Alberle had the individual convey the Hopi’s image of the “ideal person.” Part of the description was comprised of the values strength, which included self-control, and obedience to the law, which entailed responsibility (Trimble, 1976, p. 71). From the other values described in the Hopi Indian study, it is apparent that self-controlled and responsible were included in a value orientation which was predominantly humanistic.
III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

i. Introduction

Related literature in this area may be divided into seven major categories: research concerned with the history of native-government relations in Canada, the portrayal of natives in the media, the image of natives in public opinion, the NFB as film-maker about natives, research on the values held by contemporary native Canadians, traditional native values, and dominant values in contemporary non-native Canadian society.

ii. History of Native-Government Relations

a. Contact and Dependency

Native culture, as any culture, has been constantly changing in order to adapt to new conditions. However, the rate of this change increased dramatically over the past few centuries since European contact; forced change has usurped voluntary change (Patterson, 1972, p. 37). While initially, Europeans settling on the North American continent were completely dependent upon natives to survive, this dependency gradually shifted to where natives were needed only as military allies and labourers in the fur trade (Harper, A., 1945, p. 129). Animosity increased between natives and Europeans as Europeans, through increased interaction, realized how different native lifestyles and value systems were from their own. Thus, as Europeans realized that natives did not want to be a part of the new nation they were building and once their usefulness (from a European perspective) in the fur trade and warfare waned, the dependency relationship came full circle. A brief examination of the initial relationship in four major regions
follows.

Traditional East Coast native societies (particularly in the U. S.) did not begin to dissolve until around the time of the American War of Independence; for 150 years of European-native contact prior to that, native and non-native conflicts were rare (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 17). This was the period of “mutual dependence” for this area of North America. During this period, both cultures influenced the other, and Europeans and natives adopted some elements of each other’s technology and lifestyle. For example, Huron Indians in the Georgian Bay area soon became “middlemen” in the fur trade as its influence spread westward (Innis, 1943, p. 44). Gradually, this began to affect native lifestyle. As natives concentrated on securing furs for trade and neglected customary methods of existence (for example hunting), they became increasingly dependent on goods received in trade with Europeans. This resulted in increasing their dependency on Europeans in general (Patterson, 1972, pp. 38, 39).

Another disruptive influence on these societies was non-native warfare. Because of the location of the East Coast native societies their involvement in the wars fought by Europeans on the North American continent was unavoidable. With war came diseases, unfamiliar to natives. The effects of both disease and war decimated the native population (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 17). Consequently, both England and the newly formed United States no longer considered natives valuable “allies” because of their reduction in numbers (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 18), and they were relegated to a position of irrelevance.

A time of interdependence, present on the East Coast, did not exist in the Plains region. Natives in this area had become aware of, and influenced by, Europeans long before European settlements pushed westward. In the process of non-native expansion, the Plains Indians were seen as a barrier to “the Manifest Destiny with which the eastern god had blessed his new empire” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 19). Non-natives wanted the land and the barrier was to be removed through what had become standard means of
dealing with natives: massacres and the intentional introduction of diseases to which natives had no natural immunity. To this end, General Sheridan, in his compassionate wisdom, advocated the destruction of herds of buffalo after he determined that by eliminating a primary "source of food, clothing, and housing materials," he might also eliminate the native barrier (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 19). Subsequently, natives' way of life in the Prairies was threatened by the mass slaughter of buffalo as was the seminomadic lifestyle of Metis in the Red River region (McInnis, 1969, p. 396). By 1870, excessive hunting had depleted the herds to near extinction which left natives who subsisted on them "on the verge of starvation" (McInnis, 1969, p. 397). Canada benefitted (from the perspective of the government) from this long-standing U. S. policy which affected natives across the imaginary dividing line between the two emerging nations. Thus, in the Canadian Prairies, native "resistance" or armed clashes between natives and Europeans were less frequent than in the U. S. because, by the time settlement in Canada moved westward, the natives of the Prairies "had been starved into submission" (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 23).

Similar to the East Coast, on the West Coast there was a period of interdependence between natives and European traders. Here, for a while, the fur trade "strengthened rather than weakened the existing social and economic systems" (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 24). The "cultural adaptation" which occurred was more the result of "increasing social contacts, exchange of ideas, and actual intermarriages" that the fur trade fostered rather than merely the "increased volume of trade" (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 26). This continued for a substantial period of time until a new element altered the relationship. Disease separated the period of mutual dependence from the subsequent period of conquest (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 26) and ensuing dependency.

In the Subarctic Boreal Forest Region, native trappers and hunters were largely autonomous throughout the history of the fur trade. Natives in this area did not relinquish control of the basic "productive tools and resources," such as occupancy of land and
"knowledge of the game animals" (Tanner, 1983, p. 8). As such, foreign influence in this region was not felt until much later. Yet, European influence eventually did affect them. For example, the Innu, in what is now considered Labrador, were not "trappers," that is, they were not commercial trappers; they only caught what they needed and there was no need or desire for a surplus until Europeans encouraged them to trap fur-bearing animals for trade (Nook, 1990).

After native involvement in the fur trade was no longer necessary, Europeans' desire for agricultural land increased. Natives were expected to forfeit their land. This process of native displacement occurred gradually from east to west and south to north (Patterson, 1972, p. 38). English settlement of Canada, characterized by family agriculture and adherence to property boundaries, was incompatible with native interests. Foreseeing conflicts, the British government, in 1670, charged the colonial Governors with regulation of Indian affairs. Their main concerns were to protect natives from whites and to introduce Christianity (MacInnes, 1943, p. 153).

In accordance with the goal of protection, the Royal Proclamation of 1763 legitimized native land rights and appointed the government as an intermediary between native and non-native land deals. The British’s conception of land rights in Canada at the time was that the Crown retained “absolute title” but natives had “proprietary rights” which were to be extinguished through treaties (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 27, 28). Thus, native forfeiture of their land and white appropriation of this land was to be accomplished via treaties between natives and the government. As a means to guard native land until the government could gain control over it through treaties, the Royal North West Mounted Police, formed in 1873, protected natives from whiskey traders and criminal elements who entered western Canada from Montana (McInnis, 1969, p. 397) and frequently took advantage of natives.

In Canada, John A. Macdonald’s government “negotiated” the majority of treaties between natives and the government (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 20).
Macdonald and his successor, William Lyon Mackenzie, were responsible for ensuring the impotency of the treaties for no court had the power to order the government to “fulfill its obligations” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 20, 21). While natives view the government’s obligations under the treaties as broader in scope and longer in duration than does the government (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 24), because the treaties are political, not legal agreements, and laws are used merely to carry out the agreement (Lyons, 1984, p. 9), the legal strength of treaties in Canada is currently being debated.

Native claims to land in “international legal terms” is “aboriginal title” (Lyons, 1984, p. 7). The only claim to land of non-treaty Indians is based on the “aboriginal rights” of the “first settlers of the land” and the contention that this land has not been turned over “officially” to the government. Thus, the legality and strength of aboriginal rights and treaty rights differ markedly (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 23). Nevertheless, the fact that treaties were signed to secure land from natives implicitly recognized the right of native ownership of these lands (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 23) and, as Tennant (1985, p. 325) notes, the “historical and ethical question” to be addressed is whether natives’ title to the land was, or really could be, “transferred” to the government of Canada.

By the time Europeans firmly established a superior military presence in Canada, and natives were being forced from their land to accommodate non-native settlement and expansion, the relationship between natives and whites had evolved to where the roles were reversed: natives were now the dependent people (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. xvi). Because they lacked farming experience, natives became peripheral to the economic productivity of the increasing areas of non-native agricultural settlement. They also became physically marginal to non-native settlements as they were concentrated on reserves (Patterson, 1972, pp. 187, 188). The reduction of the reserves to “geographical and social hinterlands,” available for non-native exploitation, has served to maintain native economic dependence upon non-native society (Frideres, 1988, p. 370). Guiding
this relationship in Canada for almost one and a half centuries has been the *Indian Act* (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 3).

b. The *Indian Act*

The first government of Canada, led by Macdonald, passed what in reality was the first Indian act, an “Act providing for the organization of the Department of the Secretary of State and for the management of Indian and Ordinance Lands” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 21). The succeeding Mackenzie government drafted the first act actually called an Indian act, setting the precedent of a narrow definition of an Indian which was restricted to blood relations through the male line, a European concept of lineage unfamiliar to most native societies (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 21, 22). The definition of Indian, essential for the *Indian Act*, was a male of Indian blood who belonged to a band, offspring of this person, and any woman legally married to this person (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 9). The definition of an “Indian” immediately became a contentious issue and has remained so to the present time.

Predating the *Indian Act*, and in anticipation of legislation to govern natives and address their concerns, the Indian Department was created in 1755 as part of the military. Legislation pertaining to natives was instituted by the military governing the colony because natives “were classified at the time as either enemies or allies” (Tanner, 1983, p. 15). Control of Indian affairs remained with the military until, in 1830, when the government no longer needed natives as military allies, civil control of the Indian Department was established (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 4). As administration of Indian affairs passed from the military to a civilian body the concern for native political representation decreased (Tanner, 1983, p. 16).

Setting the precedent for the policy of the 1876 *Indian Act*, in 1857 the colonial government delineated public policy, with assimilation and the means of achieving
assimilation as major components. The introduction to this legislation, the Act for the Gradual Civilization of the Indian Tribes in the Canadas, clearly stated the government’s intention of removing “all legal distinctions between them [natives] and her Majesty’s other Canadian subjects” (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 6). In 1867, the British North America (BNA) Act, section 91, subsection 24, empowered the federal government with legislative authority over issues concerning natives and native land (MacInnes, 1943, p. 155) and the new federal government maintained the assimilation character of native policy that had existed now for some time (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, pp. 6, 7). Thus, the Indian Act, passed in 1876, solidified legislation that had already been in place. To this end, the Act proposed money, property, and enfranchisement as incentives for natives to assimilate into the “mainstream” of Canadian society. It was so comprehensive that it would affect every aspect of native life.

Enfranchisement, provided for in the Indian Act, was offered as an incentive for natives to leave the reserve and make their way into Canadian society. Originally, only two means of enfranchisement existed: if an Indian woman married a non-Indian man, or if Indian men chose to be enfranchised. Any male Indian who was “sober and industrious” could apply to an enfranchisement agent to obtain full Canadian citizenship. If he qualified (he also needed band approval), he would receive a “ticket” for a piece of land to which he would receive a “title deed” after three years, thereby owning the land. After six years from the initial application he could petition the agent for his share of band funds that had been invested by the government. Following this six year period, under Canadian law, he would no longer be an Indian but an “ordinary” citizen of Canada. This would give status Indians, among other things, the right to vote, freedom of speech, and the right to organize politically. However, as Cardinal (1969, p. 19) points out, enfranchisement was a drastic step, for a status Indian had to give up all treaty and special rights, his membership on a reserve, and all claims to his share of land and resources. While Indians recognized this as a serious procedure and one to be undertaken
only as a last resort, McGill, an employee of the Indian Affairs Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, made the government’s policy on this issue clear, stating, “although we do not urge Indians towards enfranchisement, on the other hand, we give them every encouragement to take this step” (MacInnes, 1943, p. 134).

Incentives to assimilate were an important element in the history of native policy in Canada. This aspect illuminates the true nature of the Act. Basically, it was not intended to protect native land, but only to protect natives from being exploited in land dealings which, it was assumed, would occur as native land was secured for non-native occupation and settlement (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 6).

As mentioned, the Act maintained the government’s role as protector of native land. The policy goal of protection resulted in a paternalistic relationship between the government and natives and the feeling being that the government knew what was best for natives (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 17). This has been described as the beginning of the “colonial period” in native history for, because of their marginalization, natives had become irrelevant from a European perspective (Patterson, 1972, p. 40). This was reflected in legislation governing natives in Canada which created “a colonial form of administration,” where natives’ legal position was separate from other Canadians and more limited, and their administrative body was more “centralized” than that governing other Canadians. This “wardship principle” had as its “welfare rationale” the protection of natives from European “colonizers.” Nevertheless, a fundamental feature of wardship is that external administrators retain true power or control over “the wards” (Tanner, 1983, pp. 2, 3). As such, the European “colonizers” disregarded the values of natives and, in doing so, “destroyed the natives’ political, economic, kinship, and religious systems” (Frideres, 1988, p. 367). Further, this system of wardship or colonialism entrenched the “economic and political dependency of Indian reserves” for the reserve system, because the “land base” being “too small and impoverished,” failed to foster self-sufficiency (Tanner, 1983, p. 17). Accordingly, this paternalistic or wardship arrange-
ment resulted in the government being intrinsically involved in, and wielding power over, every aspect of native life (Tanner, 1983, p. 17). Because natives were no longer in control of the political and economic processes which affected their lives, they indeed, had become a “colonial people” (Patterson, 1972, p. 40).

Paradoxically, while the long term aim of “internal colonialism” (Long, Little Bear and Boldt, 1984, p. 70) and the Indian Act is assimilation, the Act was also intended to protect natives by isolating them on reserves, thereby reducing contact with non-native society (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 12). This was supposed to reduce non-native exploitation of natives and retard the deterioration of native culture by lessening non-native impact on, and interaction with, natives. Yet, the government aim to make natives more self-sufficient, by isolating them on reserves was also thought to further the process of assimilation by bringing natives into the Canadian economy (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 21). Thus, as Chamberlain notes, “the Act codifies and often exaggerates the distinctions which it is its function eventually to eliminate” (1975, p. 90). From this, it is apparent that protection and assimilation were contradictory policy goals (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 19).

The government demand that natives settle on land bases or reserves, in order to better protect them allowed institutions (church, school, government) to be brought into place more easily (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 20). Ponting and Gibbins suggest that the education and Christianization of natives and their placement on reserves were all means to an end: assimilation (1980, p. 8). Education, regarded as essential for assimilation, was left up to the churches. The churches maintained that it was necessary to “Christianize first and then civilize” which arose from the churches’ self-appointed responsibility for the “moral and spiritual training” of natives (McLean, 1889, pp. 263-264). Thus, in the institution of the missionary (and later the residential) schools, natives had their “language and customs ridiculed and have been submitted to psychological and physical punishment to force them to abandon their traditions” (Patterson,
This has led to a pervasive mistrust of religious organizations and the government.

Even the present situation of education for natives is replete with discrimination and mistrust. Currently, the DIA gives money to schools which accept a number of natives from different reserves in the area. This money has been used by schools to purchase equipment, etc. Often these tuition agreements were not renewed after the schools had secured enough money to build additions or buy new equipment. An example is Sir Wilfred Laurier, a school in London, Ontario, which built a new gymnasium with money they acquired through these tuition agreements, after which native students were transferred to other schools. This strategy is still practiced in Ontario and is rampant in the Prairie provinces (Doxtater, 1990).

Missionary activities also affected Indian policy. The missionaries provided the moral justification for Canada's Indian policy, and assimilation was the desired end result (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, pp. 80, 5). Because churches, in their effort to convert natives to Christianity, often worked in concert with the government, many changes to the Indian Act were a result of church influence. For example, the churches convinced the government to ban certain dances and rituals (Frideres, 1988, p. 368). Accordingly, an 1884 amendment imposed a prison sentence for anyone involved in a Potlach or Tawanawa dance. Here the government's intention was to protect natives from themselves (Miller, 1978, p. 82), for the government saw these festivals as "retarding the progress of the Indians" (McLean, 1889, p. 15). From the churches' perspective, the dances, a vital part of native culture, were a hindrance to the spread of Christianity (Frideres, 1988, p. 368).

Further amendments to the Indian Act, frequent and usually detrimental to native concerns, tended to increase government control over Indian affairs. Under an 1880 amendment, any native acquiring a university degree would automatically be enfranchised (Miller, 1978, p. 82). Following an 1889 amendment, if a band did not want to
lease reserve land, the government could now force them to do so (Miller, 1978, p. 99). Because of these and other drastic amendments, the Act was criticized for giving such great and wide-reaching power over Indian affairs to the federal government. This extensive power was wielded by the Indian Agent who was responsible for administering in native communities. His administrative powers were so vast that a dependency relationship inevitably formed between him and natives (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 11).

Expressing their dissatisfaction, natives attempted to regain some power and, thus, control of their destiny, by organizing for protest and resolution of “grievances” as early as the 1920s (Patterson, 1972, p. 41). This dissatisfaction appears justified for as Cardinal (1969, pp. 43, 44) observes, the Act, instead of upholding the treaties and protecting native rights, condemns to colonial rule the people it was intended to protect. The changing attitude of the government and increasing pressure of native organizations were evident in the revision of the Indian Act in 1951 (Patterson, 1972, p. 171).

The new Indian Act in 1951, while still championing native assimilation, contained some significant changes, including a reduction in government involvement in native cultural affairs, the allowance of the Potlach, the lifting of the ban on native consumption of alcohol in public, and the termination of both enfranchisement without consent and prohibition of native political organizations. As a further development in this area, by 1960 enfranchisement was no longer regarded as a good incentive for natives to assimilate. This was reflected in a change in policy in 1960, when “all natives were enfranchised for federal elections” thereby allowing natives living on reserves to vote in federal elections (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 13). Thus, the “cultural distinctiveness” of native Canadians was finally seen as legitimate (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 22) and it was recognized that natives need not be assimilated to be Canadian citizens (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, pp. 13, 14). Despite these changes, however, by the end of the 1960s, the Indian Act remained largely the same (in terms of goals) as the original Indian Act of 1876 (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 14).
During this time period (the 1960s), the government was severely criticized for the historical treatment of natives and, as the public became more aware of the poverty and alienation of natives, criticism mounted. Public sympathy for natives was furthered by the youth, civil rights, and anti-poverty movements and by university campus activism (Weaver, 1981, p. 15). Generally, the government was criticized for its “paternalistic” attitude which hindered native initiatives and curtailed their freedom to develop as they desired. Specifically, rhetoric and criticism during the 1960s focused mainly on the Indian Act; it was seen as “a piece of racist legislation” (Weaver, 1981, p. 19).

Much of this criticism was supported in a national survey on the situation of native Canadians, commissioned by the Canadian government (Weaver, 1981, p. 6). The Hawthorn Report (1966, 1967) recognized the “colonial situation” of natives, implicated the Indian Affairs Branch as the “colonial ruler,” and pointed to the deliberate lack of native involvement in the “decision-making process” (Patterson, 1972, p. 178). In order to rectify this situation, volume one of the report proposed special status for native Canadians known as “citizens plus.” This would afford natives greater freedom in choosing how they wished to live. Thus, whether or not they remained in a native community, natives would retain all the privileges of their status, and at the same time be able to participate fully as citizens of Canada (Weaver, 1981, p. 21).

Unfortunately, the recommendations of the Hawthorn Report were rejected because the government felt the views of those who drafted the report had become biased from too intimate involvement an in the issue and therefore the recommendations were allegedly unrealistic. The optimism and support for natives expressed in the Hawthorn Report made the policy proposals which followed even more incomprehensible.
c. The *White Paper*

Although the objectives of the government changed little over the years, the introduction into the House of Commons in 1969 of “A Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy,” marked a watershed in native-government relations (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 26). The *White Paper*, as it was commonly known, was not particularly innovative in terms of native policy; again, it merely extended policy that had been in place for over a century. The only novel element of the *White Paper* was termination. The intention of this policy aspect was to eliminate, in the short-term future, all special native rights (Weaver, 1981, pp. 196, 167). While the implicit goal of the termination of special rights had been an aspect of government policy since the 1830s, the difference in 1969 was that it was openly proposed for immediate enactment (Weaver, 1981, p. 4).

Denunciations of the *White Paper* were swift and harsh, prompting Harold Cardinal, (1969, p. 1) in the *Unjust Society*, to say, “The Americans to the south of us used to have a saying: ‘The only good Indian is a dead Indian.’ The MacDonald-Chretien doctrine [the *White Paper*] would amend this but slightly to, ‘The only good Indian is a non-Indian.’” Further, Cardinal (1969, p. 1) maintained that “the history of Canada’s Indians is a shameful chronicle of the white man’s disinterest, his deliberate trampling of Indian rights and his repeated betrayal of our trust.” The press and a segment of the public supported natives’ condemnation of the *White Paper*. Indicative of the government’s logic, it saw the considerable public emotionalism surrounding the *White Paper* issue as a problem, one to be dealt with quickly (Weaver, 1981, p. 192), and not the *White Paper* itself as problematic. Ironically, the *White Paper* served to rekindle distrust of the government, which it was the government’s intention to eradicate (Weaver, 1981, p. 5).

Central to the problem was that the Liberal government then in power held a perspective on natives which emphasized individual rights to the exclusion of the rights
of a communal group (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, pp. 25, 26). This was contrary to the native cultural tradition of a strong community. Indicative of the federal government's conception of the issue, the White Paper maintained that equality with the remainder of Canadians was important in solving natives’ problems and that special rights were the cause of their problems (Weaver, 1981, p. 4). Accordingly the White Paper called for the "repeal of the Indian Act," the elimination of "special legal status" for Indians, the dissolution of the "centralized bureaucracy of the Indian Affairs Department," and the transference to the provinces of the responsibility of providing services to natives (Long et al., 1984, p. 70). The White Paper also proposed the dissolution of the Indian Affairs Programme, a part of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND).

The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and DIAND both felt the White Paper was the best solution and should be implemented (Weaver, 1981, p. 197). This was meant to put an end to paternalism and discrimination (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 26). Yet, the underlying premise of denying natives participation in policy-making was that the policy-makers were better equipped than natives to determine the problem and its solution (Weaver, 1981, p. 195).

In a number of consultation sessions prior to the release of the White Paper, natives outlined the issues with which they were concerned, including "land claims, treaty rights, hunting and fishing rights, control of finances [and] band membership" (Patterson, 1972, p. 178). Native participation in drafting the White Paper proposal was said to have occurred, for the government consented to negotiate and consult with natives instead of merely "imposing" policy on them as had been the tradition (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 313); yet this was not the case (Weaver, 1981, p. 10). Natives argued that the government's proposal ignored the opinions they expressed at the consultation meetings (Patterson, 1972, p. 178). When native cultural systems were acknowledged in the policy-making process, they were referred to as obsolete. Consequently, it has been
suggested the writing of the *White Paper* was undertaken with the “simplistic view of ethnic minority survival” in an economic sense and the belief that the future held no place for native cultural values. In viewing natives in terms of “socio-economic class structure” instead of ethnicity, it was not possible to comprehend the significance of natives’ cultural systems (Weaver, 1981, p. 196). This has lead Cardinal (1969, p. 1) to suggest that the 1969 *White Paper* was “a thinly disguised programme of extermination through assimilation.”

Thus, the two fundamental reasons for the rejection of the *White Paper* were: natives were not allowed the participation which they were promised, and the *White Paper* negated special rights for natives which had been recognized and upheld by the *Hawthorn Report* (Weaver, 1981, p. 173). This resulted in the withdrawal of the *White Paper* in 1971.

One positive outcome of the *White Paper* was the stimulation of “Indian Nativism,” which encouraged natives to organize politically (Weaver, 1981, p. 197). By organizing, natives were able to articulate and direct their criticism more effectively. A substantial response to the *White Paper* came in 1970 when the Indian Chiefs of Alberta presented a paper entitled *Citizens Plus*, which drew on the recommendations of the *Hawthorn Report*, to the federal government. Known as the *Red Paper*, it stated that for natives to receive fair treatment, the legal status of Indians should be preserved and that “justice requires that the special history, rights, and circumstances of Indian People be recognized” (Patterson, 1972, p. 180).

In an attempt to redeem themselves after the disastrous *White Paper*, and in anticipation of native-government clashes over land rights, Jean Chretien, on behalf of the federal government, in 1973, presented a new policy addressing claims settlement in “non-treaty areas of Canada.” This represented a significant policy change as the government finally agreed to address the question of aboriginal title to land not covered by existing treaties. Yet, this was not a recognition on the part of the federal government of
the concept of ownership of land based on original possession. This policy's main objective was the same as the treaties signed in the 1800s, the "extinguishment of aboriginal title" (Tanner, 1983, p. 26). Accompanying this development, a 1974 policy, "Indian-Federal-Government Relationships," proposed a new working arrangement between the two groups (Nicholson, 1984, pp. 60, 61). It proposed negotiations over land claims between native groups and the government (an unbalanced relationship as previously noted) instead of through a third party (Tanner, 1983, p. 26). While historically the government's relationship evolved from one of protector to manager to, according to this policy, "joint decision-maker," Nicholson (1984, p. 61) maintains that the decision-making process within the DIA never attained this joint-decision model; instead, the DIA continued to impose policies on natives.

Native land claims and the dispute over native land became more prominent as massive "energy resource-development" plans in James Bay and the Mackenzie Valley (around 1971) endangered native lifestyles in these regions. In 1976, a policy titled "New Federal Government-Indian Relationship" recognized the "special status" of natives and conceptualized it as a type of native "identity within Canadian society rather than separation from Canadian society or assimilation into it." It also rejected the approach of a universally applicable policy as "unsuitable" because of the "different needs of Indian communities" (Weaver, 1981, p. 202). Apparently, both of these policy developments were initiated to appease the public and quell mounting criticism, for by the end of the 1970s, the Indian Act of 1876 remained virtually intact.

Nevertheless, in accordance with these new developments, the James Bay and Northern Quebec Native Claim Settlement Act was signed in 1977. This agreement provided certain rights, services and a monetary sum (about $232 million) to Cree and Inuit affected by the agreement, but they had to agree to the termination of their "aboriginal title" (Opekokew, 1987, p. 26). This agreement was criticized by many because of the termination clause. In response, the government, in 1986, developed new policy
which eliminated comprehensive termination of all native rights as a requisite of any land dealings (Opekakow, 1987, p. 51). Nevertheless, native groups maintain, with the agreement of some civil servants, that termination still exists as the government’s unofficial policy (Weaver, 1981, p. 5). Nicholson (1984, p. 60), who holds a position at the “senior administrative level” in the DIA, believes that the Canadian government is determined to implement the policy position outlined in the 1969 White Paper. Significantly, it has been suggested that, years after its withdrawal, the policies of the White Paper are still being implemented (Weaver, 1981, p. 204).

The suspicion that the 1969 White Paper was being passed “through the back door” arose when the first bill to amend the Constitution (around 1978) included only “vague references” to native concerns (Frideres, 1988, p. 328). Thus, while initially there was disagreement among natives over whether or not to participate in discussions concerning the Constitution, the National Indian Brotherhood (NIB) decided to get involved lest native concerns be ignored. They also followed the rationale that if natives desired “nationhood status,” they must promote relationships with other nations, including Canada (Riley, 1984, p. 161).

d. The Constitution Act, 1982

The patriation of the Constitution in 1982 ensured the “existing rights” of native people in Canada. Specifically, section 35 states that:

1. The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.

2. In this act, “aboriginal peoples of Canada” includes the Indian, Inuit and Metis people of Canada (Frideres, 1988, p. 347).

While the Constitution Act, 1982 recognizes the existing rights of native Canadians, it has yet to be determined how these “existing rights” will be defined with regard to
the *Indian Act* (Frideres, 1988, p. 38). The *Constitution Act, 1982* also called for constitutional conferences to be held to decide exactly what would be included as aboriginal rights. The first conference in 1983, and the succeeding conferences, have yielded few results (Frideres, 1988, p. 347).

The patriation of the *Constitution* posed a serious threat, one which was anticipated as early as the Diefenbaker government's introduction of the *Bill of Rights*. This legislation set forth the idea of individual rights legislation in Canada. However, the *Bill* was essentially toothless because the rights which it outlined could be abrogated by any Canadian statute. Although this is in contrast to the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* which overrides other statutes, the *Bill of Rights* was still viewed as a threat to special native rights (Weaver, 1981, p. 199) because it set a dangerous precedent in conceptualizing individual rights without regard for native concerns and tradition.

Not surprisingly then, natives have severely criticized the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* because its embodiment of a "liberal-democratic cultural and political tradition" emphasizes the rights of the individual over the rights of the community (Boldt and Long, 1985a, p. 165). The *Charter* threatens "core" values in native culture, such as "spiritual unity," decision-making by consensus, "institutionalized cooperation and sharing, respect for personal autonomy, and a preference for impersonal controls" (Boldt and Long, 1985a, p. 390n). Further, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* overrides any Canadian statute (such as the *Indian Act*), which "denies an individual equality before the law by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion, or sex" (Frideres, 1988, p. 37).

A particular issue is whether the *Indian Act* violates the *Charter of Rights* specifically concerning the loss of legal status for any Indian woman who marries a non-Indian. *Bill C-31, An Act to Amend the Indian Act*, passed in 1985, set forth a new definition of Indian and non-Indian which ended discrimination on the basis of sex. Native women who married non-native men, and lost legal status as a result, could apply to regain
standing as legal Indians. While there are certain inequities in this provision of the Indian Act, the concern is that if this provision is nullified by a court it will set an unfavourable precedent in legitimizing a court that, in the eyes of natives, has no authority to alter the Act (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 241). Accordingly, because “equality before the law” has been widely interpreted, the Indian Act, as two recent court cases demonstrated, has really defined native rights to date (Frideres, 1988, p. 37).

Thus, until all “aboriginal peoples of Canada” are further defined, the Indian Act takes precedence in defining who are Indians (Opekowkew, 1987, p.1). Because it is the Indian Act, not the BNA Act (now called the Constitution Act, 1867), which provides the definition of Indian and, therefore, determines who receives resources and assistance, the Indian Act is perceived as both positive and negative: positive because it is probably only through the Indian Act that natives will be able to settle land claims today, and negative because it denies some people of native descent government assistance (Frideres, 1988, pp. 37, 38).

In support of native concern over the Indian Act, section 25 of the Charter protects the rights of aboriginals outlined in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, decreed by King George III of England, from being abridged by the “rights and freedoms” guaranteed in the Charter (Opekowkew, 1987, p. 17). However, there is concern that the provisions allowed in section 25 are only a “symbolic guarantee” because Parliament has the authority to “suspend or restrict” aboriginal rights and freedoms (Boldt and Long, 1985a, p. 171). “The provision governing Indian rights” can be altered in the constitutional amendment process which requires the approval of provincial governments whose concerns directly oppose native concerns (Smallface Marule, p. 38). This has led to the feeling on the part of natives that the government’s goal is assimilation through “human rights legislation” (Boldt and Long, 1985a, p. 172). As Boldt and Long (1985a, pp. 176, 172) suggest, individual rights demarcated in the Charter are antithetical to communal rights delimited by native cultural tradition; natives seek to be protected as a group, not as
individuals.

Maintaining this native perspective, a Supreme Court of Canada decision in 1984 found native rights to exist legally prior to the *Royal Proclamation of 1763* and deemed the source of native rights to be "derived from original possession of the North American continent" (Opekowkew, 1987, pp. 2, 17). Thus, as Tennant (1985, p. 325) suggests, because "aboriginal title to the land" implies the "aboriginal right to communal self-government of that land," natives increasingly have demanded the recognition of their right to self-government.

e. Native Self-Government

*That government is best which governs least. — Thoreau*

A new development in native-Canadian government relations was introduced with the *Penner Report*, issued in 1983 and drafted with native consultation and input. It officially agreed with the concept of native self-government and suggested that the federal government should acknowledge native self-government as an aboriginal right and do so in the *Constitution*. Further, it suggested that native self-government be implemented immediately (Tennant, 1985, p. 328).

The committee's proposed legislation would obligate the federal government to acknowledge the right of natives to govern themselves, institute "bilateral" agreements between native and federal governments to address questions of jurisdiction, and exclude native lands from adherence to provincial laws. It further suggested that individual native governments would have unique forms of government (Tennant, 1985, p. 329). Thus, native government would have full authority over "resources, education, and social development and taxation" (Frideres, 1988, p. 348) in accordance with natives' desire to control those powers of the federal government which determine Indian affairs (Ponting
and Gibbins, 1980, p. 322). As such, native governments would “form a distinct order of
government in Canada” (Tennant, 1985, p. 328). Two initial attempts to institute this
type of native self-government failed.

The DIA and the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) used the recommendations of
the Penner Report to write a policy proposal, completed December 1983, entitled “Indian
Nations Recognition and Validating Act.” Brought before the cabinet early in 1984, it
was “promptly killed.” John Munro, Minister of Indian Affairs, on behalf of the federal
government, refused to support “self-government as an aboriginal right” (Tennant, p.
330).

A group, comprised of people from the DIA, the Ministry of Justice, the PMO,
and the Ministry of State for Social Development, drafted new legislation in consultation
with the AFN executive, entitled Bill C-52, which was introduced into the House of
Commons in June 1984. In effect, the Bill was merely a minor revision of the
government’s original perspective: legislatively-based band government (Tennant, 1985,
p. 331). With Parliament preparing to be “dissolved” and an election looming on the
horizon, the possibility of the Bill even being considered was minimal (Tennant, 1985, p.
331).

At the 1985 First Ministers’ Conference (FMC), in discussing means to achieve
self-government, native representatives expressed fears that any agreement would under-
mine federal powers and increase provincial jurisdiction, which natives thought would
decrease their rights.29 Criticism also focused on the potential “loss of lands and re-
serves” and the “unpredictable treatment” natives might be subject to if control over
Indian affairs was delegated to the provinces (Weaver, 1981, p. 176). Central to their
concerns was the uncertain status of treaties with the federal government that would result from a change in jurisdiction to the provinces. Natives argued that the provinces
would not be obligated to uphold treaties natives made with the federal government.30

No agreement was reached at the 1985 FMC so the government, instead of seek-
ing a comprehensive agreement with all natives, pursued “community-based self-government initiatives” (Opekakew, 1987, pp. 37, 38). An example of advances in native self-government was the enactment of the Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act in 1986, giving 33 reserves north of Vancouver recognition as a “legal entity,” the Sechelt band. Apart from this there have been very few inroads in the development of native self-governments. Reasons for this include the varying perspectives of the different native groups, the discordant perspectives of natives and federal and provincial governments, “native suspicion” of government programs, undesired involvement of the provinces, and the financial difficulties in establishing self-government (Frideres, 1988, pp. 361-363).

Also presenting a problem is the legal debate surrounding the issue. For example, while the terms self-determination, sovereignty and native government have, of late, been incorporated into the term aboriginal rights or “rights of first nations,” which includes the “political, social, economic, and cultural rights” deemed fundamental for the recognition and continuation of a unique group of people (Little Bear et al., 1984, p. 173), the determination must be made as to whether the right for natives to govern themselves is an aboriginal right, for if so, it would be recognized and upheld under the Charter (Whyte, 1984, p. 102).

Originally, native claims were recognized as law partly because common law often recognizes “a morally compelling claim as a legally binding one.” Also, at a time in the colonies when the aboriginal population was substantial, native rights were acknowledged because “it was good diplomacy” (Whyte, 1984, p. 104). Additionally, the Royal Proclamation of 1763 implies that natives would continue to practice self-government on the land allocated to them (Whyte, 1984, pp. 105, 106). The recognition of native rights in the Proclamation and in common law necessitated the signing of treaties in order for non-natives to acquire native land (Whyte, 1984, p. 106) for fundamental to all treaties was the “surrender” of all native “rights, titles, and privileges” to the lands outlined in the treaty. Because “place” is fundamental to the notion of self-government,
for it implies a continuously functioning community of which self-government is a significant element, it has been suggested that "aboriginal title to land is the demonstration of aboriginal government" (Tennant, 1985, pp. 324, 325). Accordingly, the fact that the government felt the need to sign treaties with natives validates, to some degree, native tribes' existence as "independent political entities" (Whyte, 1984, p. 107). Yet section 35 (1) of the Charter does not explicate whether the rights contained within, which would include the right to govern oneself, are legal rights, recognized in Canadian courts (Whyte, 1984, p. 102). Consequently, the federal government and natives disagree over whether "Indian self-government is an aboriginal right" (Tennant, 1985, p. 321).

Apart from the debate over whether native self-government is an aboriginal right, the structure of native self-government and its relationship to Canadian governments is also widely disputed for it would be difficult for Canadian governments to deal with a large number of native self-governments with "constitutionally recognized authority" (Opekowk, 1987, p. 45). It is apparent that the courts will not want to exclude the possibility of "morally justifiable intervention" in native affairs by isolating section 35 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which would support "absolute aboriginal rights." Conceivably, they will apply section 1 to section 35 which would uphold native rights except where and when legislative intervention can be "demonstrably justified." This would set judicial limitations on governmental interference in native affairs (Whyte, 1984, p. 108). Thus, while the government of Canada is against granting natives sovereignty or "separate statehood," it is amenable to some form of native self-government (Boldt and Long, 1984, p. 549).

The most significant "conceptual block to Indian political autonomy" is the potential conflict between the right of native self-government and the rights of individual natives who are subject to native government (Whyte, 1984, p. 103). Therefore, according to the federal government, justification for government intervention is the protection of third parties' rights, of individuals within native communities, and of other native
rights. The final justification, highly contestable, is the assumption of the need for
government assistance in assuring the well-being of natives, which, once again, amounts
to paternalism (Whyte, 1984, pp. 109, 110). As Whyte (1984, p. 110) maintains, "there
should be a presumption that the Indians are most knowledgeable and concerned about
their own welfare."

In this regard, aboriginal peoples maintain that native government should be a
"first-order government" similar to provincial government which has "guaranteed jurisdic-
tional authority" (Little Bear, Boldt and Long, 1984, p. 173). However, the federal
government demands that native government be "subordinate to the jurisdictional author-
ity of the provinces and the federal government" (Little Bear et al., 1984, pp. 174, 175)
which would restrict native government independence (autonomy). The government's
insistence upon a legislatively-based form of native self-government is based upon the
government's efforts to address the increasing demand by native bands for greater auton-
omy and increasing control over band affairs while still maintaining the "historic legal
relationship" between the federal government and natives (Long et al., 1984, p. 79).

Accordingly, DIAND, since the mid 1970s, has supported the implementation of a "legis-
latively based" system of native self-government where native government would be
subject to the will of Parliament (Little Bear et al., 1984, p. 175).

Thus, the federal government's conception of native government is drastically
different from and more restricted than that conceived of by natives themselves. The
federal government envisions a native government wielding only the powers which the
Minister of Indian Affairs currently "exercises on behalf of Indians" (Nicholson, 1984, p.
64). While some bands have assumed authority over services which were previously the
responsibility of the DIA (Powderface, 1984, p. 165), retaining their native heritage
requires securing control over "the economic and social development" of native commu-
nities (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 221). Generally, self-determination entails control
of all institutions which have some bearing on native life (Riley, 1984, p. 160). Bas-
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ally, natives desire “political autonomy” similar to sovereignty-association rather than “cultural pluralism or participatory democracy” (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 329). However, the Western structure of government which the federal government proposes for native self-government “undermine[s] traditions of individual obligation and accountability to community and subvert[s] the notion that political power is best exercised by elders having exceptional wisdom and experience” (Tennant, 1985, p. 325). Historically, “native social order” was not built on a hierarchical structure of authority with a central group holding power. These values are antithetical to native tradition and experience (Fridere, 1988, p. 364). Further, the elective form of government fosters “factionalism,” unstable leadership, and inconsistent policy (Tennant, 1985, p. 325). Thus, Powderface (1984, p. 164) recommends that natives build their own institutions based on traditional values instead of seeking control of Western institutions which affect them. Similarly, Smallface Marule (1984, p. 44) maintains it is paramount that natives seek the implementation of “traditional institutions, systems, and processes” when considering native self-government.

As Little Bear observes, discussions regarding native self-government will emerge from the quagmire of policy-making, consisting of “constitutional conferences, the federal legislative and bureaucratic policy-making process, and federal-provincial negotiations” (Little Bear et al., 1984, p. 175). This complex policy-making environment makes it increasingly difficult for natives to promote their desired form of self-government (Little Bear et al., 1984, p. 176). For these reasons it has been suggested that natives themselves must “define and develop” native government (Weaver, 1984, p. 66). In doing so, native leaders must be wary of agreeing to “tripartite negotiations” over native self-government with the federal and provincial governments lest natives’ “limited political resources...get drawn into the morass of provincial-federal negotiations” (Weaver, 1984, p. 68).

Because natives regard themselves as many nations, not merely one, Little Bear et
al. (1984, pp. 178, 179) anticipate self-government first appearing at the band level. Nevertheless, a significant factor is the willingness of the major aboriginal groups (Metis, Inuit, and status Indians) to "maintain an intergroup common front...in their political negotiations...[so as not to] undermine the bargaining position of each group." This would be akin to reforming "tribal confederacies" to address common concerns. Such a "united political body" is deemed necessary to deal effectively with the Canadian government. Yet, this body would not instruct any native community on how it should remedy its peculiar problems (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 42). Echoing this sentiment, Weaver (1984, pp. 67, 68) maintains that native government will probably materialize only through "band governments" securing power "at the reserve level" and that this will occur with the assistance and support of "stronger national and provincial lobbying organizations" who represent concerns common to all bands. In these "regional organizations and local communities" the leaders' philosophies would emerge from their particular communities, experiences, and "historical backgrounds" (Tanner, 1983, p. 30).

Subsequently, instead of a uniform structure of self-government applied to all native people, Little Bear et al. (1984, p. 173) recommend the constitutional establishment of a general "statement of principle" which would permit native government at the local or band level to develop as best suits their peculiar needs and environment. This would alleviate the danger in native self-government of the formation of an elite ruling group. By choosing the alternative, locating authority in the "smallest political unit," the "family-clan groups and band communities" would have representatives on the tribal council and all larger units would act only in a "co-ordinating" capacity (Smallface Marule, 1984, pp. 41, 42). This strategy is deemed necessary since foregoing politics at the local level and concentrating on a larger native political strategy is "artificial" because of the "specific regional and local significance" of most political issues (Tanner, 1983, p. 30). Additionally, a broader-based approach would result in natives appearing as another "special-interest" lobby group (Tanner, 1983, p. 30).
Some indication that this has happened is evident today. Initially, the perspectives of European settlers, the Canadian government, and social scientists subsumed all natives into a common ethnic group (Patterson, 1972, p. 40). Although natives did not have a "common sense of identity and purpose" but were quite diverse, because of the economic role the Europeans saw natives filling, notably, supplying furs, Europeans viewed all natives as the same (Patterson, 1972, p. 40). Accordingly, in their negotiations with non-natives, aboriginal people have had to "make claims to ethnic legitimacy" in order to "challenge the basic assumptions" of non-natives. This has resulted in all political issues, however mundane, being caught in a web of debate over ethnicity (Tanner, 1983, p. 33). As Tanner (1983, p. 34) so poignantly notes, "because it is convenient for the federal government to have to deal only with a single unified native position, and because ethnicity is used in expressing this position, there is a danger of the Indian political argument becoming buried within an abstract nonspecific pan-native ideology with little relation to local issues." Because of this, natives expend substantial time and effort in "creating, discussing and communicating a distinct Indian reality," to non-natives and to one another (Tanner, 1983, p. 34). Natives are a "cognitive minority" currently undertaking an "enterprise of world building" (Berger, 1969, p. 3) and this "world building" or "ideological production" reinforces their uniqueness (Tanner, 1983, p. 35).

Ethnicity as a basis for political cohesion and action is common in nations with a variegated system. In such situations, "cultural differences" are employed as a "symbolic resource" in the political arena. Cultural differences are used to identify groups vying for attention in the political environment. In Canada, this led to the "transformation" of native tribes into ethnic groups (Tanner, 1983, p. 6). Natives are improperly identified as ethnic groups, yet their position in Canadian society more closely resembles that of minority groups. At this point one can differentiate between ethnic groups and minority groups. The former largely acknowledge the "moral authority" of the government and reside within the system, while the latter reject, or are "excluded from," the authority of
the government (Tanner, 1983, p. 9). Aboriginal people, forced to exist in a position outside mainstream society, are in a different position than both ethnic groups immigrating into a country and colonized people who have “liberated” themselves, because immigrant groups compete within the system for status and liberated peoples may begin anew, building a new system (Tanner, 1983, p. 12). Natives’ position is somewhere between the two aforementioned groups. As evidence shows, non-native discrimination continues to “exclude” natives from the larger society. Such discrimination ignores the “incompatibility” of native lifestyle with the remainder of Canadian society, for means of achieving success in the wider society contradict native values (Tanner, 1983, pp. 12, 13).

Thus, natives are in “indirect opposition” to Canadian society, operating not as ethnic groups but rather as a “minority group.” The difference here is between a “poly-ethnic system” and a “unified majority” with marginal minorities. Natives are in the position of minority groups because they do not share many of the “cultural values” of the larger Canadian society; their situation is “one of decline from an earlier independence” whereas the ethnic multiplicity of Canadian society resembles more a “long-term improvement,” and there are differences in the manner in which the two groups relate to the “central institutions” of Canadian society and to the “national system of production” (Tanner, 1983, p. 31). Therefore, it is evident that natives’ political marginality is closely linked to their economic marginality.

The relegation of natives to the status of a peripheral ethnic group by the dominant groups in society has placed them outside the political and economic centre in Canadian society. Economic transactions between natives and non-natives over the past one hundred years have been unbalanced, with natives being the dependent party in the transactions (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 326). As Powderface (1984, p. 166) recognizes, there are tremendous difficulties in securing political autonomy when one is financially dependent upon the government.

Yet, the banishment of natives to the political and economic periphery of Cana-
dian society is changing, however slightly. The decline of the native “colonial” situation was a result of the reduction of the “charity and paternalistic orientations in support organizations such as the churches.” This eliminated the “moral legitimation upon which colonialism had been built” (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 315). Frideres suggests that to further remove themselves from the colonial situation, natives must “reject the notion of individual entrepreneurship or individual capitalism” and concentrate on securing “community ownership and control of reserve economies” (1988, p. 374). Thus, natives must retain their tradition values, emphasizing the communal good as opposed to individual achievement.

These developments notwithstanding, self-determination and self-government will be difficult because of natives’ “political marginality” (Weaver, 1981, p. 13). Because natives “constitute a political minority” foreign to the normative political arrangement and not recognizing, in the same manner, “the legitimacy of the state,” many times this results in “symbolic politics”: native demands which the government not only cannot respond to, but does not comprehend (Tanner, 1983, p. 32). This situation is unfortunate for, traditionally, their single conduit for political expression has been DINA. Nevertheless, because ideology remains the primary “political resource” of natives, the strength of their position relies upon them reminding “governments and the public of unfulfilled moral responsibilities” (Tanner 1983, p. 33).

In Canada, it seems that natives, because of their political marginality, are in a better bargaining position with the government when they act as a united lobby group. Although the national native movement is not unified (Riley, 1984, p. 162), and while ethnic, regional, economic development, and acculturation differences exist among natives, increasingly there is a “sense of common identity” (Patterson, 1972, pp. 186, 187). Even so, native organizations are at a political disadvantage because they cannot access the quantity and kind of resources available to the federal government (Tanner, 1983, p. 24). In order to secure changes in policy, natives must “form policy alliances
with groups within the dominant society, in particular with officials or groups within
government" (Tennant, 1985, p. 332). Thus, the issue of native participation remains a

By forming the National Indian Brotherhood, natives took disputes to the national
level (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 314) and, with the formation of the World Council
of Indigenous People, to the international level. In 1980, the National Indian Brother-
hood incorporated and “reorganized” under the name Assembly of First Nations (Ope-
kokew, 1987, p. 33). Despite the benefits of the national native organizations, Riley
(1984, p. 161) warns against natives transferring their dependency on the government to
native organizations.

There are further potential hazards in the relationship between natives and their
representative councils and national organizations which stem from natives’ view of the
structure of local native government imposed upon them by the Canadian federal govern-
ment. Initially, because the federal government thought it would hasten the assimilation
process, legislation was enacted requiring native groups, by 1869, to have local govern-
ment. Elected chiefs functioned as intermediaries between native communities and the
government (Tanner, 1983, p. 16). The government’s assumption was that replacing
tribal organizations with elected local governments would involve natives in the Cana-
dian political process (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, pp. 9, 10) which would, in turn, entice
them into supporting and becoming a part of the Canadian “mainstream.”

Thus, because of the origin of elected local government, many natives consider
the structure of elected councils to be a means of external control and they view the
elected band councils as an “arm of the federal government” (Walkom, 1990d, p. A10).
Indeed, the authority of band councils is restricted and all band bylaws must be approved
by DIAND (Walkom, 1990d, p. A10). Additionally, funding from the government is
conditional which means that many band and regional councils are “accountable” to the
Indian Affairs Branch (IAB) of DIAND as opposed to the constituents of their bands. In
fact, many see the role of band councils as merely "dispensing agents for federal funds" (Walkom, 1990d, p. A10). This places the councils in a precarious position between band members and the IAB (Powderface, 1984, pp. 165, 166).

The IAB through DIAND, acting on behalf of the federal government and legally under the Indian Act, has extreme powers over those within its jurisdiction (Tanner, 1983, p. 20) thereby increasing the pressure on band councils. Because the motivating force in the development of policy has been a preoccupation with finance, a system "based on cost-benefit analysis," ceasing funding in order to achieve native compliance is a familiar government strategy. Natives are manipulated via welfare. Obviously then, "political independence" is impossible while so many native communities are dependent on government assistance (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 39). Because of this situation, several bands, and even band councils, desire the institution of traditional native government "based on matriarchy, family groups and hereditary chiefs" (Walkom, 1990d, p. A10).

At present, native leaders and organizations hold a paradoxical position in desiring the maintenance of special status for natives which unavoidably continues the dependency relationship which exists between natives and the federal government (Tanner, 1983, p. 27). Native peoples are currently seeking a new act which will protect their land and resources without impeding "other areas of native life" (Friederes, 1988, p. 37) and which will maintain their special rights and settle the historical conflicts over land and treaty rights (Weaver, 1981, p. 5). Tanner (1983, p. 28) notes that this position should be seen as "a reaction to social exclusion and a statement about moral separateness" for, by retaining the wardship system, especially the Indian Act, support is given to the moral separateness of native communities from Canadian society. Accordingly, natives agree it is easier to secure increased autonomy from a position of special status rather than that of "ordinary citizens" (Tanner, 1983, p. 28); for the means to ensure equality is to "enhance" native rights, not eliminate them (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 234). As Tanner (1983, p. 29) contends, natives, sharing a similar "class position" within Canadian society, can
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use their "culture and history as an ideological and symbolic resource" to better their position in a class society, the objective being, not higher status in the class hierarchy, but the survival of their culture and community "as an end in itself."

The history of native-government relations outlined here attests to the mistreatment of Canada's aboriginal people. The colonialized experience of natives in Canada, based upon the government's paternalistic attitude, has been reflected in misguided and detrimental policies. As demonstrated, there has been an increase in native opposition to such treatment and increased demands for the acknowledgement of native rights. It is expected that such change will be reflected in native-oriented NFB films. Specifically, it is assumed that more recent native-directed films will more overtly support native lifestyles and rights, and will have a greater emphasis on humanistic values.

iii. Image of Natives in the Media

Most studies of natives in the media have concentrated on the image of "Indians" in Hollywood fiction films. However, even before the advent of film, other forms of media (popular literature, the arts, news coverage, and Wild West Shows) were already disseminating a stereotyped image of native North Americans.

The image of the Plains Indian was perpetuated in Wild West Shows as early as the 1830s, a significant factor considering the Wild West Shows "toured all over the world" (Bataille and Silet, 1985, p. xx). The image was solidified in news coverage of the Indian Wars from 1860 to 1890 and in increasingly popular dime novels (O'Connor, 1980). A large portion of these novels were "captivity narratives," horrific fictional accounts of what it would be like to be held captive by Indians, which supported the Europeans' conceptualization of natives as "subhuman or inspired by the devil" (Bataille
and Silet, 1985, p. xix). The Plains Indian image was further stylized in sculptures, drawings, and paintings as artists embellished natives according to their own personal perceptions of them. The artists' renditions of natives were further distorted as artworks were exported to Europe and copied by European artists who, again, added their personal stylizations (O'Connor, 1980). Consequently, stereotyped images of natives in the media have been widespread since the 1880s (Churchill et al., 1978).

A modified Plains Indian, usually of two varieties, either the noble red man or the vicious savage, became the prevailing image. The stylized image consisted of natives clad in tailored shirts and pants or leggings made from animal skins, complete with fringes and glass bead embroidery, wearing eagle feather bonnets, living in conical tipis made from buffalo hides, riding horses atop blankets (the weave of which was indicative of Navajos from the southwestern United States), and hunting buffalo with repeating rifles (O'Connor, 1980). This newly created false identity was applied to all native tribes and cultures (Churchill et al., 1978, p. 37) even though the tribes which lived in the Plains region comprised only a relatively small percentage of the total aboriginal population."

Ironically, the image of Plains Indians commonly held by non-natives is from a period in the evolution of the Plains nations after European contact and, therefore, such Indians were not "fully aboriginal." They did not evolve until after the Spaniards introduced horses to the continent around Santa Fe in the 1600s. Even so, by the mid 1800s, most natives did not hunt with horses and were not dependent upon large game (bison) as a food source; most were agriculturally based (although originally almost all tribes were hunter-gatherers) (Patterson, 1972, p. 39). Also, the majority lived in permanent dwellings, not in animal skin tipis, and wore "woven robes" as opposed to "tailored hide clothing" (Price, 1973, pp. 87, 88). The "horse-riding, buffalo-hunting" society was only a brief period in native North American history that evolved indirectly through contact with whites. A possible reason for the predominance of this image is that the last "Indian" resistance to white expropriation of native land (in the U.S.) was in the Plains and
Southwest (Price, 1973, p. 87). Also, this period was the pinicle in the history of the Plains nations and is a good example of cultural contact which occurred at a slow enough pace to allow natives to incorporate Western “technology” (horses) in a beneficial manner. Clearly then, with the inception of film in the latter part of the 19th century, there existed an historically and culturally inaccurate image of natives, and natives “were firmly established as figures of entertainment” (Bataille and Silet, 1985, p. xix).

a. Audio-visual Media

The film industry has probably been most responsible for entrenching the Plains Indian image by portraying, almost exclusively, the horsemen of the Plains. The silent film era perpetuated the stylized Plains Indian image (outlined above) and created additional stereotypes, for example, the stoic, stone-faced Indian, who either crossed his arms over his chest or used one hand to shield his eyes as he scanned the horizon (Price, 1973, p. 76).  

While films about natives were seen by early audiences to contain a high degree of “misrepresentation, sensationalism, and all-around falsity,” (Vestal, 1936, p. 63) and were criticized as “untrue, unreal, and unfair,” by natives themselves (Anonymous, 1911, p. 59), “Indian” films still flourished. Yet, as a reaction to perceived audience disinterest, the film industry, as early as 1911, began devising variations of the Indian stereotype. Consequently, they created the “wicked half-breed,” either Canadian or Mexican, in an attempt to attract audiences (Bush, 1911, p. 60).

So pervasive, it seems, was the negative image of natives, that an example of non-native distrust was the studios’ practice of having armed guards present when filming battle scenes using “real Indians” to watch for “the least sign of treachery” (Dench, 1915, p. 61). Apparently, Hollywood believed the fiction it created. Another example of Hollywood’s absurdity, which also contributed to the misrepresentation of native culture,
was the practice, in some films, of creating a native language by having the actor stand motionless and speak English and then print these shots in reverse so as to run the English dialogue backwards (Price, 1973, p. 80).

From the presentation of all natives as savages, the image of natives in film evolved to the point where natives were friends with the white heroes, but they were still inferior to whites; now only renegade Indians were villains (Price, 1973, p. 81). Even in "supposedly sympathetic portrayal[s]," natives were shown as unintelligent, incompetent and cowardly (Friar and Friar, 1969-70, p. 94).

Hollywood, desiring a more realistic portrayal of natives, increasingly began to employ real natives to play native characters. In this regard, perhaps innovative for its time, yet 1.0 more realistic, was Joe Rosenthal's "Hiawatha" The Messiah of the Ojibway (1903), the first dramatic film in Canada and probably one of the first films in North America to use a native cast (Ojibway Indians) (Clanfield, 1987, p. 3). However, because real native behaviour was not the same as the film stereotype, the industry concluded that native actors had to be taught how to "act Indian" (Price, 1973, p. 85). This phenomenon is still prevalent as natives depicted in film and television today, apart from rare exceptions, are, as always, the "white man's Indian" (David, 1989, p. 7).

Undoubtedly, this had some affect on the way natives viewed themselves. As Singer (1982, p. 349) contends, it is evident that the way in which a group is perceived by the larger society affects the image the group has of itself and its future development. Thus, if media influence the way society perceives a group, with which it has little direct contact or knowledge, then it is conceivable that the same media portrayals may influence the way the group perceives itself. As Mills (1956, p. 314) notes, the media affect how we perceive ourselves by supplying "new identities and new aspirations of what we should like to be, and what we should like to appear to be." This seems to be the case for the 1960s, when Hollywood was considered to be more enlightened with regard to aboriginal people. Documentaries emerged that ignored stereotypes and concentrated on
natives as people with "strengths and weaknesses" (Kaufman, 1975, p. 33). However, the overall influence of the media upon native self-identity had already occurred. For example, natives began to wear beaded headbands, a Hollywood invention, in order to appear "Indian" (Friar and Friar, 1969-70, p. 95). Wilkinson, a native, agrees that the media have affected the way in which natives view themselves (1974).

Further, lack of regard for realistic presentation of native culture and concerns is apparent in the paucity of portrayals of contemporary natives. Natives, deprived of a present, are stuck in history somewhere between 1800 and 1880, their film image continually reworked and never allowed to come to "an ethnic rest" (Kaufman, 1975, pp. 31, 34; Churchill et al., 1978, pp. 37, 38). The few accounts of contemporary natives that exist depict them as either "the passive victim of uncontrollable circumstances, or as the passive repository of a static aboriginal culture" (Larsen, 1983, p. 37). Consequently, also absent are film presentations of living conditions on reservations (in the U.S.) or reserves (in Canada). The reason for this, according to the film industry, is because such films make for "lousy family entertainment." Instead, the industry presents what it calls "pseudo-history" (Kaufman, 1975, p. 30).

The presentation of this "pseudo-history" is noticeable in a contemporary example. Criticism of Where the Spirit Lives, a dramatic television film addressing the "brutal reality of native residential schools" (McTair, 1989, p. 21), suggests the story told was a "distortion of reality" in that its treatment undermined the severity of the events that occurred at the school (David, 1989, p. 7). The sexual abuse of students by teachers was portrayed as an isolated incident of a homosexual relationship between a teacher and a student. Similar criticism has been levied against Justice Denied, a recent NFB dramatic film exploring the wrongful imprisonment of Donald Marshall, a Mic Mac Indian. The film fails to address the issue of the stereotype of the young male native "group" as criminal. Instead, it presents Marshall's experience as a seemingly isolated incident and ignores the racism present in Canada's judiciary system (Morris, 1990, p. 8). Another
less recent example of the presentation of a distorted reality is *Shadow of the Hawk*. John Kemeny, formerly employed at the NFB, was producing films through an arrangement with Columbia Pictures of the U. S., and under Columbia, he made *Shadow of the Hawk* (1976 or 1977), an action film about Indians. Daryl Duke, a native from Canada, worked on the film but was later fired. Among the several differences, between Duke and his employers, was Duke’s dismay and anger over the lack of authentic details of behaviour and place, and the fact that the lead native role was played by a non-native actor, Jan-Michael Vincent (Kneman, 1977, pp. 135-138).

It is evident that the misrepresentation of natives was promulgated in films as the beliefs and motivations of native cultures were replaced by new ones derived by non-natives with their peculiar historical perspective and “cultural biases” (Churchill et al., 1978, p. 37). Plots for films were written according to anti-native attitudes by non-native producers and directors and were told to non-native audiences (Price, 1973). If native lifestyle was portrayed as significant, instead of as a “declining savagery,” it would be much more difficult to conclude the film in a manner that would reinforce the values of contemporary society (Price, 1973, p. 76). Further, if, by negative stereotyping, natives were viewed as less than human, non-natives could more easily justify the lack of legal or moral restraint in their efforts to seize native land, and displace or kill natives (Deloria, 1911, p. 50). Thus, it is easier for non-natives to accept as truth the fictitious native identity created by non-natives, the effect of which has been the dehumanization of natives (Churchill et al., 1978, pp. 37, 46).

It has been suggested that by the time television technology had become widespread, non-native discrimination toward natives had become “a fine art” (Kaufman, 1975, p. 32). In fact, film stereotypes of natives were transferred wholesale, either directly or indirectly, to the small screen. For example, the film *Broken Arrow* (1950) became a “popular television” program (Hartman, 1976, p. 27).

The consensus of studies in this area is that the television and film industries
have perpetuated a stereotyped image of indigenous people which is identified by the
generic title “the American Indian” (O’Connor, 1980, p. xi; Kaufman, 1975, p. 31).
Films have concentrated on only a few tribes such as Apache, Cheyenne, Comanche,
Navajo, Mohawk, Iroquois, Mohican, and Seminole, presenting them as Plains Indians.
Yet, the Mohawk, Iroquois, Mohican, and Seminole tribes were not part of the horse-
riding Indian societies of the Plains region (Price, 1973, p. 87). Further, these industries
rarely portrayed non-violent tribes; the tribes most frequently mentioned were the
Apache, Cheyenne and Comanche, those with a tradition of violence (whether real or
exaggerated) (Price, 1973, p. 87). Thus, Hollywood presented only about a dozen
Plains-Southwest tribes, ignoring the diverse cultures of over 560 different societies and
language groups (Price, 1973, p. 88). While the indigenous populations of North Amer-
ica were extremely diverse, referring to all of them as “Indians” assumes the existence
of an ethnic as well as a racial relationship (Friar and Friar, 1972). Bataille and Silet
suggest that “the movies did what thousands of years of social evolution could not
do...Hollywood produced the homogenized American Indian” (Bataille and Silet, 1985,
p. xxii). As Friar and Friar (1972, p. 2) note: “Hollywood has continued to be a co-
conspirator in committing cultural genocide by subverting the native American’s vari-
ous ethnic identities and retaining him as a racial scapegoat. By explicitly justifying the
genocide perpetrated by our forefathers, Hollywood utilizes our ignorance to enforce
our egoism.”

Because information we receive about anything that we do not experience
directly is used to form opinions of those objects, events, and persons, it is significant
that many non-natives are only exposed to native North Americans through popular
films. Visual media, because of their visual nature have greater potential to distort
images and stereotypes than other forms of media (Bataille and Silet, 1985, p. xx). It is
important, therefore, to be cognizant of the image of natives portrayed in film (and all
media) considering that one hundred of such films were released in 1910 alone and
thousands more have since been released (Friar and Friar, 1972, pp. 3, 92). Also, conceiving of it in an historical context, early Hollywood films reached audiences of “tens of millions” of people, many of whom were recent immigrants who could not read English and consequently gained a substantial amount of their information from movies. Thus, there was tremendous potential for Hollywood to affect public opinion and dictate attitudes toward natives (Bataille and Silet, 1985, p. xx).

While the Indian stereotypes may have been created as entertainment, they have resulted in the creation of a false reality of native culture and, significantly, the constant and widespread view that there is some general truth in these stereotypes (Price, 1973, pp. 75, 76). The most serious problem resulting from these stereotypes is the dehumanization of native North Americans. Because the films either do not present, or present an inaccurate, historical context for natives’ actions, natives are not understandable in terms of human behaviour (O’Connor, 1980). Also, because “political, economic and historical” developments are not addressed, it appears that the “social morass” which characterizes native society is a result of natives’ negligence (Waubageshig, 1971). The absence of an historical and cultural context serves to perpetuate the existing ethnic stereotypes and restricts our understanding of natives as human beings, which does little to foster empathy for natives’ current struggles (O’Connor, 1980).

Unfaithful, stereotyped portrayals of natives has led some to question the appropriateness of non-natives “telling stories” about natives (David, 1989, p. 6), and has led others to suggest that this phenomenon is indicative of the commodification of native culture (Emberley, 1990). Worth (1972b, p. 103) raises an ethical question in asking what reasons we may have not to demand that others have the right to determine how they will be presented in symbolic form to the rest of the world.
b. Print Media

The same stereotypes found in films and on television are also present in print media. The belief in racial superiority of non-natives over natives, implicit in examples of visual media discussed previously is manifest in some of the earliest literature and in public opinion of the times. In 1838, Lord Glenelg, the British Colonial Secretary, stated that the aim of British policy was "to protect and cherish this helpless Race" and "raise them in the Scale of Humanity" (Upton, 1973, p. 59).

This negative image has also been reinforced in educational textbooks. McDiarmaid and Pratt (1971) found that the textbooks they examined did not focus on contemporary North American natives but concentrated on Indians during the 1600s and 1700s. The overall image presented in these textbooks was one of an aggressive and unskilled Indian. Vanderburgh (1968, pp. 3, 18) in her examination of elementary school social studies textbooks, found that the books failed to provide information on the traditional "social and political organization" of native tribes and that there was a paucity of information on "religion, values, ethics or esthetics." No single tribe was given comprehensive treatment, and the current situation of native Canadians was omitted. Additionally, references to cultural artifacts (for example, memorial or house poles) lacked explanations of their spiritual value. The pervasiveness of these stereotypes becomes apparent when evidence of them are found in university courses on American Indians (Price, 1973, p. 76). Swanson (1977) also found "negative imagery and negative stereotyping" in his examination of forty-eight high school history texts from two different time periods. The texts, by omission and selective references, did not "critically examine" what are largely regarded as untrue depictions of natives. Further, the texts supported the "White majority's social institutions" (Swanson, 1977, p. 35). Similar sentiments were expressed by social scientists, evidence of which is McLean's explicit statement about "the superior intelligence of the white race" (1889, p. 61). Overall, social science literature did little to
counter the inferior image of natives as presented in popular culture (Upton, 1973, p. 52).

These stereotyped qualities are also supported in popular print media. Haycock's (1971) content analysis of popular national magazines read in Canada from 1900 to 1970 shows changes in the image of natives, but the image that remained was still largely negative. The natives' image in the magazines changed from a stereotyped view of natives as inferior, to a more positive view which recognized natives' debased status, to one that promoted equality and desired more “favourable conditions” for natives (p. 92). However, this created another, different stereotype of natives as “a discontented and exploited minority who will agitate until they get what they want” (Haycock, 1971, p. 91).

The image of native aggression is supported in Singer's (1982) content analysis of a major Ontario daily newspaper. He found that the image of the Indian in this newspaper was one of “an individual whose relationships to Canadian society are essentially mediated by dependence on government and presumably aggressive land claims” (p. 357). Additionally, 80% of the articles portrayed natives in situations of conflict or deviance (p. 357). While the greatest number of articles concerned native-government relations and land claims, the articles on conflict and deviance were most prominently located (p. 348), thereby emphasizing these aspects.

Historians also partake in the creation of stereotypes, and the treatment of native Canadians in historical writings has been characterized by dishonesty, prejudice and ignorance. “The Indian in Canadian Historical Writing,” a survey of about fifty Canadian history books by James Walker, illustrates the derogatory treatment of natives in these history books, characterized by citations of torture, scalping, and brutality toward their women, all implying that natives are inferior to non-natives (Patterson, 1972, pp. 182, 183).

The role of historians is, undoubtedly, significant for “historians and their books help to create national stereotypes” (Patterson, 1972, p. 183); historians write history and
this is part of the consensual validation process. People view recorded history as concordant with existing values and, indeed, it reinforces this system of values. In this regard, it is interesting to note that “since Harold Innis’ *The Fur Trade in Canada*, non-native historians have tended to represent the destruction of native peoples as primarily the result of the inability of gatherer-hunters to absorb Western technology” (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 50) and have not concerned themselves with the “racial and cultural genocide” that occurred on the North American continent as a result of the introduction of Western/European technologies (Heyer, 1988, p. 118). Thus, the focus is on the implied deficiencies of native or non-Western cultures instead of the destructive potential of applying Western technology and Western means of employing such technology to non-Western cultures. This contributes to the promulgation of the belief that societies must not only utilize Western technology in order to “progress,” but must also adopt the dominant values of Western society in order to survive.

Because the misrepresentation of natives has been so firmly entrenched in the media, it is likely these misrepresentations affect the manner in which non-natives, specifically, non-native film-makers, perceive natives. Messages about natives conveyed via the numerous forms of media are believed to play a significant role in the consensual validation process of non-natives. It is unlikely, however, that the same messages are perceived by, or affect, natives (and native film-makers) in the same way. Thus, differences are expected in the way natives are portrayed in native-oriented NFB productions as made by native, compared to non-native, film-makers.

It is apparent that the image of natives in the media is both harsh and negative. The image of natives in the media does not inform us as to the image of natives in the mind of the public. Mills (1950, pp. 577, 598) suggests public opinion is not “wholly controlled and entirely manipulated by the mass media” and one must consider the hundreds or thousands of “informal opinion circles” and the “unofficial opinion leaders” of these circles. However, mass media content and public opinion are believed to be
highly correlated. Thus, the third area of research addresses the image of natives in public opinion.

iv. Image of Natives in Public Opinion

Generally, people perceive differences between native Canadians and other Canadians. The differences cited most often were cultural differences, including values, attitudes, philosophies and ways of life (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 76). Despite perceived differences, or possibly because of them, studies in this area have shown public opinion to be largely unsympathetic or indifferent toward natives.

The view of natives as racially inferior surfaced in a study of ethnic relations in a northern Ontario town. The non-native residents held the belief that natives were lazy, untrustworthy, unsuccessful and unwilling to improve their condition (Stymeist, 1975). Mackie (1974, p. 42) found similar negative impressions of natives in a survey of Edmonton area residents. The overriding image of natives was one of a socially segregated group that “neither shares the work or success values of the surrounding society nor receives its material rewards.” Additionally, the Edmonton area residents perceived natives as poor, uneducated and unwillingly to strive to better themselves. Similar negative images of natives were found in a national survey (Berry, Kalen and Taylor, 1977), where natives were the lowest ethnic group in the ranking (in terms of favourable attitudes toward), and in a nation-wide pilot study undertaken by the Native Council of Canada (1976). The NCC study respondents perceived natives as lazy, lacking self-initiative, and abusive of alcohol. Further, Chamberlain (1975, p. 47) notes that negative images such as impoverished reserves, prostitution and derelicts, commonly attributed to the welfare state, are now associated with North American natives.

Gibbins and Ponting (1976b) conducted a preliminary probe and a national survey, both of which examined the public’s familiarity with native issues, knowledge about
natives, the image of native Canadians, and opinions about native land claims (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 92). They found that the public was not well-informed in the area of native affairs and that native issues did not have a place of prominence in the public's view.

However, somewhat more positively, there appears to be some sympathy toward natives, for a large portion of the Canadian public regard natives as having to face problems not of their making. Problems listed include an absence of economic opportunities, discrimination and prejudice, and a government that impedes native development (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 80). Ponting and Gibbins also surmise that public opinion is generally receptive to natives finding “a new role for themselves in Canadian society” (Gibbins and Ponting, 1976a, p. 92). Yet, how they were to achieve this was a more contentious issue. The public, especially Anglophones, disapproved of native assertiveness in protesting for land claims or native rights (Ponting and Gibbins, 1981, p. 222). Overall, it was found that the public was basically indifferent and moderate in their views (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 92).

Bradford (1977, p. 3) also discovered similar “latent prejudices and apathies” toward natives and their social and cultural concerns as noted by the people which he interviewed, all of whom were involved with natives on a daily basis. He also found a “lack of respect and acceptance” of natives which was conveyed to natives as an “uncaring, or...confused and untrustworthy” attitude toward them. Haycock (1971, p. 91), finding similar apathy and indifference on the part of some non-natives to be prevalent at the time of his study, suggests that this will probably always be the case. As Bradford (1977, p. 3) maintains, non-natives are “abstractly sympathetic yet practically apathetic” which is translated into a “non-attitude.”

Ponting and Gibbins (1980, p. 69) note that whether or not such public perceptions are true or false, they still “constitute an important ingredient of social reality.” The truth of the perceptions is not as important as their content and dissemination throughout
the public. Further, they suggest the opinions of the majority cannot be ignored in the political process of a democracy and minorities must contend with public opinion. As was concluded in section ii, if a minority does not have the empathy of the majority, being dealt with fairly by the government may be more difficult. Therefore, marginalised groups without “allies” within the central government may be ineffective (Tanner, 1983, p. 7). Accordingly, Ponting and Gibbins (1980, p. 93) suggest that public opinion will play an increasingly important role in native affairs, as the issues of land claims and native rights may bring natives and non-natives into more direct contact and conflict. The relevance of public opinion will depend upon the compatibility of native and non-native interests in the future.

Significantly, non-natives, being only superficially aware of native concerns and tradition, not grounded in experience or “solid” knowledge, may readily have their attitudes turned into anti-native sentiment by pressure from the government or economic conditions (Bradford, 1977, pp. 3, 4). Public opinion and sympathy toward natives obviously shifts with changes in society. For example, by 1977, it was determined public opinion was less supportive of “government sponsorship of social programs,” of which natives were benefactors, because of increasing conservatism in a time of economic recession (Weaver, 1981, p. 203). Thus, at present, if public opinion is characterized by indifference, or a negative image of natives, the public is less likely to support, or sympathize with, natives in the struggle for government acknowledgement of land claims and special native rights.

It is interesting that a negative image of natives abounds in the media and in some segments of the public. Although the public is basically uninformed on native rights and issues, it, nevertheless, holds a view of natives which is less than favourable. On the guarded assumption that most non-natives have little direct experience with natives, they must form their opinions based on information received elsewhere. These other sources of information, for example the media, provide symbolic contact. Singer (1982) contends
that a resident of a large, English-speaking city in Canada may come in contact with native Canadians more often indirectly in the daily newspaper than directly in real life. Potentially, symbolic contact could be more than once per day (p. 357). The reportage in the media of negative events associated with minority groups may come to constitute what knowledge the larger public has of these groups because, unlike reporting negative events of majority groups in society where there are other ways of knowing the more positive aspects of their ways of life, there are few opportunities for the reportage of the positive aspects of native lifestyles (Page, 1982, p. 158). Also, the limited direct contacts which occur may confirm these stereotypes. Thus, it becomes apparent that the media have the power to define the identity of a group in the eyes of the public (Singer, 1982, p. 349). The information gleaned from educational texts and popular magazines, and from interpersonal communication with those who read them, suggest similar notions and all interact to reinforce and validate each other. Consequently, media and public opinion are two closely related elements in the consensual validation process.

v. Role of the NFB as Film-maker about Natives

Filming members of a culture other than the one of which the film-maker is a member is problematic; even portraying members of one’s own culture creates problems. Often film-makers do not know how certain scenes may affect audiences or how audiences may perceive the people being portrayed. As Pryluck (1976, p. 258) maintains “ultimately, we are all outsiders in the lives of others.” Nevertheless, as mentioned, one of the ways in which we gain knowledge of other cultures is through the media, and one source of media information since 1939 has been the National Film Board of Canada.

In 1950, the Unit System of the NFB, which John Grierson established in 1944, consisted of four units: A, B, C, and D. Unit B was responsible for “sponsored, scientific, cultural, and animated films” (Jones, 1981, p. 60) and, therefore, made films about
natives. An “Inner Circle” existed within Unit B, consisting of Roman Kroiter, Wolf Koenig, Stanley Jackson, Tom Daly, and Colin Low (Jones, 1981, p. 80). Because of the NFB’s financial support of them, film-makers at the Board, including Unit B, were often permitted to choose their own subject and were given sufficient time to examine it in detail (Jones, 1981, p. 202). Thus, one would expect Unit B’s films to be insightful and critical. Yet, many of Unit B’s successful films have been criticized for not addressing the negative aspects of life, “the sick, the horrible, or the ugly.” It has been suggested that the “Inner Circle” tended to avoid these films (Jones, 1981, pp. 80, 84). The result was that Unit B’s native-oriented films were criticized as being superficial or inconsequential.

One exception however, was Circle of the Sun (1961), which did address the unsettling elements of the Sun Dance of the Blood Indians (Jones, 1981, p. 84). Circle of the Sun was one of the first films in which natives spoke about themselves, although it was reworked by a script writer (James, 1977, p. 195). In this film, James (1977, p. 176) points out that, “all elements function to tell about the people — what they think and how they feel.” The Blood Indians permitted this dance to be filmed for the first time because they “feared that the tradition might be dying.” The unnerving implication in the film is that the entire culture of the Blood Indians may also be dying (Jones, 1981, p. 84). Yet, it appears that Circle of the Sun is an anomaly in its treatment of the harsh reality of the Blood Indians, possibly because it was more the work of Colin Low, who directed it, than of the group. Significantly, Low continued to make “socially relevant” films after the dissolution of Unit B and the entire Unit System in 1964 (Jones, 1981, pp. 60, 84, 85).

In the opinion of Willie Dunn (in Watson, 1970, p. 117), of the NFB films on natives made by non-natives, a few were “perceptive and honest,” but “most have been crap.”99 Many have continued an earlier perspective in which documentary films about natives made by non-natives presented natives as “interesting and a bit quaint,” or of later films which romanticized natives and native life but also suggested “the tragedy of a
dying culture" (James, 1977, p. 195). Bearing in mind this observation, with the creation of the Challenge for Change project in 1967, which developed out of the Unit System (Jones, 1981, p. 87), and the trend toward regionalization (Dick, 1986), the situation began to improve. The first producer of the project, John Kemeny, collaborated with the Company of Young Canadians to organize a native film unit, which included Willie Dunn, Noel Starblanket, and Michael Mitchell, based on the premise that "Indians should make films about Indians" (Watson, 1970, p. 117). This was in keeping with the mandate of the NFB to assist Canadians in understanding other Canadians, their lifestyles and concerns, in different regions of Canada (Ellis, J., 1989, p. 125). This also reflected Grierson’s belief in the benefits of decentralization (Clanfield, 1987, p. 30) and adhered to his notion of utilizing the documentary form to foster improvements in the social condition of mankind (Ellis, J., 1989, p. 274). In this regard, the Challenge for Change project was an attempt to provide a vehicle for various groups to articulate their problems and "needs" and to make the appropriate government agencies aware of their concerns (Ellis, J., 1989, p. 274). As Dick (1986, p. 112) observes, there were noticeable changes in the type of documentary which emerged from this new direction. The films concentrated on the "grass roots" or "ordinary" people in their local milieux and focussed on their concerns rather than those of the film-maker.

Under the aegis of the Challenge for Change program, Willie Dunn, a Micmac Indian, made his first film, The Ballad of Crowfoot (1969), with the assistance of a group of Indians from the Company of Young Canadians. Dunn wrote the music and lyrics and directed the film which looked at the history of western Canada from a native perspective. Also for the Challenge for Change program, in 1969, Dunn directed These Are My People, a film examining the impact of Europeans on native lifestyles (National Film Board of Canada).

Another of the Challenge for Change productions, You Are on Indian Land (1969), was made by the native film unit of the Challenge for Change program and
Mohawk Indians from Cornwall, Ontario, who participated in the shooting and editing of the film (Ellis, J., 1989, p. 274). The film dealt with the government-proposed closing of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River from Cornwall Island, which went through the Saint Regis Reserve (Ellis, J., 1989, p. 274; Watson, 1970, p. 118). Mohawk Indians were guaranteed free travel across the river in a 1794 treaty (Ellis, J., 1989, p. 274) and, therefore, were opposed to the closing of the bridge. While initially, Ottawa, because of its position on the issue, attempted to “suppress the film” (Watson, 1970, p. 118), it was released and, eventually, the government was persuaded to keep the bridge open (Ellis, J., 1989, p. 274).

The previous example supports the contention that from its inception the Challenge for Change program was considered “political and highly controversial” (MacCann, 1973, p. 42). As such, restrictions on the Challenge for Change program soon became apparent. Films about groups who were peripheral to mainstream Canadian society were permitted to be more critical than those films of groups who were viewed as threatening (for example, a proposal for films addressing “militant trade unions in Quebec” was rejected). In this regard, while there is a great amount of freedom accorded to film makers at the Board, there is a problem of self-censorship, separate from “questions of objectivity and bias” (Handling, 1984, p. 204). According to Jones (1981, p. 171), “films which criticized something fundamental about society were not encouraged and rarely permitted.” Yet, this type of film was deemed necessary to achieve positive results. As Jones (1981, p. 171) maintains, in order to assist natives in improving their lot, “you should not advise or help them to enter the ‘mainstream of Canadian life.’ You should help them resist it.”

Along these lines, Challenge for Change enlisted the help of Boyce Richardson to make a film about the James Bay Hydroelectric Project and its effects on natives in the area. In short, it would address aboriginal land rights. The Interdepartmental Committee, which approves or rejects proposals, after a period of ambivalence, decided to cease
production of the film, based on the opinion of the "highest authority." Members of the film crew believed this to be Prime Minister Trudeau (Jones, 1981, p. 172). Nevertheless, after a compromise was reached, the film, Our Land is Our Life, was made as well as another, Cree Hunters of the Mistassini. Jones (1981, p. 173) contends that Our Land is Our Life serves "as a witness against the values and imperatives of a society based on an insatiable demand for energy." So it is apparent that films criticizing the government or large corporations, "something fundamental about society," were able to be produced. While it is difficult to speculate on the political maneuvering required to continue production of the films, the Interdepartmental Committee may have permitted completion of the films because of the marginal position (from the government's perspective) of natives in Canada and the subsequent belief that the films would have little impact.

The marginal position of natives notwithstanding, a number of criticisms of the Challenge for Change program were raised. Among them was the assertion that while the films addressed "specific social, economic, and political issues" (Handling, 1984, p. 204), they only dealt with the concerns of the middle class and rarely showed the problems of the working class. In doing so they ignored the "social reality" of larger issues and kept film-makers from working on critical films dealing with larger social issues (Waugh, 1984, pp. 311, 312). The questions of whether the natives in Our Land is Our Life and Cree Hunters of the Mistassini can be considered middle class, or whether or not aboriginal rights and native land claims are not part of a larger social issue, are, undoubtedly, debatable.

Another criticism of the program was that it was contradictory for "government agencies to be promoting social change." This is in reference to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, one of seven government departments involved in the creation of Challenge for Change. One native Canadian highlighted the antithetical nature of natives' "common dislike for Indian Affairs," and the Department of Indian Affairs' sponsorship of films designed to improve the situation of natives in Canada.

Despite such criticism, the Challenge for Change program, by using a collaborative film-making method, allowed the native subjects, to some degree, to interpret and present their reality as they perceived it. In allowing the native subjects to be involved in filming and editing, film-makers in the Challenge for Change program adhered to the policy of permitting "those who were vulnerable and could suffer as a result of being filmed" more control over the final product (Pryluck, 1976, pp. 265-267).

Around the same time the Challenge for Change program was created, Alanis Obomsawin, an Abenaki Indian, was invited by the NFB to be an advisor on a film about natives. Two years later she was employed by the Board and she remains there today (National Film Board of Canada). In 1971, Obomsawin made Christmas at Moose Factory, "one of the first Canadian films" to present native life from a native perspective (Alioff and Levine, 1987, p. 11). In this regard, commenting on the purpose of her filmmaking Obomsawin says: "The basic purpose is for our people to have a voice. To be heard is the important thing...whether it has to do with having our existence recognized, or whether it has to do with speaking about our values, our survival, our beliefs, that we belong to something that is beautiful, that it's O. K. to be an Indian, to be a native person of this country" (Alioff and Levine, 1987, p. 13). Thus, for Obomsawin "film is just another form" for her to assist her people to be heard (Alioff and Levine, 1987, p. 13). In this capacity Obomsawin spends much time with the people she intends to film maintaining that she is "not the only one making the film," but the people of the community are "the most important part of the film" (Alioff and Levine, p. 14). Because they "come from the same place" Obomsawin and the people in her films are able to develop a special relationship (Alioff and Levine, 1987, p. 14). Again, this may be another reason to expect differences between native-directed and non-native-directed films. This is not to suggest that non-native film-makers do not develop a repore with native subjects, merely that, because Obomsawin has more in common with the people she films, they
may be more willing to open up to her, reveal aspects of themselves or opinions which may remain concealed in the presence of non-natives or may be overlooked by non-natives.

The portrayal of natives in films by the NFB has a longer tradition than direct native involvement with the Board. It has only been recently that natives were afforded opportunities to present their lifestyles, their culture, their values, their view of reality from their own perspective. If these portrayals are substantially different than past and present non-native representations of native reality, as this study will attempt to show, such activity may be a major step toward eradicating, or at least changing, long-standing native stereotypes. To this end, Obomsawin views her work at the Board as a “kind of bridge” between natives and non-natives (National Film Board of Canada).

vi. Values of Contemporary Native Canadians

*Concepts of honour, tradition, law and order could not prevail against the more purely economic motives of an acquisitive society religiously committed to possessive individualism.* — Manuel and Posluns

*We’re the slag that refuses to mix into the great melting pot.*

—Vincent Two Lance

Much of the research done in this area concentrates on value differences between natives and non-natives in a variety of settings. In examining the current value orientations of natives, it is important to note that natives have largely been “submerged” by non-native Canadian society. Georges Erasmus, Assembly of First Nations national chief, maintains that the federal government, by defining and imposing programs, has “undermined [native] values” (Johnson, 1989). Also contributing to the disintegration of traditional native values is the non-native educational system. As one native suggests,
she was “force-fed...a whole different set of values” (Maracle, 1977, p. 8). As such, native Canadians have not had the power to determine a future for themselves that ignored the values of the remainder of society (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 67). Yet, Trimble (1976, p. 67) maintains that precisely because of the colonial situation of natives in Canada, natives have become “even more conscious of differences [between themselves and non-natives] and [this caused natives] to become more cautious about internalizing the different [value] systems that were being thrown their way.”

From this, one might expect few differences between native and non-native value orientations. Yet, Erasmus believes that the traditional native value system is “still intact” (Johnson, 1989). Mary Lou Radulovich (1977, p. 15), director of the Ojibwe Cultural Foundation on Manitoulin Island, concurs, suggesting that traditional values are present and are “coming back stronger and stronger.” As Kluckhohn and Strodthbeck (1961, p. 26) maintain, whether or not, and how quickly, a minority group is assimilated into the dominant group in society depends partly upon how similar the minority group’s value orientations are to the dominant group’s value orientation. This seems to support Erasmus’ belief, for after several hundred years of contact with non-natives, natives have yet to be completely, some would argue even partially, assimilated.

Further support comes from Vogt’s and Albert’s (1966) project. They studied Navajo, Zuni Indians, Spanish Americans, Texan and Oklahoman farmers, and Mormons, and considered a number of factors including: geographical and cultural setting, intercultural relations, kinship systems, economy, political structure and religious systems. They discovered five different value systems existed and continued to exist in the five cultures they studied. This was true even though the members of all five cultures lived in similar geographic environments, faced similar problems, and were exposed to each other’s, and the dominant American culture’s, values and beliefs both directly, through personal contact, and indirectly, through mediated contact. As another example, while it is generally accepted that modern technology erodes natives’ traditional lifestyle and
values, evidence to the contrary exists in Inuit’s peculiar use of television to support and reinforce their way of life (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 50).25

Trimble (1976), upon comparing the value orientations of native and non-native high school students, found differences even though the natives had had much exposure to American culture. He discovered that natives retained a value system different than the dominant non-native value system, but the nature of this value orientation had changed from “tribal-specific values” to more generalized “pan-Indian values” (Trimble, 1976, p. 77). These values, such as noncompetitive and present time oriented, are largely similar to the humanistic-oriented characteristics of native society listed in section vii of this chapter. Further differences in basic values between non-native and native Americans were found in DuBray’s (1985) study of non-native and native American social workers. DuBray studied differences between American Indian and Anglo-American social workers regarding four categories of value orientation: activity orientation, relationship with others, time orientation, and man/nature orientation. She found differences between the two groups in three of the categories; there were no differences between the two groups with regard to activity orientation. The native case workers had a collateral relational orientation, a present time orientation, and a harmony with nature orientation. Such orientations resemble those of traditional native value orientations. Accordingly, DuBray (1985, pp. 36, 37) concluded that, even after several years of professional non-native education, the native social workers retained core native values. Friesen (1974) also found differences between native and non-native students in southern Alberta. The native students displayed less “confidence in human nature, in the future, and in self-esteem” (Friesen, 1974, p. 153). Additionally, the native students’ value orientation was traditional with regard to “family authority” and present time orientation. However, Friesen (1974, p. 154) discovered that the differences in value orientations were not as great in integrated schools. There seemed to be less emphasis on family and group ties (collectivist orientation). This, he concludes, can only be viewed as positive if cultural
assimilation and the erosion of distinct cultural identities are desirable.

From Friesen’s observations it is evident that exposure to non-natives does affect native value orientations. Support for this notion is found in Tefft’s (1971) examination of Wind River Shoshone and Northern Arapahoe Indians which revealed differences in value orientations between the two tribes, the nature of which depended upon their relationship to non-natives in the area. Tefft discovered that the Shoshone value orientation is similar to the dominant non-native value orientation which stresses an “achievement orientation,” which includes man-over-nature, doing, and future time orientations and an “individualistic orientation.” Conversely, the Arapaho emphasized “collectivist” and nonachievement” orientations. Tefft attributes the differences to the differing relationship each group has to the white reference group. However, Trimble (1976, p. 75) suggests that Tefft’s findings concerning the Shoshone’s value system may be the result of situational factors, and that the values the Shoshone exhibited may not be the same as the values they idealize.

Bachtold and Eckvall (1978) examined how the values of the Hupa of northwestern California have changed or remained constant after increasing exposure to non-natives and how the Hupa are dealing with the resulting “cultural duality.” Bachtold and Eckvall (1978, pp. 368, 372) maintain that the research literature suggests traditional Hupa values were similar to dominant non-native values, specifically regarding the man/nature orientation and achievement orientation, but they differ from non-natives in that they exhibit a “strong individualism as well as a deep concern for collaterality.”

While the preceding research has approached the study of values using different methods and from a variety of perspectives, the most significant finding, in terms of this research study, is that in all the studies, differences were found in value orientations of natives and non-natives. Further, the studies found that contemporary native value orientations contained aspects of traditional native value orientations. Whether only a few or a significant number, traditional native values were still present.
vii. Traditional Native Values

While there were many different native nations and bands, fundamental to all was a common philosophy (Mitchell, 1977, p. 4). Boldt and Long (1985b, p. 538) maintain that there existed certain "cultural traits and values" which were "shared by most Indian tribes." By examining the socio-cultural characteristics of native tribes, it is possible to uncover the values that natives traditionally held. These characteristics include: the use of land as a "common resource base," a "cultural attachment to place," a "fundamental ecological view," a "flexible system of economy and exchange," an "extended kinship and reciprocity system," and "dependence upon a co-operative system of enterprise" (Frideres, 1988, pp. 326, 327). Each of these elements will be addressed in turn.

a. Spirituality, Values, and the Natural Law

Probably the most significant aspect of native culture is spirituality or native religion; it permeated every aspect of native life. Religion, according to Vanderburg (1985, p. 253), stems from the need of a culture to create a symbolic universe in order that it may "exist in reality" for myths and religion accommodate the development and organization of the "symbolic universe of a culture." Thus, religion is a necessary combination of ethos and world-view, "the approved style of life and the assumed structure of reality" (Geertz, 1973, p. 129).

Indeed, Geertz (1973, pp. 126-129) maintains that this meaningful relationship between the moral and the cognitive aspects of a culture produces a coherent value system in which conduct in accordance with the value system appears to be common sense. The two aspects complement and complete each other. Natives' traditional religion emphasized "the cosmos" and their relation to it and their immediate environment (Patterson, 1972, p. 54). As such, religion became the basis upon which a system of
values was built (Vanderburg, 1985, p. 253). For example, in Navajo culture the focus on “calm deliberateness, untiring persistence, and dignified caution” reflect their conceptualization of nature as “powerful, mechanically regular, and highly dangerous” (Geertz, 1973, p. 130). Thus, religion is a generating force of social values when its symbols are employed to create a world in which the values are accepted and regarded as significant. Religion makes values appear objective; “in sacred rituals and myths values are portrayed not as subjective human preferences but as the imposed conditions for life implicit in a world with a particular structure” (Geertz, 1973, p. 131). Because native spirituality was a way of life, the values which emerged from native religion were inextricably inter-twined in the cultural fabric of native societies. Accordingly, cultural unity was transmitted indirectly via myths and the sacred from generation to generation. This is accomplished largely unconsciously as most members of a culture are not cognizant of the presence or existence of myths and the sacred (Vanderburg, 1985, p. 255).

In transmitting values Cardinal (1977, p. 222) notes the importance of ceremonies to native spirituality. Natives’ “religious beliefs and practices” were a significant part of traditional value systems and served to “maintain a feeling of essential equality and community equilibrium” (Foster, 1969, p. 312). As Manuel and Posluns (1974, p. 263) note, of importance is not the “details of ceremonies — they are only the technology of religion...it is the values lived out in everyday human, social, and political relationships, and celebrated by those ceremonies, that must be understood and shared.” In short, ceremony “reaffirms common values” (Lasch, 1979, p. 190).

The connection between religion or spirituality and values is emphasized in Foster’s observations. As he notes of the peasants of Tzintzuntzan, Mexico, a change in values is readily apparent in religion and its relationship to society. As values change there is a corresponding increase or decrease (depending upon the nature of the change in values) of the perceived importance of religion in society. Foster asserts that traditional native value systems are being usurped by new value systems, predominantly secular,
which precipitate “major social changes” (Foster, 1969, p. 312), such as diminishing the importance of dreams and visions which originally were given great emphasis (McLean, 1889, p. 37) because of their substantial spiritual meaning. Thus, because different religions support or emphasize different values, certain religions, when viewed by people outside those religions, are seen as inferior, invalid, or non-religious. For example, despite the central importance of spirituality, natives were viewed as non-religious because they were not Christians (Deloria, 1911, p. 51).

Subsequently, traditional native spirituality may have caused natives to act in what we perceive as strange ways; however, this was in accordance with the natural law which governed all life. All people are subject to this natural law (Lyons, 1985, pp. 21, 22). The natural law dictated that all life is equal; anything the “Creator” has placed on the earth must be respected and one must “protect life and all its manifestations” (Lyons, 1984, p. 6). Excessive behaviour or conduct would destroy the balance that existed in nature and the natural law would extract “retribution in direct ratio to violations” in order to maintain balance (Lyons, 1985, p. 19). This notion was adhered to even in warfare.64

In adhering to the natural law, natives were viewed as having a man-in-harmony-with-nature orientation where “man, nature, and supernature” are conceived of as extensions of each other which implies a holistic world view (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 13). Indeed, natives’ relationship with nature was one of harmony; they saw no benefit in mastering or controlling nature (Page, 1982, p. 153). Because, for natives, the “essence of life was found in being and not in becoming better than before” (Page, 1982, p. 154) altering nature was inconceivable. Thus, natives’ spiritual beliefs prevented them from excesses and abuse of their environment.

As a consequence of their man-in-harmony-with-nature orientation, natives saw themselves as being on about equal status as animals “within creation,” where both man and animals were seen to be involved to the same qualitative degree in religious activity (Deloria, 1911, p. 52). Thus, respect for oneself entailed respect for all living things.
Natives viewed all living beings as an enormous "extended family" and decisions were made with concern for the well-being of the "seventh generation to come." This is fundamental to the natural law which maintains that the earth belongs to future generations and that the present generation must "safeguard" it for their children (Lyons, 1984, p. 8).

This perspective is connected to natives' conceptualization of time. Natives' understanding of time is markedly different than that of non-natives. The Western notion of time is linear and mechanical and, in comparison, those in another culture with a different conception of time appear lazy. However, the veracity of this belief is negligible for this is not a reflection of personal qualities, it is simply "the way these people exist in reality by means of their culture" (Vanderburg, 1985, p. 262). Thus, natives have a "cyclic sense of time in accord with nature and human rhythms" (Diamond, 1974, p. 206) because such a sense of time best complemented or approximated the way in which they lived. Accordingly, natives conceive of time as an "eternal present" (Pelletier, 1974, p. 104) as can be seen in many native languages, such as the language of the Hopi Indians, where verbs do not distinguish between past and present; "time runs together, something like an ever continuing present" (P. David Seaman in Boslough, 1990, p. 129). Consequently, natives view the life-span of man, falling somewhere between that of an ant and a mountain, as an inappropriate unit of time measurement (Lyons, 1984, p. 7).

By considering the welfare of the seventh generation in adherence to the natural law, natives demonstrate the significance of equality in their culture. This conceptualization of time, in keeping with the value of equality which permeates native culture, is indicative of natives' almost unconscious or automatic concern for the long-term future. Thus, native spirituality and the values produced by their spiritual beliefs acted as guiding principles for their behaviour which promoted respect for themselves by respecting their tradition and all other forms of life.
b. Ka-Kanata and the Importance of Place

Commensurate with this pervasive aspect of equality, natives viewed themselves and their native neighbours as co-owners, or more accurately, co-caretakers, of lands provided by the “Great Spirit” (Deloria, 1911, p. 52). In fact, this was a partial source of their identity which, in total, stemmed from tribal and band memberships, relationship to the land, and “the individual’s relation to the Great Spirit” (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 325).

The traditional native relationship to the land was spiritual in nature. While native cultures differ, the values and social structures of all emerged through “a spiritual relationship with the land.” Thus, all native cultures have a common core in “social and spiritual experience” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 7). As Manuel and Posluns (1974, p. 191) suggest, “the culture of Indian people is every inch of our land and every event of our history.” But, far from romanticizing this relationship, “its strength lies in the accuracy of the description it offers of the proper and natural relationship of people to their environment and to the larger universe. It offers a description of the spiritual world that is parallel to, and in fact a part of, the material universe that is the basis of our experience” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 256). Accordingly, some native tribes in Canada described their land as Ka-Kanata, meaning (in Cree language) “the clean land.” This also outlined natives’ relationship to the land, one of respect and responsibility. The term also described a native philosophy governing how one should conduct oneself, a “clean” person being an honest person, “with himself, with his family, with his neighbours, with all people” (Cardinal, 1977, p. 11).

Because of the spiritual importance of place, for natives, the entire notion of land ownership was nonsensical. To conceive of it in any way other than “the right to use it while we have need of it” is anathema to natives (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 255). Natives revered land in contrast to non-natives’ lust for private (individual) ownership.
Consequently, native use of land was communal (Kaufman, 1975, p. 23). As Manuel and Posluns (1974, p. 256) note, capitalists, as well as natives, are well aware that land is valuable because there is a limited supply. But the capitalist exploits this limited resource for personal gain, with the adulation and encouragement of his society.

Again, the values of equality and sharing characterize natives' relationship to, and use of, land.

c. Potlach, Poverty, and the Natural Economy

Connected to the egalitarian nature of native societies is the practice of giving which Manuel and Posluns (1974, p. 41) state is the foundation of all native societies. They have found the practice of giving in every native society in North America in which they visited. The practice of sharing was a reaction to their environment; vast tracts of land made personal ownership of property unnecessary, and in times of shortage, sharing seemed to offer the solution (Page, 1982, p. 153). Thus, borrowing was prevalent and there was "little notion of private property" (Page, 1982, p. 153). The spiritual importance of "giving and sharing" is manifested in native "religious ceremonies." For example, the Potlach, a Chinook word meaning "to give," celebrates the "interrelatedness" of all in attendance (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 44, 45). In these exchanges natives expected to give as much in return as they received; there was a balance of give and take (McLean, 1889, p. 14). Accordingly, natives unquestioningly expected and granted reciprocal treatment and, thus, "sharing was their investment" (Page, 1982, p. 153). Indicative of this, in many Indian languages there is no expression or term meaning "thank you" or expressing gratitude (McLean, 1889, p. 14).

Commensurate with the practices of giving and sharing, native societies were structured upon a "communalistic economic base." This meant that all articles necessary for subsistence of the individual were either easily attainable by all in their environment
or were "held in common" (Diamond, 1974, p. 131). The only "private" property that existed were "tools...breechclouts, back scratchers and similar 'extensions of the personality'" fashioned by the individual. Yet, this "private" property was either not necessary for the survival of the group, could easily be made by any member of the group, or was so personal in a spiritual manner that it could not be "owned communally" (Diamond, 1974, p. 131).\textsuperscript{28}

Thus, traditional native economies are considered "natural economies" because they were devoid of "true money" (Diamond, 1974, p. 133). Exchanges were usually in the form of barter or gifts. In these exchanges "social value and social effort" were acknowledged and conveyed, reinforcing the notion of community for community meant security in a traditional economy (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 43). Because economic organization was structured around social values, in native societies "spiritual and material power" were never separated as much as they have been in the history of North American non-native societies (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 41, 43); most material goods had some spiritual significance. Also, because natives did not acknowledge the Western notion of "social progress" which "reflects the illusory cultural logic of mercantilism...that the sum of the behavior of individuals motivated by profit will secure the prosperity and progress of society at large" (Diamond, 1974, p. 39), native societies were not competitive (Diamond, 1974, p. 133), they were co-operative. Similarly, because primitive societies did not have an "acquisitive socio-economic character" (Diamond, 1974, p. 133), they lacked economic classes. Further, the qualities of individualism and materialism, characteristic of Western societies, contradict the "consensual political system,...kinship system,...communal ownership system, and...collective economic system" (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 36) of traditional native societies. Thus, individuals in native societies participated to a much greater extent in the "social economy" of their societies than do individuals in modern society (Diamond, 1974, pp. 142, 143).
In modern society, man is alienated from his labour and, therefore, society because money transmutes his work into an "abstract commodity" the worth of which is determined by the market system (Diamond, 1974, pp. 133, 134). Workers in an industrial/post-industrial age are more like a tool or extension thereof, in contrast to natives who conceived of tools as extensions of the personality. Natives made a tool in its entirety, used it, and bore witness to the result of its use (Diamond, 1974, pp. 143, 144). As such, production was for "use or pleasure rather than for individual profit." Consequently, traditional native societies were devoid of economic exploitation (Diamond, 1974, p. 133).

However, subsequent to European contact, native economies were transformed by non-native "extractive economic purposes" beginning with the fur trade and continuing to the present time (Patterson, 1972, p. 187). As Diamond (1974, p. 204) notes, "acculturation has always been a matter of conquest," and because physical conquest was no longer morally conscionable, the government opted for economic conquest by diluting traditional native economies with the intention of rendering them unable to support traditional native culture. One of the more contemporary means by which this was accomplished was by permitting hydroelectric companies to dam rivers thereby flooding reserves and native hunting grounds disrupting traditional native lifestyles and methods of subsistence. Two of the many examples where such activity was permitted are: the Moose Lake and Chemawawin reserves in Manitoba (Walkom, 1990b, p. A10) and the land of the Temewaugama Anishnabai people around Maple Mountain and Lake Temagami in Northern Ontario (LaRonde, 1990).

The effect of Western economic systems on native lifestyle is abundantly apparent. Unlike many Central and South American Indian communities who, although materially poor, are economically independent, existing outside the "national or international economic system," native North Americans are "locked into the non-Indian economic system" (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 39). In the opinion of Smallface Marule
(1984, p. 39), they are “hooked on consumerism.” Native dependence is based on their economic marginality which is the result of a lack of economic development on most reserves. Economic development should be distinguished from economic growth. Economic growth involves an increase in capacity of production, while economic development necessitates changes in the economic structure, for example, shifting from “primary extractive or agricultural industries to secondary or processing industries” (Frideres, 1988, p. 370). It is questionable whether the Western conceptualization of either notion benefits natives. For example, the unfortunate result of substantial economic development on reserves, most noticeably in Alberta, has been the formation of an elite class in native communities who support the “political and economic system of the DIA” (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 41). Smallface Marule (1984, p. 41) warns that without the “revitalization of the traditional system of leadership,” there is a danger of elitism, a Western notion, foreign to traditional native philosophy, creating a dual class native society based on economic wealth.

Western concepts of poverty and prosperity are alien to traditional native culture and problems are created when these terms are applied to their situation. For example, it has been suggested that natives are an example of “inequality, poverty and isolated status” (Haycock, 1971, p.91) and that it is necessary to train natives “toward self-support, salvation from a life of pauperism, and the begetting of a love for honest labour” (McLean, 1889, p.262). However, natives who maintain a traditional lifestyle are not part of the “culture of poverty” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 183). Indeed, a gatherer-hunter lifestyle is not the cause of native poverty and some regard it as the “only viable and lasting alternative to it” (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 54). The notion of poverty applied to native communities is a European concept directed at those communities that have been forced into a transitional stage between the traditional and the modern (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 183). Further, “poverty is a social status...it is the invention of civilization” because it “is not a certain small amount of goods, nor is it a relation between
means and ends; above all it is a relation between people” (Kulchyski, 1989, pp. 53, 54). Accordingly, it is only in comparison to Western/European culture that non-natives perceive native culture as impoverished.

In examining the notions of poverty and affluence, it is important to note that, in contemporary society, advertising “seeks to create needs” which it does not fulfill and this leads to unhappiness (Lasch, 1979, p. 309). Further, advertising perpetuates “consumption as a way of life” (Lasch, 1979, p. 137) contributing to modern society’s “unlimited needs” in an environment of “excessive material goods” which, in turn, creates a society characterized by scarcity (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 52). The Western economic system intentionally creates a scarcity of goods which is the result of neglecting to use technology “for the effective distribution of plentiful goods” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 245, 246). Conversely, traditional native society was an affluent society because, while there were “minimal goods,” there were also “minimal needs” (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 52).

Yet, because native economies have been altered by Western economic systems, and because they have continually been compared to non-native economies, the belief that native societies are indigent has become generally accepted. In accepting this belief one is faced with the faulty notion that natives can remove themselves from a life of “squalor” through hard work which ignores the reality of the “present economic-political structure” in which “the price of native advancement is assimilation and thus the loss of native culture and values” (Native Council of Canada, 1976, p. 41). Additionally, work for natives must be meaningful; monetary reward is not meaningful. Further, because natives, unlike Christian Europeans, were not burdened with the debt of “original sin to work off in this world” to secure a position in the afterlife (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 6), salvation offers little incentive to work hard. Accordingly, unlike the Puritans and their descendents who colonized the North American continent, natives “never saw any virtue in work per se” (Pelletier, 1974, p. 109).
Natives' reaction to external influence and their ability to adapt is apparent in the changing shape of their economy. For example, farming was regarded as a complement to the "existing economy" and not an alternative because it did not require a fundamental change in the relationship between humans and the land (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 33, 34). However, more drastic changes occurred with the introduction of welfare services by the government. The result was a mixed economy or "form of production," a substantial portion of which was direct economic dependence on the government (Tanner, 1983, p. 32). Consequently, native modes of production rely largely upon the "permission and intervention" of the federal government. Yet, as Kulchyski conceives of it, the resultant "mixed economy" does not constitute two individual, that is, separate, economic structures but instead represents a "primary economy based on gather-hunter economic strategies, and a secondary economy based on wage labor," farming, or government assistance (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 53). Jackson (1990) concurs maintaining that, because one must cope with the non-native system, one must necessarily have some "pocket change." Thus, money is not used to accumulate material possessions, rather, it is used to "make ends meet" in dealing with non-native culture.

Just as the notion of the "culture of poverty" focussed attention on the lives of the poor as the cause of poverty, the concept of "modernization" is being used in a similar manner. Thus, some anthropologists contend that the acquisition of basic goods, "better health," and "communications" is impossible without also accepting the dominant culture of Western civilization (Tom Gladwin in Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 192, 193). However, Manuel and Posluns (1974, p. 221) suggest it is not incompatible to "live decently...comfortably" and "maintain and develop" native lifestyle. Consequently, natives have been able to retain their traditional values while adopting new, or modifying existing, structures of economic organization.
d. Social Structure

The notion of equality, characteristic of other aspects of native lifestyle, was also fundamental to native social structure. The division of labour existed naturally among natives and the work done by men and women was seen as equally important (McLean, 1889, p. 25). In conceiving of the gatherer role of women and the hunter role of men in hunter-gatherer societies as equally important, “egalitarian gender relations” existed (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 52). Such relations are indicative of societies with a collateral orientation.

In societies where a collateral orientation is dominant, such as Navajo, the “goals and welfare of the laterally extended group” are given primacy (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 19). That is, emphasis is placed upon the “more immediate relationships in time and space” especially “sibling relationships” (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 18). In these societies, individuals are regarded as having a “being” or “being in becoming” orientation concerning their means of self-expression. The “being” orientation stresses what an individual or human being is as opposed to his accomplishments; it is the “spontaneous expression” of what exists in the “human personality” (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, pp. 16, 17). The “being-in-becoming” orientation also stresses what an individual or human being is as opposed to his accomplishments but it is also concerned with development, specifically, “the development of all aspects of the self as an integrated whole” (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, pp. 16, 17). Thus, a native’s self-image stemmed not from what he did, but from who he was, a part of the community.

Because the individual was so closely connected to the community, natives had methods different than those in Western societies of dealing with maladies. While in modern society “bureaucracy transforms collective grievances into personal problems amenable to therapeutic intervention” (Lasch, 1979, p. 43), in traditional native societies, the opposite was normative. Personal problems, for example periodic emotional distur-
bances, were acknowledged by the community and dealt with or resolved in a group context; the individual was not isolated or ostracized. Currently, because natives feel that the Western ways of dealing with problems such as alcoholism and sexual abuse using “drug counsellors, police, [and] the courts” have failed, they would like to reintroduce traditional methods of dealing with these problems which entail viewing them as “community problems with community responses” (Walkom, 1990a, p. A8). Similarly, because they feel the Canadian judicial system is ineffective, some natives would like to return to “traditional shame punishments” in order to deal with native indiscretions (Walkom, 1990d, p. A10).

For natives, then, the individual did not exist “prior to his being a part of the tribe or clan” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 6). Accordingly, while non-native society has laws to protect the individual, concomitant with the emphasis on the individual, native societies had unspoken guiding principles to ensure the good of the community. Yet, in some rare circumstances, more tangible means of guidance were deemed necessary. For example, in some native tribes of the Plains region, during communal buffalo hunts (very carefully planned and executed), certain natives were charged with the responsibility of policing the hunt to ensure “uniform communal action” and prevent over-zealous individuals from jeopardizing the “communal enterprise.” Social sanctions were levied against those individuals who endangered the hunt. The usual punishment was public humiliation or the destruction of property; this property had spiritual value, not exchange value (Spencer et al., 1977, p. 330). It is apparent that, even after white contact, natives attempted to maintain the co-operative or communal aspect of their culture.

This may seem to restrict personal freedom but the notion of freedom is nonexistent in native societies because “society is not perceived as oppressive;” exploitation and liberty only come with civilization (Diamond, 1974, p. 17). As Boldt and Long (1984, p. 544) note, “self-direction (autonomy)...was everyone’s right in Indian society.” Accordingly, because in native societies “individual self-interest was inextricably inter-
twined with tribal interests,” the good of the community was commensurate with the good of the individual (Boldt and Long, 1984, p. 541). Thus, the “tribal will” was a guiding “spiritual principle” which manifested itself in “sharing and cooperation rather than private property and competition” (Boldt and Long, 1984, pp. 541, 542).

Another indication of this communal spirit was the practice of adopting orphans into families and treating them as one of the family’s own (McLean, 1889, p. 81). They would also replace lost sons, daughters, husbands, etc., with Indians taken prisoner during battle. These individuals would be openly accepted into the tribe (McLean, 1889, p. 63). This is in marked contrast to contemporary society’s practice of institutionalizing orphans until a home can be found, if one can be found. This, according to Van Waters (in Lasch, 1979, p. 311n), is symptomatic of modern society which increasingly turns to institutions to deal with “problems” of childhood, and “the community has expressed its concern for childhood by creating institutions.” Referring to “changing patterns of socialization,” Lasch notes that in contemporary society the concern is not that adolescents “internalize the moral standards of the community” merely that they conform “to the conventions of everyday intercourse, sanctioned by psychiatric definitions of normal behaviour” (Lasch, 1979, p. 316).

Thus, in contrast to non-native society’s emphasis on the individual and competition, traditional native social structure stressed community, kinship, co-operation and equality.

e. Political Structure

The qualities of native social structure characterized what little political structure existed. Because native political structure emphasized equality, decisions in the political process were arrived at by consensus, not majority vote (Lyons, 1984, p. 5). In the political process elders acted as wise men, counselling the young. In many native socie-
ties even children were involved in decision-making (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 45n). Thus, there was a quality of public participation in decision-making. In fact, Diamond (1974, p. 18) declares native societies to be the “only fully participant societies.” Indeed, in native tribes, the “state” was not separated from the community; natives’ notion of statehood or “nationhood” was based on “their social community” (Boldt and Long, 1984, pp. 546, 547).

Because of this structure, authority, a “collective right,” could be “temporarily delegated” to an individual only if that individual was respected by all members of the tribe, not merely a majority (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 36). Accordingly, the role of leaders in native societies was “communal and traditional, not political or secular” (Lyons, 1984, p. 5). Because natives unconditionally accepted custom as the guiding principle of their conduct, they eliminated the need for “personal authority, a hierarchical power structure and a separate ruling entity to maintain order” (Boldt and Long, 1984, p. 543). Thus, elders and chiefs were respected, “not because of their power or authority, but because of their knowledge of the customs, traditions and rituals” (Boldt and Long, 1984, p. 544).

Because the fundamental law is the spiritual law and spirituality is the “highest form of politics,” spirituality played an integral role in native government (Lyons, 1984, p. 5). While it has been suggested that “capitalism and communism are both spiritually bankrupt” and these two political/ideological systems function in opposition to the natural law, in contrast, native government laws are consistent with the natural law (Lyons, 1984, pp. 11, 12). Accordingly, compliance with the leader’s wishes was through respect for the people’s tradition and, by extension, respect for oneself; “it is not the result of coercion or an institutionally manipulative act” (Diamond, 1974, p. 135). Thus, traditional native social organization and form of leadership were conducive to both the “individual’s unique personality and the community’s need for cooperation” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 236).
In order to satisfy both individuals and the community, significant issues of peace, war, hunting, and "other social, political, and civil matters" were first discussed among individuals and small groups and then at a council (McLean, 1889, p. 42). The council, in its most rudimentary form, the gens, was a democratic body because all adults, both male and female, could participate in the discussion of any issue which the gens addressed (Morgan, 1877, p. 85) (Although this was not true of all First Nations). At council, orators outlined the problem from their different perspectives. From this, it is apparent that the council was founded on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity (Morgan, 1877, p. 85).

While it has been suggested that "neither a political society, nor a citizen, nor a state" existed on the continent when it was discovered (Morgan, 1877, p. 66) and although their "social systems" were disparate, the structure of all native societies was based on kinship (Newcomb, 1974, p. 19). Thus, there existed only a gentile society (Morgan, 1877, p. 67). What little native "government" existed, then, was based on kinship and, in its most developed form, consisted of the gens, phrantry, tribe and confederacy. Basically, the gens was present in Iroquois tribes but was similar to the gentes of many other native tribes (Morgan, 1877, p. 85). The gens was a group of "consanguinei having a common gentile name" where the consanguine family was based upon "the internmarriage of brothers and sisters, [both their] own and collateral [who we regard as cousins], in a group" (Morgan, 1877, p. 384). The phrantry was a larger group of "related gentes" who were united because of "common objects." The tribe was an even larger group of gentes, who were also part of a phrantry, and who all "spoke the same dialect." The confederacy consisted of tribes, "members of which...spoke dialects of the same stock language" (Morgan, 1877, p. 66). This loose political structure was democratic at all levels.

Again, this was probably the most developed political structure existing at the time and was not characteristic of many native communities (although the Iroquois had a
similarly sophisticated political structure); most had much simpler, less formal arrangements. Tribes as such were largely non-existent before Europeans imposed this organization on aboriginal people. Prior to this they existed in small bands (not in the legal sense of the term) which may have had some interaction with each other and were probably linguistically similar but were usually politically autonomous (Hall, 1989, p. 225).

f. Communication and the Oral Tradition

Because of their peculiar political structure, native societies may be likened to a public in which the number of people who present opinions and receive opinions is about the same and where the structure of communication in a public permits immediate feedback or response to opinions presented. Here the public is not influenced by "authoritative institutions;" it is basically "autonomous" and the opinions that arise from such a situation are easily transformed into direct action (Mills, 1956, pp. 303, 304). Given this, the public and traditional native societies resemble a classic democracy.

This can be contrasted this to a mass society where the number of opinion givers greatly exceeds the number of opinion receivers. The structure of the dominant forms of communication does not allow for immediate or effective response to opinions expressed and the transformation of opinion into effective action is curtailed by those who control the means for such action. In this regard, the mass is not autonomous, rather representatives of institutions regularly infiltrate the mass (Mills, 1956, p. 304). In a mass, transforming ideas into actions only requires the consent of the majority. This creates a division between those who are "'in' and those who are 'out'" (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 7). Clearly, the concept of the mass is representative of contemporary Canadian society.

Noticeably, then, the means of communication in a culture affect the "characteristics" of the culture (Innis, 1951, p. 138) for, as an institution in society, modern media
(pervasive means of communication) provide "a broad base of common experience;" they are a "resource of common experience" (Anderson and Meyer, 1988, p. 134). Because media are a source of common experience, the relationship between modes of communication and "social reality" significantly influence the "cultural orientation and values" of a society (Heyer, 1988, p. 115).

The relationship between modes of communication and values is evident in native societies. While natives sometimes communicated their history, the "collective memory of the tribe," through sign language or picture symbols, oral communication was a more common means of transmitting culture (Kaufman, 1975, p. 23), and some North American native tribes existed without any form of writing (Finnegan, 1988, p. 61). Stories and information were conveyed orally (Finnegan, 1988, p. 63) and camp socials were held where the elders relived the tribe’s history by reciting "twice-told tales" (McLean, 1889, pp. 73-75). This oral mode of communication promoted increased interaction between individuals, increased public participation in social and political matters, and maintained and strengthened kinship and social relationships.

This oral tradition, as Innis (1951, p. 136) notes of Greek civilization at one time, solidified "scattered groups" into a common culture. Similarly, natives' oral tradition served as a bonding agent of culture. Oral performances functioned to educate, moralize and maintain the existing social structure (Finnegan, 1988, p. 76). The oral tradition also had great religious meaning (Deloria, 1911, p.53). Aboriginal peoples were very cognizant of their history and tradition (McLean, 1889, p. 36) and oration, therefore, apart from being a form of intellectual expression, presenting reality as perceived by the orator, was the means by which natives conveyed their insight into and understanding of the world to younger generations.63

Despite Michaels' (1985, p. 505) claim that in societies lacking print or electronic media, because the spoken word cannot be separated from the orator, "authorship takes on privileged status," the "individual personality" of the orator was not really important
in native societies and the issue of "proprietorship" did not exist (Finnegan, 1988, pp. 75, 76). "Esoteric lore" was "more publicly known" than some scholars suggest. While certain songs, medicine rites, etc., may have been used by a small number of people (for example, shamans) more than by others, they were available to all; they were held by some but it was understood that all could benefit from them or their use when the need arose. Thus, they had no real exchange value in an economic sense (Diamond, 1974, p. 132). Subsequently, natives' oral tradition, by focussing on dialogue, mitigates the evolution of "monoplies of knowledge" which would facilitate "overarching political authority, territorial expansion, and the inequitable distribution of power and wealth" (Heyer, 1988, p. 117).

Examples of natives adhering to the oral tradition and employing modes of communication characteristic of a public exist today, to some degree, in northern Inuit communities. The Inuit Broadcasting Corporation (IBC) epitomizes the potential of advanced technology to strengthen the culture of a marginalised group rather than supplanting their culture with that of the dominant societal group. Inuit, through the IBC and use of the Anik satellite, created a broadcasting system with interactive capabilities to enable concerned parties to discuss mutually important issues such as game management and aboriginal rights. This satellite system, called the Inukshuk Project, often served as a common "town hall," linking disparate northern communities. Programming on the Inukshuk system included "community profiles, cultural documentaries, news, music, public service programs, and instruction in traditional crafts and skills" (Brisebois, 1983, pp. 108, 109). Significantly, these programs were all in a traditional language, Inuktitut, and were created by Inuit.

In these communities, there is no division between the producers of the media products and the audience; "both are part of Inuit community" (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 57). Subsequently, the relationship between the producers and the community is a multi-level
network of interaction, where the possibility exists for community members to provide feedback to the producers on a daily basis (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 57). Therefore, Brisebois (1983, p. 109) contends that the Inukshuk Project is indicative of the means by which natives can integrate Western technology while maintaining native “language and culture.”

g. Ideology, Values, and the Technological Imperative

With regard to technology, natives hold a different perspective than either of the two dominant global ideological systems. As such, Lyons contends that indigenous people are currently in the centre of an ongoing philosophical war against communism and capitalism (Lyons, 1984, pp. 8, 9). He suggests that capitalism and communism both have in common a “total commitment to industrial development and technology” (Lyons, 1984, p. 10). While natives are not against technology, it is not anathema with regard to their value system, they do not condone the manner in which it is generally used. Natives can reconcile modern technology and native lifestyle because of their belief that technology is not inherently detrimental. Because it is a creation of the human mind, technology can be put to good use (Lyons, 1984, p. 10).

Nevertheless, a North American myth of native reality is the belief that native lifestyle is something permanently primitive, unable to adapt to the “changing social conditions brought about by new technology” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 2, 3). Thus, there is an assumption that “Indian culture must remain static to remain Indian,” that when lifestyles change, “values and beliefs” change (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 37). The myth stems from inextricably linking certain social circumstances and technologies “with the values and beliefs they helped to realize” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, pp. 2, 3). This forestalls the possibility of adopting new technologies while maintaining current value systems. Yet many suggest that technology is not “inherently dominating or a
structure of hegemonic power” (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 60). As Manuel and Posluns (1974, p. 13) suggest, it is important to realize that “technologies are only the tools through which we carry on our relationship with nature.” By adhering to this belief native history is testimony to natives’ “successful adaptation to change” (Smallface Marule, 1984, p. 37) and technological innovation. While the instances in which natives have utilized modern technology in ways commensurate with traditional values are few thus far because of a paucity of opportunities (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 234), as Kulchyski (1989, p. 61) notes, the Inuit example cited previously shows promise that natives can thwart the “logic of the spectacle and...employ ‘advanced’ technology in a radically subversive way: as communication that defies the sender-receiver model and organizes speech with responses.” The Inuit use of modern technology supports the notion that “media do not induce a social relation but that social relations condition the way in which the media will be used” (Kulchyski, 1989, p.51).

From the information contained in the previous sub-sections, it is apparent that the values and mores of natives were antagonistic to those of the non-native settlers (Slotkin, 1973, p. 7) and, before non-native contact, some of the isolated native cultures probably approached a state of equilibrium or harmony. This is in contrast to industrialized societies where technological and other innovations are frequent and consistent, thereby keeping the elements of their cultures “in a state of stress and change” (Newcomb, 1974, p. 20). Civilization or modern societies are characterized by “internal disequilibrium” where “technology or ideology or social organization” are never quite synchronous. This notion of “incompleteness” is an element in our conceptualization of progress (Diamond, 1974, p. 207). Yet, as Lewis Mumford argues in the Myth of the Machine, progress in civilization, the movement away from nature, including technological development, results in “progressive alienation” (Heyer, 1988, p. 106). Thus, because natives did not submit to the Western notion of progress, and because spirituality is fundamental to all aspects of native culture, producing a more holistic, integrated society, technology may
be adapted readily for use without disturbing the traditional balance.

viii. Dominant Values in Contemporary Canadian Society

As civilization evolves, the central authority permits less, commands more; and states grow more, not less, totalitarian. — Diamond

While the preceding section has outlined, by comparison, many of the dominant values of Western culture, a brief overview is necessary to complement the characteristics and values elucidated thus far.

The dominant cultural orientation of non-native Canadian society is characterized by the desire to dominate, control, and exploit nature, individualism and independence from family, capitalism (commercialism, goals of production, and accumulation of wealth), nationalism, future time, a doing orientation, and the conception of human nature as evil but perfectible which holds the “occupational world” (including technology) as paramount and supports the importance placed on “occupational status” (Frideres, 1974, p. 95; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, pp. 29, 30; Binck and Surlin, 1989, p. 2).

The dominant non-native perspective is that the environment should be altered to maximize production. Inherent in this perspective is the consumption, for immediate benefit, of what the environment provides which, in the long-term, is destructive (Page, 1982, p. 153). The result is immediate individual gain but long-term collective loss. The prevalence of such activity possibly is related to non-natives’ conception of time. With regard to time, non-natives’ are concerned with the short-term future, specifically with making it “bigger and better” (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 15). According to natives, then, Western societies lack the proper understanding of time because they measure time against the life-span of an individual (Lyons, 1984, p. 7). The Western conceptualization of time results in governments making decisions using the life-time of an individual as a reference point, or, more detrimental, the span of a government’s term.
in power. Not surprisingly this creates "short-sighted policies" (Lyons, 1984, p. 7).

This perspective on the environment and conceptualization of time are concordant with a "doing" orientation which is concerned with accomplishments that are measured by standards external to the individual. This is the dominant orientation with regard to human activity in Western societies (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeek, 1961, p. 17). As Lasch (1979, p. 116) notes of Western societies, success has become an end in itself, people have only the accomplishments of others by which to judge their own achievements. Thus, "self-approval depends on public recognition and acclaim" (Lasch, 1979, p. 116). Accordingly, in societies in which the "doing" orientation predominates, competition is imminent (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeek, 1961, p. 17).

The entrenchment of the notion of competition came with the advent of industrialism and the widespread acceptance of the concept of "frontier individualism" (Bosserman, 1971, p. 135). Competition and individualism were further supported by non-native, specifically Christian, religions as evidenced by the notion "the Lord helps those who help themselves" (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeek, 1961, p. 13). As a result of the emphasis on competition and individualism, efficiency has become the paramount value in society, creating an abundance of "direct means-ends relationships" (Bell, 1961, p. 24). This has transformed values "into economic calculabilities" (Bell, 1961, p. 22). Thus, efficiency and competition, in concert with an individualistic orientation, resulted in the elevation of individual goals over the goals of "collateral...groups" (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeek, 1961, p. 18).

This has also changed the manner in which man perceives and relates to time and space. Significantly, the "concrete (use) value" of personal property has been subordinated by its "abstract (exchange) value" (Fromm, 1955, p. 106). While native ownership of any personal material items carried with them spiritual values connected to their use, in modern commercial society, spirituality is not associated with personal ownership of property (Fromm, 1955, p. 118). Ownership is no longer active but passive; there is a
decreased level of direct involvement (Fromm, 1955, p. 118).

Such decreased involvement also characterizes social relations and the process of socialization in Western society. As Lasch (1979, p. 302) notes, labour in industrial society removes one or the other parent from the home which “diminishes the role” they play in the “conscious life of the child.” Further, Nystrom (in Lasch, 1979, p. 140) contends that the family unit sustains and perpetuates custom. Contrary to native societies in which “elders were a treasure,” and transferred knowledge and customs to the young (Mitchell, 1977, p. 2), in non-native societies older people are often separated from their immediate family and isolated in senior citizen homes. In non-native societies, then, family structure is characterized by the separation of generations. Therefore, it is conceivable that disruption of, or change in the family unit may contribute to the dissolution of custom and the breakdown of humanistic values.

Thus, while the interdependence of people has increased in society due to, among other things, the division of labour and advances in communication and transportation, this has done little to stop the disappearance of “primary group ties of family and local community” and remedy the lack of “unifying values” (Bell, 1961, p. 21). As such, modern society has witnessed the de-emphasizing of social values and the elevation in importance of values akin to an emphasis on the individual which are material values. Kulchyski (1989, p. 52) maintains that this has resulted in a society “characterized by aesthetic populism, a new depthlessness, an effacing of history, and a fragmentation of subjectivity.”

The consequences of such an orientation are apparent in current ecological problems which reflect the ineffectiveness of contemporary North American society “to recognize land, water, and air as social, not individual, commodities” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 11). The lack of concern for future generations, blatantly apparent in our behaviour and treatment of our environment, stems, according to Lasch (1979, p. 101), from our society’s fear that “it has no future.”
While much of the research cited in this area addresses American society and American values, studies have shown similarities between American and Canadian value systems (Surlin and Berlin, 1990). Other studies (Lipset, 1985, 1990; Naegele, 1968; and Clarke, 1976) found differences in value systems between the two countries maintaining “Canadians are more conservative, more traditional, more collectively-oriented, less individualistic, less optimistic, have less faith in the future, are less willing to risk (capital or reputation), exercise greater caution, reserve and restraint, are less religious and less moralistic” (Surlin and Berlin, 1990, p. 2). While Lipset contends that value differences exist between Canadians and Americans, other research using Rokeach’s value system inventory finds American-Canadian similarities (Surlin and Berlin, 1990, p. 3).

From the information in this and the previous section, a list of differences between the socio-cultural characteristics of native and non-native societies can be compiled. The values associated with the characteristics listed corroborates the assertion that native values are basically social or humanistic while non-native values are predominantly materialistic.

Characteristics of native society

group emphasis
coopération (group concern)
respect for age
harmony with nature
present orientation, lack of time consciousness
being or being-in-becoming
giving
practical
patience
extended family
non-materialistic
modest
silent
low self-value
respects other religions
religion is a way of life
land, water, forests and other resources belong to all and are used reasonably
equality
face-to-face government

Characteristics of non-native society

individual emphasis
competition (self-concern)
emphasis on youth
conquest of nature
future oriented, time consciousness
doing and activity oriented
saving
theoretical
impatience
immediate family
materialistic
overstates (overconfident)
noisy
strong self-value
converts others to own religion
religion is a segment of life
resources belong to the private domain and are used in a greedy manner
wealth
representative democracy

(Frideres, 1988, p. 217; Bryde, 1972; and the sources used in the previous two sections)

Based upon information in the previous three sections it is apparent that contemporary
native values are similar to traditional native values and that these are different
from the dominant values in non-native society. Therefore, because it is felt that a filmmaker's
values are reflected in his or her films, differences in values emphasized in the
films under study are expected between native-directed and non-native-directed produc-
tions.
ix. Summary

We share a common world. The reality of this common world is constructed through social interaction; “realities are defined and interpreted within social frameworks” (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1982, p. 226) and, therefore, are constantly being created and recreated (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 1). Accordingly, social and cultural variables are considered to play a significant role in “determining the way in which people adopt new ideas and things,” (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1982, p. 224) how they construct reality.

In order to maintain a coherent world view, people interpret the reality of everyday life and make it meaningful to themselves in terms of past subjective experiences and knowledge (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 19). However, when an individual desires to make a decision on a particular problem and has no “expert opinion” or direct experience to validate his decision, he or she “seeks to validate it through agreement with others” (Hovland, Janis and Kelley, 1953, p. 137). Thus, the reality of everyday life is shared with others; it is intersubjective, continual interaction and communication with other people (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 23). Therefore, not only do individuals have existing opinions, they also share these with, and these opinions are partially formed or reinforced by, others. Apart from cultural variables then, group interaction is viewed as important in providing individuals with “definitions of appropriate behaviour [attitudes and opinions] in a group context” (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1982, p. 224). This is part of the process of “consensual validation” through which reality is given definition and interpretation within social settings.

All individuals have membership in a number of groups which influence the attitudes of their members (Hovland et al., 1953, p. 155). As Mills (1956, p. 316) notes, advertising and public-relations personnel, those whose job it is to shape opinions, are well aware of the influence of an individual’s “immediate social context” on that individ-
ual and that members of the public “continually influence each other in complex and intimate, in direct and continual ways.” In their discussion of “situational cues” (reminders of the presence of a group) and “salience of membership” (an individual’s awareness, not always conscious, of the presence of a group), Hovland et al. (1953, p. 155) note that “the salience of any aspect of the group heightens the tendency to conform to its norms at that particular time.” They also contend that “situational cues...heighten the individual’s awareness (salience) of his membership in a given group” (Hovland et al, 1953, p. 163). When we become aware of our membership in a certain group, we typify others using some scheme, for example, group membership. We understand others by utilizing “typificationary schemes”; we see each other, then, as a “type.” While the effect of these schemes is most readily apparent in face-to-face encounters with others, they also affect our perceptions of those we do not interact with in person. These become “highly anonymous abstractions” (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 33). These typifications are increasingly anonymous the further the encounter is from face-to-face interaction (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 31).

The reality of everyday life includes, not only the phenomena of the “here and now,” but phenomena that vary in “degrees of closeness and remoteness” both through space and in time (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 22). This includes much of our knowledge of the world which is gained, not first-hand, but through the media. More and more we are confronted with different people, not in person, but in “visual symbolic forms” (Worth, 1972b, p. 94). Accordingly, we know much of reality second-hand through stereotypes and prefabricated interpretations; information is provided complete with interpretations (Mills, 1959b, p. 406).

Because we do not experience reality directly, it is necessary for us to have a culture through which to “mediate all relationships” (Vanderburg, 1985, p. 242). The source of this is what Mills (1959b, p. 406) calls the cultural apparatus which is comprised of all the “organizations and milieux...[from] which artistic, intellectual and scien-
tific work” emanate. The cultural apparatus is created and employed by “dominant” institutions and “any establishment of culture means the establishment of definitions of reality, values, taste” (Mills, 1959b, pp. 409, 412). Consequently, there are dominant definitions of reality, dominant values, etc., in any society. So engrossed in, subsumed by, the cultural apparatus are some, that they are unaware of its influence. As Lasch (1979, p. 97) notes, “the proliferation of recorded images undermines our sense of reality.” In the extreme, people may not believe the reality of their own experience until it is verified by the media (Mills, 1956, p. 311). Thus, what is regarded as common sense is increasingly composed of stereotypical images conveyed via the mass media rather than the product of “social tradition” (Mills, 1956, p. 313).

These ostensibly common sense messages communicated via the mass media may provide individuals with interpretations of reality that are new and seemingly group-supported. In this way, the message presented creates the appearance of consensus which leads the receivers of the information to believe “that these are the socially sanctioned modes of orientation their groups hold toward given objects” (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1982, pp. 225, 226). Some media have a “consistent public” and thereby “reinforce their messages [and interpretations of reality] in the minds of the public” (Mills, 1956, p. 313). Awareness of one’s membership in a group may also “increase the individual’s resistance to persuasive communications contrary to the group’s norms” (Hovland et al., 1953, p. 163) which would also reinforce the messages which appear to be group-supported. In this situation, the sender of the message supplies the social construction of reality which becomes part of the consensual validation process (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1982, p. 226). Subsequently, the media have the power to define the identity of a group (Singer, 1982, p. 349) and influence the attitudes and opinions of its members.

The division into native and non-native groups combined with the inundation of audio-visual, electronic, and print media accounts, and the opinions of opinion leaders and others in informal and formal groups, all part of the consensual validation process,
provide us with information which we either accept, reject, or modify when incorporating it into our personal system of opinions, attitudes, and beliefs, all of which stem from our value orientation in order to reduce or eliminate cognitive dissonance and maintain a coherent view of the world.

The consensual validation process affects the views, attitudes, and opinions of members of a society including film-makers. This process contributes to determining and maintaining the dominant values in society. Because members of a society are acculturated into the dominant system of values, they will probably project these values in their work, whether intentionally or incidentally. Thus, elements of the consensual validation process play a role in determining what values are projected in the work (films) of film-makers in a society. Significantly, the films produced by these film-makers in turn become part of the consensual validation process. In explaining, then, why native film-makers are not similarly affected by non-native media products and the values they promote, it may be that native film-makers may not be as greatly affected by these sources of information, attitudes, etc., because other sources, such as interaction with natives, native myths, history, customs, and traditions and native media, play a more important role in maintaining, modifying or creating traditional native value systems. Thus, non-native media do not play as significant a role in the consensual validation process of natives.

Just as Mills (1959a, p. 178) notes of Western scientists, who are “working on the basis of certain values...selected from the values created in Western society,” other Westerners, film-makers, also employ the values of Western society in the routine of their work. In their respective institutions, people, as they carry out their role, largely adhere to the values in society that legitimate these institutions (which would be the dominant values in society), regardless of the individual’s personal values (Mills, 1959a, pp. 37-39). Indeed, in Western societies, many different value orientations exist; however, they are unified by numerous means of “legitimation and coercion” (Mills, 1959a,
p. 40) into a single dominant value system (predominantly materialistic), one promulgated by corporate interests through the media. According to Mills (1959a, p. 76), "by their work all students of man and society assume and imply moral and political decisions"; they express their peculiar ideology, which includes their values, in their work.

One would expect, then, that a film-maker's values would be contained in his/her films. Worth (1972a, p. 77) comes to a similar conclusion proposing that ethnographic films, "sets of signs used to study the behaviour of a people," are basically used in two ways, as "data about culture, or as data of a culture." With regard to the former, Worth (1972a, p. 77) maintains that the film is a record of "the basic data of a culture in and within the cognitive system and value structure of the data collector" or film-maker. Concerning the latter use, he contends that films reflect "the value systems, coding patterns, and cognitive processes of the maker." In both cases the film is seen by Worth to reflect the values of its creator, the film-maker. Indeed, Worth (in Gross, 1981, p. 5) writes: "the most objective documentary film or report includes the views and values of the maker." This provides further reason to believe differences exist between native-directed and non-native-directed films.

Consider then, native and non-native film-makers in contact with natives while filming a production about natives. Conceivably, native film-makers may detect the "situational cues" present, and become aware of their membership in the group termed "natives." This serves to make them aware, probably not consciously, of native values which may result in these values being projected in their work. Similarly, non-native film-makers become subconsciously aware of the native group and, consequently, of their own membership in the non-native group. This, too, fosters a subconscious awareness of the values of their group which may be projected in their work. As Vanderburg (1985, p. 261) notes, "when people regard another culture through the eyes of their own — that is, via their own structures of experience — they will necessarily impose on it the sacred, the system of myths, the values, the norms...of their own culture." Therefore, Worth (in
Gross, 1981, p. 6) hypothesized that filmed accounts of natives by natives would expose aspects of their “cognition and values” which otherwise may be overlooked by non-natives. Kluckhohn and Strodtebeck (1961, p. 364) suggest that culture is inseparable from the “social structure of groups” and the “psychological systems of individuals.” Further, they contend that culture influences all human behaviour and “values especially are a pervasive cultural factor of influence.” Therefore, it is my contention that the directors of these productions, affected by, and products of, the society in which they were raised, will fall back on the dominant values of their society and these will be expressed in their work. However, the validity of this conjecture is contingent upon the degree to which native and non-native film-makers accept or reject (on a conscious level) or absorbed or learned (on a subconscious level) the dominant values of their respective groups.

These values are manifested at a number of different stages of production and post-production, for example, editing. Worth (in Gross, 1981, p. 6) thought that perhaps a person’s value and belief systems would be revealed through the manner in which one edited one’s film. Jones (1981, p. 162) agrees that editing injects bias into a film because “any scene invariably would seem to be a comment on the one that preceded it,” regardless of the film-maker’s attempt “to present a balanced, objective, picture.” Documentary film-makers, then, when filming native life, “bear witness through their choice of shots, angles, movements and framing devices” (Clanfield, 1987, p. 55); they “intrude into the stream of human life,” “choosing ‘angles and compositions,’ ‘what to film and not to film’ (Jones, 1981, p. 201). As Geertz (1973, p. 19) notes of ethnographers, documentary film-makers “inscribe...social action,” transforming it from a “passing event” into “an account” which can be referred to repeatedly. Because many authors contend that values may be reflected in editing, one part of the analysis will utilize thick description of the text (film), focussing on shots and how they are arranged, to uncover patterns.

Worth and Gross suggest that our knowledge of “how to interpret [these accounts
or] mediated symbolic events” is learned (Gross, 1981, p. 27). At a fundamental level we attribute meaning to persons, objects, or events based on stereotypes we hold of these objects or events in “real life” (Gross, 1981, p. 28). At a more advanced level one can discern meaning in the sign-events in film by their contiguity, the sequence in which the shots are arranged as well as the shots themselves. The sequence is viewed as intentional in order to imply meaning in the sign-events (Gross, 1981, p. 28). Thus the process opposite to inferring meaning, i.e., the process of implying meaning or creating “mediated symbolic events,” is probably also learned and may be performed in a manner similar to attributing meaning, that is, by stereotypes we hold of people in “real life.”

Worth (in Gross, 1981, p. 32) argues that a film is always a “created social artifact”; it communicates “the way picture-makers structure their dialogue with the world” (Worth in Gross, 1981, p. 33) which, conceivably, is conditioned by the values they hold. Martin (1976, p. 25) concurs; referring to films made about aboriginal people in northern Canada, he suggests that they “say infinitely more about our society’s myths of the moment, and the sensibilities of individual filmmakers” than they disclose about northern natives because they bear “the unique imprints of their white makers.” Therefore, “an appropriate interpretation of any picture always assumes that it was structured intentionally for the purpose of implying meaning” (Gross, 1981, p. 3). Films, rather than representing reality, compose their own “reality.” Thus we cannot simply “know” what they mean but must rely on inferences based on “learned conventions” (Gross, 1981, pp. 32, 33). As Worth (1972a, p. 75) notes of film, or any communication mode, the people (producers and audience respectively) who either imply or infer meaning “from the use of a sign in the process of communication,” must have a “common and shared significance” or system of assigning meaning to persons, objects, and events. Vanderburg (1985, p. 257) suggests that “a culture may systematically avoid making certain interconnections in its symbolic universe, although these connections may be perfectly obvious to another culture.” Also, as Balikci (1976, p. 24) argues, because film-making is “relatively inde-
pended of a literary tradition," it is likely that the codes and conventions of native filmmaking may be structured on natives' oral tradition. Therefore, native films are apt to be different than non-native films, the codes and conventions of which are structured on a literary tradition. Therefore, native film-makers and editors may shoot and edit films differently from non-native film-makers and editors. This, again, would lead one to expect differences between films made by natives and those made by non-natives as the systems of assigning meaning are culturally defined, derived, and determined.

The distinction between a mass and a public noted earlier is relevant to the discussion of the differences between native-directed and non-native-directed media products and how one's culture affects what one creates. The interaction that occurs in a public is typified presently in northern native communities. As Kulchyski (1989, p. 58) notes, interaction between Inuit producers and the Inuit community resulted in the development of "a specifically Inuit visual language" that drastically altered "both the form and content of televised communications." Significantly, the IBC's programs were regarded as reflecting "Inuit values" (Brisebois, 1983, p. 112). For example, one of the films, *Hunting a Seal*, consisted predominantly of events in "real time"; the time the events took to occur on film was virtually the same as the time it would take for the events to occur in real life. Consequently, the act of hunting a seal, as it was portrayed in this film, involved long periods of inaction, "anticipation," "boredom," and "waiting" (Kulchyski, 1989, pp. 58, 59). This can be contrasted to a film, *Nanook of the North*, covering a similar event where waiting and anticipation, significant aspects of the hunt, were not emphasized. As another example, upon comparing two films on the same Navajo subject, one made by Navajo, the other by a non-native, Worth and Adair found significant differences in what was presented in each film (Worth, 1972b, p. 101). Worth and Adair's Navajo Filmmakers Project revealed that people of different cultures created methods of structuring film which were related to their value systems (Gross, 1981, pp. 7, 14).
The native-oriented NFB productions in question are, again, but one source of information in the consensual validation process. Yet, they are an important source of information because, this researcher argues, these NFB productions, almost exclusively documentaries, are taken more seriously than other sources of information due to the prestige of the NFB and the credibility attributed to documentary productions over fictional productions. These elements should add to their persuasive power for, as Hovland et al. (1953, p. 19) maintain, the “effectiveness” or “impact” of a communicated message is conditioned by the person or institution delivering the message and the means by which it is communicated. Thus, the way in which the audience perceives the communicator, in terms of trust, confidence, “knowledge, intelligence, and sincerity,” will have an impact on the way the message is received; all are factors in judging the credibility of the communicator (Hovland et al., 1953, p. 20). Further, it appears that people are more receptive to messages they perceive as informational rather than manipulative (Hovland et al., 1953, p. 24) and this researcher contends that documentaries are perceived as informational as opposed to manipulative. Additionally, DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1982, p. 225) maintain that even more persuasive potential exists in situations in which the individual is not strongly predisposed toward the object of persuasion, as appears to be the case with the attitudes of many non-natives toward natives in Canada (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 86). Once again, group influence plays a significant role (Hovland et al., 1953, p. 137) because the media largely do not assist individuals to integrate the information they provide about social realities with the individual’s concerns and understanding of his personal and social reality (Mills, 1956, pp. 314, 315). Accordingly, people seek other persons or sources of information to validate their knowledge and experience. So it is with one source of information in the consensual validation process, National Film Board of Canada films, with which this research is concerned.
IV. HYPOTHESES

The premise behind the working hypotheses is that the portrayal of native Canadians in NFB films directed by non-natives or natives is affected by each group's set of dominant cultural values. These values are most likely reflected in their films. Thus, a number of single-tailed, directional hypotheses arise.

Because native values are predominantly humanistic and non-native values are predominantly material, it is expected that native-directed films will emphasize humanistic values while non-native-directed films will emphasize material values. Accordingly, the first hypothesis states that: native-directed films will emphasize humanistic values while non-native-directed films will emphasize material values.

Because it is believed that films of a longer duration afford directors opportunities to examine subjects in greater detail, the researcher suggests that longer films have the potential to affect audiences differently than films of a shorter duration. Therefore, it is important to examine, in an exploratory fashion, possible differences between values emphasized in long and short films. The second hypothesis, then, is that there will be a difference in the values emphasized within long productions and short productions for both native-directed and non-native-directed films.

Given the nature of native-government relations in Canada, it is expected that there will be greater support for native rights in more recent native-directed films; leading to a greater emphasis on humanistic values in more recent films as compared to earlier native-directed films. It is also expected that more recent non-native-directed films will show a decrease in the emphasis on material values. This is expected because, although public opinion research suggests the public is basically indifferent toward natives and negative stereotyping of natives continues in the media, it is the contention of the researcher that non-native NFB film-makers are sympathetic toward natives. Conse-
sequently, the third hypothesis is that: values emphasized in the productions will change over time, specifically, that more recent native-directed films will show an increased emphasis on humanistic values and that more recent non-native-directed films will show a decreased emphasis on material values.

Significantly, it should be noted this project has been undertaken from a non-native perspective since the researcher is a non-native Canadian.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

i. Introduction

Data for the research were generated through analysis of NFB productions. A combination of textual and content analysis was used for data gathering and analyzing productions in the sample. Content analysis was used in the reliability tests. Content analysis utilized a variation of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), Form E (Rokeach, 1973). This researcher used this procedure in an entirely novel fashion, patterned after earlier research by Surlin and his associates. After comparing one individual’s (the researcher’s) perceptions to a panel of judge’s perceptions for reliability purposes, the researcher continued to be the single content analyst, instead of using an entire panel from which to generate data. A pre-test and two reliability tests were conducted to assess inter-coder reliability and internal reliability for the value ratings.

ii. Sampling and Sampling Frame

The population studied was all English-language NFB productions (film and video), released between 1960 and 1989, that addressed native Canadians as their subjects and either listed in the NFB’s Film and Video Catalogue (1988), the NFB’s Video Catalogue 1989, or the NFB’s International Film and Video Guide (1987) in both the Broad Category Index under the heading “Multiculturalism - Canadian Indians,” and the “New Releases” section. The resulting population consists of eighty-three productions. The sampling frame is provided in Appendix 4.

The NFB verified the sampling frame’s exhaustiveness. The only omissions from
the sampling frame are archival films released before 1960. These films were excluded for a number of reasons. First, the expense of screening these films made their inclusion prohibitive. There is a viewing fee because of possible damage during projection. Second, because these films, located in archives in Montreal and Ottawa, are not available for distribution, very few members of the public see these films; therefore, it is unlikely that archival films are a part of the consensual validation process or have much bearing on the public’s perception of natives.

The productions in the sampling frame were first divided into two categories, "productions directed by natives" and "productions directed by non-natives" based on whether the film had a native or non-native director. A list of directors of all films in the sample was compiled. The names were checked against listings in several biographical reference texts, such as Who’s Who in Canadian Film and Who’s Who in Film. The list was also verified by the NFB. Directors were used as the standard for division in this case because it was felt that, regardless of whether natives or non-natives participate in the production, the most creative input comes from the director and, ultimately, the director has the final say in how the film will be made. The productions were then divided into long and short productions, based on the contention that, because productions of a longer duration afford the director opportunities to delve more deeply into the issue at hand, differences may exist between long and short productions. A long production is one which is more than thirty minutes, while a short production is one which is thirty minutes or less. This distinction was made arbitrarily after an evaluation of the average length of productions. The long and short productions were further divided into groups according to the decade in which they were released. This resulted in three groups: 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. Differences in the portrayal of native Canadians were expected in films from different decades because of changes in public opinion and native-government relations in Canada, especially around the introduction of the 1969 White Paper and its subsequent withdrawal in 1971.
A sample size of thirty productions (or 36% of the population) was selected based on previous research and for adequate representation of the population (Anderson, 1987, p. 172). Stratified random sampling was used to choose productions for analysis. Proportionate sampling was used to ensure that each stratum was represented proportionate to its appearance in the population. For example, the stratum “non-native-directed, long productions released in the 1980s” consists of seven productions, which is 8.4% of the population. Accordingly, 8.4% of the sample, or three productions (due to rounding), were selected from this stratum. They were chosen by drawing names from a hat. The same procedure was used until the sample of thirty productions had been selected. The result was twenty-five non-native-directed films and five native-directed films. The sample may be found in Appendix 5.

Random sampling among the remainder of the productions in the short production category was employed to select the short production used in the first reliability test. The production was A Safe Distance. While, ideally, one long and one short production should have been used in the reliability test, the justification for using one short production was to reduce the potential for respondent wear-out. The panel of judges may have become over-loaded or overwhelmed by the reliability test if longer films were used.

iii. Pre-Test and Reliability Tests

For the pre-test and first reliability test, a panel of nine judges (three males and six females) gathered in a screening room and was given a list of Rokeach’s values with three answer categories after each value: “supported,” “not supported,” and “not projected.” These lists are a variation of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) in that, instead of ranking the values, the judges were to check the appropriate answer category after each value. The panel members were required to complete both forms (one for terminal values and one for instrumental values) for each film viewed. That is, they rated a set of thirty-
six values for each film in the pre-test and reliability test. The response forms for both terminal values and instrumental values may be found in Appendix 6.

Both the panel and the researcher used the same value rating system described above. Because the tests were testing both the reliability of the method or technique (the value scales) and the reliability of the researcher's ability to rate the values in the films, the researcher rated the films in the pre-test and first reliability test at the same time as the judges.

For the purposes of this study, all judges in the reliability tests had to be non-native North Americans in order to reduce the effect of cultural differences. Also, the more homogeneous a group is the more powerful the test is in value research (Becker and Conner, 1981). All judges were made aware of the seriousness of the pre-test and the reliability test and both tests were conducted in one session. A minimum of three judges was required in order to generate enough responses for comparison to the researcher's coding. Also, an uneven number of judges was required because one method of data analysis that was used required a determination of how the majority of judges responded to each value and a fifty-fifty split was undesirable. As mentioned, there were nine judges.

At the beginning of the pre-test, a review of the list of values was undertaken to ensure everyone had a common understanding (definition) of the values and to familiarize the judges with the value scales. (The instructions are reproduced verbatim below). The object of the value rating was clearly identified; in the tests the judges were to rate the values projected in the production as a whole. Also, the researcher explained the criteria used to decide if a value is "supported," "not supported," or "not projected."

Then the pre-test was conducted in which the judges viewed a short documentary, The White Ship (not about native Canadians as this may have biased the participants). The purpose of the pre-test was to familiarize the judges with the technique before conducting the first reliability test. After viewing this film, all judges rated the values as they saw
them presented in the short documentary by checking the appropriate answer categories. Again, they were rated as “supported,” “not supported,” or “not projected.” Following this, the judges viewed the second film, *A Safe Distance*, after which they rated the values for this film. There was no discussion between, or during, the films.

Explicit instructions were given to the panel members. Because values are largely subconscious, it is somewhat difficult to state exactly what makes a value supported or not supported. However, they were told to look at the film as a whole, considering elements such as music, narration, dialogue, what action was shown on the screen, non-action, verbal and non-verbal messages, explicit and implicit comments. The exact instructions given to the panel members for the pre-test and the reliability test were as follows:

You are about to watch two short films. What I would like you to do for each film is to rate the values projected in the production as a whole. To do this you will use the respondent forms in front of you. Each form contains a list of eighteen values, thirty-six values total.

You are to rate these values according to whether they are supported, not supported, or not projected in the film. A value would be “supported” if some element of the film, whether action or non-action, verbal or non-verbal, indicates support for a particular value. A value would be “not supported” if some element in the film indicates a lack of support for the value or supports the value’s opposite. This distinction is important to understand when it comes to determining whether a value is “not projected.” Values that are “not supported” are still addressed or shown in the film. It is only when a value is not addressed or not shown that it can be considered “not projected.” Using the first value on the form as an example, if a film does not show someone who is ambitious or some example of ambitiousness, you cannot consider this value to be “supported.” However, if the film shows someone who is lazy or unambitious, the value “Ambitious” would be “not supported.” Because the film addressed the value in some way, in this example by showing its opposite, the value cannot be considered “not projected”; it could only be regarded as “not projected” if the film did not
address the value in any manner.

I will now go over the value lists with you (READ ALOUD both lists of values (Appendix 3) and their meanings provided in parentheses as defined by Rokeach).

You will rate the entire set of values twice, once for each film. I urge you to refrain from speaking to one another or discussing the film with one another while it is playing or between the first and second films.

Again, you are to rate the values projected in the production as a whole. Rate each value as either supported, not supported, or not projected.

If there are no questions we will proceed.

The instructions for the second reliability test were identical to those above. The second reliability test was conducted (at a later date) with four panel members (two of the four judges participated in the first reliability test), after the researcher had analyzed the productions in the sample. Two short films (again using short films to reduce the potential for respondent wear-out) were chosen at random from the films which the researcher analyzed. The two films selected were *Augusta* and *Rice Harvest*. The same procedure was followed for the second reliability test as was employed in the first reliability test except the pre-test was omitted. The values as the researcher rated them for these two films were compared to the values as rated by each panel member in order to test, for a second time, the reliability of the researcher's ability to perceive values projected in the films. The reliability of the technique was also calculated in the second reliability test.

a. Pre-test and First Reliability Test Results

Because this study is concerned with what values are supported, the categories "not supported" and "not projected" were collapsed into one category. The agreement scores for each value were calculated from the data generated during the pre-test and reliability test.

The criterion of eighty percent agreement was needed for acceptable inter-coder
reliability. Therefore, in order for the researcher’s perceptions to be considered reliable, the researcher had to agree with the majority viewpoint of the judges on 80% of the value ratings. The majority response (among the nine judges) for each value was determined and compared to the researcher’s response. For example, in the film used for the pre-test, *The White Ship*, for the terminal value “A sense of accomplishment,” seven of the nine judges rated the value as “supported” and the remaining two judges rated the value as “not supported/not projected.” Accordingly, the majority response for this value was the response “supported.” The researcher rated this particular value as “supported” and, therefore, was in agreement with the majority for this value. This was repeated for each of the thirty-six values. From this was determined the number of times the researcher agreed with the majority value rating. For the pre-test, the researcher agreed with the majority on 89% of the value ratings. For the reliability test, the researcher agreed with the majority on 86% of the value ratings. Thus, the successful inter-coder reliability test gave the researcher support to proceed with content analysis.

Eighty percent agreement was also desired when determining internal reliability for the value ratings. In calculating the percentage of agreement, the researcher’s responses were included with the judges’ answers (thus, agreement was tabulated using ten sets of responses). To ascertain the index of reliability for the technique, it was first determined whether eighty percentage agreement was reached for each value. If 20% or fewer responses or 80% or more responses indicated that a particular value was supported then “majority agreement” was obtained. Agreement was also achieved, then, if 20% or fewer responses or 80% or more responses categorized a particular value as not supported/not projected. Maintaining the previous example (the value “A sense of accomplishment” in the film *The White Ship*) to illustrate this procedure, of the responses (from the nine judges and one researcher) eight rated this particular value as “supported” and two rated it as “not supported/not projected.” Therefore, because 80% of the responses categorized this value similarly (as supported), majority agreement was achieved for this
value. As another example, (using the same film) the terminal value “A world of beauty” was rated as “supported” in two (20%) of the ten responses. Accordingly, majority agreement was achieved because eight (80%) of the ten responses rated this value as “not supported/not projected.” The same procedure was repeated for each of the thirty-six values. From this it was possible to calculate the number of values upon which there was eighty percent agreement. This number was then divided by the total number of values (36) to determine if there was agreement on 80% of the values in total. The results were 64% and 56% respectively for the pre-test and the reliability test.

In order to achieve at least 80% agreement overall, agreement on each value was recalculated using 70% agreement among responses for each value as the standard. This yielded 83% and 81% agreement respectively for the pre-test and the reliability test.

There may be several reasons for the lack of a high percentage of agreement on some of the values among a culturally homogeneous group. However, it is clear that the procedure works, as is indicated by the high percentages of agreement on many values (100% on some), yet it appears to be less reliable for certain values where ambiguity exists regarding whether or not they are supported within the film content.

b. Second Reliability Test Results

Inter-coder reliability and internal reliability for the second reliability test were calculated in the manner outlined above. There were four judges present for the second reliability test. While this did not present a problem with regard to internal reliability, it did present some problem in determining inter-coder reliability. Because there was an even number of judges a fifty-fifty split on some values was possible thereby preventing a majority viewpoint or response. This was the outcome for six values for the first film and ten values for the second film. These values were excluded when calculating the overall percentage of agreement.
The inter-coder reliability for the first film, *Rice Harvest*, was 83%, that is, the researcher agreed with the majority response on 83% of the values. For the second film, *Augusta*, the researcher agreed with the majority response on 73% of the values. Failure to achieve 80% agreement may have been a result of the exclusion of ten of the thirty-six values because of the lack of a majority response and the relatively small number of judges for the second reliability test thereby making a high percentage of agreement more difficult. Again, while 80% agreement is the generally accepted level for inter-coder reliability, it should be stressed that the method is being employed in an experimental manner and 80% agreement overall was achieved for three of the four films. Agreement for the fourth film fell just short of 80%, but 73% still shows a strong coder-researcher reliability. Combining the results of the four tests, one sees the average percentage of agreement was 83%, above the generally accepted level of agreement for inter-coder reliability.

For the internal reliability of the second test it was not possible to determine if there was 80% agreement on individual values. Because of the number of judges, agreement would be 100%, 75%, or 50%. Consequently, agreement on each value was calculated using 75% as the standard. The percentage of agreement for *Rice Harvest* and *Augusta* were 81% and 72% respectively.

The lack of 80% agreement overall for the second film, *Augusta*, may indicate some breakdown in the reliability of the technique. Yet, even in this instance there is strong evidence that the method works as indicated by the 100% agreement achieved on half of the total number of values (18 of 36). For *Augusta*, of the 18 values on which there was 100% agreement, ten were either humanistic or material values. There was 75% agreement on seven more values, either material or humanistic. Thus, for this film, there was a clear majority on 17 of the 20 values (11 humanistic and 9 material) with which this study is mainly concerned. For *Rice Harvest*, of the 14 values on which there was 100% agreement, eight were either material or humanistic. There was 75% agree-
ment on nine more material or humanistic values making a clear majority response on 17 of the 20 material and humanistic values. Similar findings are present in the two films of the pre-test and first reliability test. Of the 10 values on which there was 100% agreement for *The White Ship*, seven were either material or humanistic. For *A Safe Distance*, of the five values on which there was 100% agreement, four were either material or humanistic. This would seem to suggest that many of the values deemed humanistic or material are more prominently portrayed in the films and, as such, may be more readily perceived by the viewer. Additional research is needed to determine the veracity of this notion.

iv. Textual Analysis

We interpret, and make meaningful, persons, objects and events we experience and we use strategies to assign meaning to all we experience (Worth and Gross, 1974, p. 134). Using “interpretive strategies” we assume “implicative intent” and “infer meaning” of all symbolic events (such as film) (Worth and Gross, 1974, p. 137). Thus, we assume that the producer of a message is implying meaning and we infer meaning from the message. Worth and Gross (1974, p. 134) maintain that “we articulate [or create messages] in terms of the subsequent interpretations we expect, just as we imply only in those terms which we expect others to use when they infer.” Because members of a culture have a common base of experience, they usually have a “system of common signs [anything employed to refer to something else] to communicate” (Anderson and Meyer, 1988, pp. 15, 19). This process of “creating and maintaining signs” is called significiation (Anderson and Meyer, 1988, p. 15). Echoing Worth and Gross, Anderson and Meyer (1988, p. 17) suggest that “signification occurs in the representation (or creation) of our human reality; meaning occurs in the interpretation of that reality (always embedded in time, place, and creation).”
As noted, films are symbolic events. In analyzing films or symbolic events, one must recognize the differences between "existential contiguity" (for example, in the alphabet A precedes B, B precedes C, etc.) and "intentional order (sequence or pattern)" (Worth and Gross, 1974, p. 140). When one recognizes order in a film or symbolic event, one may be certain that it (the event) is communicative as opposed to existential (Worth and Gross, 1974, p. 140). Realizing the existence of structure, we employ the interpretive strategy of implication and inference. Recognizing structure involves the "assumption of intention" (Worth and Gross, 1974, p. 145); we assume the producer of the message intended to communicate something to us.

Such an interpretive strategy was used for analyzing the productions. Because several authors suggest that values are reflected in editing, textual analysis concentrated on the relationship of shots to uncover any patterns, especially among non-native-directed films as compared to native-directed films. In conducting such analysis, one may look at the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationship of shots. The syntagmatic (or temporal) meaning is the relationship of the signifier to what comes before it and what comes after it. The paradigmatic (or spatial) meaning is the choice of one signifier to the exclusion of a variety of others (Nichols, 1976, p.631). The signifier is the form of expression used to describe or refer to the content (signified). The signified is what is traditionally regarded as the content.

Examples from these films were used to illustrate the patterns which were found. The examples refer to action within shots and to how shots relate to each other according to how they were arranged in sequences. Such analysis provided textual references to the films to complement and support the value ratings of the sampled NFB productions.
CHAPTER 3

DATA ANALYSIS

i. Introduction

In all cases the value orientation of the production (material or humanistic) was the dependent variable while the director of the production, the length of the production or the release date of the production was the independent variable. Column percentages were computed to provide the information relevant for comparisons. The units of analysis are the values projected in the films.

While the distinction between long and short films was maintained when categorizing the films into decade of release in the sample, the bivariate tables comparing decade of release to material and humanistic values did not continue this distinction. The major reason for discontinuing this distinction was that there were not enough data to create stable bivariate tables. Indeed, some cells were empty. Additionally, because the differences between long and short productions in both native-directed and non-native-directed film categories were not statistically significant, it is unlikely that grouping the long and short films together before dividing them into decade of release had substantial bearing on the tables comparing the relationship between values and decade of release.

While this study was largely concerned with values supported, as was noted in explaining why the “not supported” and “not projected” categories were combined for data analysis, the distinction between values “not supported” and “not projected” was maintained in examining the first, most significant comparison, that between native-directed and non-native-directed films. This was undertaken to determine if values were overtly “not supported” which, if true, would have theoretical implications. This procedure was not followed for the analysis of native-directed films and non-native-directed
films by length and by decade of release as the number of cases in each cell was too few, as was the total number of cases, to produce stable bivariate tables. Thus, only tables showing values “supported” were used because a table showing values “not supported”/“not projected” combined would merely be a mirror image of the “supported” table.

ii. General Findings

The first two tables (Tables 1 and 2) show the ranking of the values in terms of the frequency or amount of support for each of the values from greatest to least. All values have been included and the tables maintain the distinction between terminal and instrumental values. From these tables, as can be observed from the ranking, it is apparent that the native-directed films clearly provided much more support for humanistic values than for either unclassified values or material values. This is especially true with regard to terminal values. The one unclassified value that deviates from this pattern is Family security, although the amount of support for Family security is not surprising given the importance of family and kinship relations in traditional native societies.

Another value that deviates somewhat from the expected results is the humanistic instrumental value Cheerful. It received as little or less support than three material instrumental values (Responsible, Self-controlled and Independent). It is important to note again that there is some disagreement regarding the classification of Responsible and Self-controlled as material values. Thus, the relatively high amount of support they received may not be unusual. Also, the three films in which Cheerful was “not supported” have a sombre or serious mood because of the nature of their subjects. This is especially true with regard to The Ballad of Crowfoot. This film is a visualization of a song by Willie Dunn about Crowfoot and the decimation of his people. The other two films, Poundmaker’s Lodge and Foster Child, both deal with serious subjects, a centre for natives coping with substance abuse and a young man in search of his real parents. The
TABLE 1 — RANKING OF VALUES IN NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS

Table shows ranking (from greatest to least) of frequency of support for each of the values. M and H indicate material and humanistic values respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of support (maximum of 5)</th>
<th>Amount of support (maximum of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TERMINAL VALUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>INSTRUMENTAL VALUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Equality (H)</td>
<td>5 Broadminded (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family security</td>
<td>Helpful (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner harmony (H)</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A world at peace (H)</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A world of beauty (H)</td>
<td>Forgiving (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom (H)</td>
<td>Loving (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>Imaginative (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True friendship</td>
<td>Courageous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mature love</td>
<td>3 Obedient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An exciting life</td>
<td>Polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Freedom</td>
<td>2 Cheerful (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pleasure (M)</td>
<td>Independent (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 A sense of accomplishment (M)</td>
<td>Responsible (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>1 Logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comfortable life (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social recognition (M)</td>
<td>0 Clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capable (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambitious (M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 — RANKING OF VALUES IN NON-NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS

Table shows ranking (from greatest to least) of frequency of support for each of the values. M and H indicate material and humanistic values respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of support (maximum of 25)</th>
<th>TERMINAL VALUES</th>
<th>Amount of support (maximum of 25)</th>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Independent (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>An exciting life</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ambitious (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Family security</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Courageous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Self-controlled (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Capable (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A sense of accomplishment (M)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A comfortable life (M)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A world of beauty (H)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Broadminded (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Social recognition (M)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Helpful (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wisdom (H)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pleasure (M)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Loving (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mature love</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Responsible (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A world at peace (H)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Imaginative (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inner harmony (H)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cheerful (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>True friendship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Logical Obedient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Equality (H)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Clean Forgiving (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
films leave one with a feeling of incompleteness or lack of closure and the sense that there is something terribly unjust in the events surrounding these people. Thus, the lack of support for the humanistic value Cheerful does not indicate that native-directed films lack a humanistic orientation, merely that one humanistic value is not supported in three native-directed films due to the nature of their subjects.

Indeed, the ranking of the values suggests that the native-directed films have a predominantly humanistic value orientation. Over half of the material values (5 of 9) received no support in any of the native-directed films.

In Table 2, showing non-native-directed films, it is apparent that material values were generally given more support than humanistic values, especially with regard to instrumental values, but that unclassified were mixed throughout the ranking. Indeed, with regard to terminal values, several unclassified values received more support than either material or humanistic values, the value receiving the most support being the unclassified value Freedom. Combining the great support for the value Freedom with the little support for the value Equality (the lowest ranked humanistic value and second lowest ranked terminal value), one discovers a finding similar to that of Binck and Surlin (1989) where they note Rokeach’s contention that such a ranking is indicative of a “capitalist” or material value orientation. Thus, the non-native-directed films appear to project a high concern for individual freedom but less concern for an “equally free society” (Binck and Surlin, 1989, p. 11).

Another value that deviates from what was expected is the value Responsible. The relatively low ranking of the material instrumental value Responsible may, again, be indicative of the debate or disagreement over the classification of this particular value as material.

While the non-native-directed films provide greater support for material values, the difference between the amount of support for material and humanistic values is not as dramatic as it is for the native-directed films. This may be due to the fact that the non-
native film-makers, or at least some of them, are more knowledgeable of, and sensitive to native culture, possibly because of greater positive exposure to it and a greater understanding of it, than other non-natives. Also, perhaps because of their type of work and the subjects they chose, their value orientations may be more humanistic than material.

While these general findings support the expectations of the study, it is necessary to address the specific hypotheses.

iii. Hypothesis 1

Of the twenty values of interest in this study, 15% of the values supported in native-directed films were material values while 85% of the values supported were humanistic values. For the non-native-directed films, 58% of the values supported were material values while 42% of the values supported were humanistic values (see Table 3).

From these column percentages it is evident that there are significant differences in the values supported between native-directed and non-native-directed films. The native-directed films clearly provide more support for humanistic values than material values. Support for humanistic values may be even stronger than indicated since of the eight incidents of support for material values in native-directed films, five are comprised of the two values Self-controlled (three incidents of support) and Responsible (two incidents of support). As noted the classification of these two values as material is disputed.

The difference between material and humanistic values supported in the non-native-directed films is not as dramatic as the difference in the native-directed films, but the difference is significant nonetheless ($X^2 = 32.8$, df = 1, sig. = .05). The column percentages show that the non-native-directed films provided more support for material values than humanistic values. Thus, the findings from comparisons in this table provide support for the first hypothesis.
TABLE 3 - VALUES SUPPORTED IN NATIVE-DIRECTED VS. NON-NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS

Production directed by (column percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Supported</th>
<th>Natives</th>
<th>Non-Natives</th>
<th>row totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
<td>138 (58%)</td>
<td>146 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>46 (85%)</td>
<td>100 (42%)</td>
<td>146 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>column totals</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
<td>238 (100%)</td>
<td>292 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of Freedom = 1
Unit of Analysis = values projected in films
$X^2 = 32.8$
significance = .05
TABLE 4 - VALUES NOT SUPPORTED IN NATIVE-DIRECTED VS. NON-NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS

Production directed by (column percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Not Supported</th>
<th>Natives</th>
<th>Non-Natives</th>
<th>row totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
<td>36 (28%)</td>
<td>54 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>91 (72%)</td>
<td>93 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>column totals</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td>127 (100%)</td>
<td>147 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of Freedom = 1
Unit of Analysis = values projected in films
$X^2 = 28.26$
significance = .05
Further support for the first hypothesis is present in Table 4 which addresses values “not supported.” Of the values not supported in the native-directed films, 90% were material values and 10% were humanistic values. Of the values not supported in the non-native-directed films, 72% were humanistic values and 28% were material values. As was expected there were differences between native-directed and non-native-directed films regarding the values they did not support. The native-directed films demonstrated a lack of support for material values while the non-native-directed films predominantly exhibited a lack of support for humanistic values. These findings also provide support for the first hypothesis.

Because the distribution of the cases in the table is not likely due to sampling error, the relationship between director of production and values not supported is statistically significant ($X^2 = 28.26$, df = 1, sig. = .05). This would seem to suggest that some values are overtly “not supported.” Thus, it appears that while the films directly support some values, they also directly do not support other values. In this instance such findings support the distinction between value orientations of native-directed and non-native-directed films. That is, while a native-directed film may demonstrate its humanistic orientation by supporting humanistic values, it is not necessary for material values to be “not supported” for the film to have a humanistic orientation, material values may merely be “not projected.” However, of the productions in this study the native-directed films overtly supported humanistic values and overtly did not support material values. By overtly not supporting material values instead of just not projecting such values, the native-directed films’ humanistic orientation is strengthened. The opposite is true concerning the non-native-directed films which overtly supported material values and overtly did not support humanistic values thereby strengthening their material value orientation.

In Table 5, of the values that were “not projected” in native-directed films, 73% were material values and 27% were humanistic values. In the non-native-directed films, of the values “not projected” 61% were humanistic values and 39% were material values.
TABLE 5 - VALUES NOT PROJECTED IN NATIVE-DIRECTED VS. NON-NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS

Production directed by
(column percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Not Projected</th>
<th>Natives</th>
<th>Non-Natives</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>19 (73%)</td>
<td>54 (39%)</td>
<td>73 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>7 (27%)</td>
<td>84 (61%)</td>
<td>91 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals</td>
<td>26 (100%)</td>
<td>138 (100%)</td>
<td>164 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of Freedom = 1
Unit of Analysis = values projected in films
\( X^2 = 10.21 \)
Significance = .05
Thus, native-directed films were more likely to project humanistic values in some manner and from Tables 3 and 4 it is clear they were projected in a supportive manner. The non-native-directed films were more likely to project material values and as seen in Tables 3 and 4 they were projected in a predominantly supportive manner. These findings further support the first hypothesis and follow the same pattern present in Tables 3 and 4.

In the three tables (3, 4 and 5) the native-directed films provided more support for humanistic values than material values, did “not support” more material values than humanistic values, and did “not project” more material values than humanistic values. The supported, not supported, not projected pattern in the non-native-directed films is directly opposite that present in the native-directed films. Thus, the non-native-directed films provided more support for material values than humanistic values, did “not support” more humanistic values than material values, and did “not project” more humanistic values than material values. Also common to these three tables is that the differences in percentages of support, non-support, and non-projection between humanistic and material values is greater in the native-directed films than in the non-native-directed films. Together the findings from Tables 3, 4 and 5 provide strong support for the first hypothesis.

iv. Hypothesis 2

Addressing the second hypothesis, whether there are differences between long and short productions regarding values supported, Tables 6 and 7 show the distribution of cases for native-directed and non-native-directed films respectively.

In Table 6, because two of the cells and the entire table have too few cases to properly use the Chi square test of significance, one cannot determine if the relationship is statistically significant and, therefore, one cannot assume that the two variables are dependent. However, using the column percentages, in the short films 16% of the values supported were material and 84% of the values were humanistic. This is quite similar to
**TABLE 6 - NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS, VALUES SUPPORTED BY LENGTH OF PRODUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Supported</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>row totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>26 (84%)</td>
<td>20 (87%)</td>
<td>46 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>column totals</td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of Freedom = 1  
Unit of Analysis = values projected in films  
(cell size too small for X² analysis)
TABLE 7 - NON-NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS, VALUES SUPPORTED BY LENGTH OF PRODUCTION

Length of Production  
(column percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Supported</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>row totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| column totals    | 192   | 46   | 238        |
|                  | (100%)| (100%)| (100%)     |

Degree of Freedom = 1  
Unit of Analysis = values projected in films  
$X^2 = 3.14$  
not significant
the long films in which 13% of the values supported were material and 87% of the values supported were humanistic. Thus, the second hypothesis does not hold true for the native-directed films.

In the non-native-directed films (Table 7) there is a lack of statistical significance in the relationship between length of production and values supported. Therefore, one cannot assume a relationship exists between these two variables. Looking at the column percentages it is evident that much more support was given to material values in long productions than in short productions. Yet, because the distribution of the data in the table is not statistically significant, one should be wary of inferring substantive significance although findings may have substantive meaning without being statistically significant. Thus, while this researcher must assume that the second hypothesis is not supported with regard to non-native-directed films, additional research in this area may show an association between the two variables.

v. Hypothesis 3

Tables 8 and 9 are concerned with the third hypothesis, an examination of the relationship between values supported and decade of release for native-directed and non-native-directed films respectively.

Looking at the native-directed films (Table 8) one sees that it is not possible to determine if the relationship between decade of release and values supported is statistically significant for the Chi square test cannot be used because of too few cases in two cells. Therefore, one cannot assume a strong association exists between the variables, and from the distribution of the cases in the table it is likely that the variables are unrelated.

Nevertheless, looking at the column percentages it appears that there is a pattern of high, low, high support for material values over the three decades of release, 11%, 5%,
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### TABLE 8 - NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS, VALUES SUPPORTED BY DECADE OF RELEASE OF PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values Supported</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>8 (89%)</td>
<td>18 (95%)</td>
<td>20 (77%)</td>
<td>46 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Totals</strong></td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>19 (100%)</td>
<td>26 (100%)</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of Freedom = 2  
Unit of Analysis = values projected in films  
(cell size too small for X² analysis)
**TABLE 9 - NON-NATIVE-DIRECTED FILMS, VALUES SUPPORTED BY DECADE OF RELEASE OF PRODUCTION**

Decade of Release of Production  
(column percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Supported</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>row totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>28 (60%)</td>
<td>55 (50%)</td>
<td>55 (69%)</td>
<td>138 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>19 (40%)</td>
<td>55 (50%)</td>
<td>25 (31%)</td>
<td>99 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>column totals</td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>110 (100%)</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
<td>237 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of Freedom = 2  
Unit of Analysis = values projected in films  
$X^2 = 6.45$  
not significant
and 23% for the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s respectively. This may, at first, seem to suggest a relationship between the changing cultural milieux of different decades and the values projected in films which reflect these changes. In this case it could be hypothesized that natives, or native directors, are being co-opted by the dominant non-native material society as suggested by the dramatic increase in support for material values in films released in the 1980s. Yet, upon closer examination, one sees that the six incidents of support for material values are comprised largely of support for the two disputed values Responsible (two incidents of support) and Self-controlled (two incidents of support). Taking this into account and adjusting the percentages accordingly the pattern becomes less apparent. Thus, the third hypothesis does not hold true for native-directed films.

For non-native-directed films (Table 9) comparing decade of release by values supported, the relationship is not statistically significant. Accordingly, the variables are likely unrelated. Looking at the column percentages one sees a pattern of high, low, high support for material values over the three time periods similar to that in the native-directed films. This, as previously suggested, may be a product or reflection of a changing cultural climate. Yet, because the differences are not large and lack statistical significance, one cannot, with any certainty, assume substantive significance, and that there is an association between the two variables. Accordingly, the findings from Table 9 also do not support the third hypothesis.

vi. Textual Analysis

After viewing several of the films, a pattern became apparent in the non-native-directed films. In many of these films natives are portrayed as being caught in a dilemma between two ways of life, a traditional native lifestyle and a contemporary non-native lifestyle. Many of these films imply that natives must choose between the two
ways of life. In a number of films, *Cesar's Bark Canoe, Bella Bella, Haida Carver* and *Man Who Chooses the Bush*, this is expressed by the juxtaposition of a series of shots, ones showing natives, usually elders, performing a ritual dance, conducting a spiritual ceremony or practicing traditional crafts, with shots showing natives, usually youths, engaged in less traditional, predominantly non-native activities.

For example, in *Cesar's Bark Canoe*, shots of Cesar working on the bark canoe are juxtaposed with shots of native children playing with each other and with a dog. They are oblivious to Cesar. In examining the paradigmatic meaning of these shots one must determine why they are included to the exclusion of any number of other shots. It is inferred that the director had a definite communicative intent in structuring the sequence of shots in that particular fashion. By juxtaposing shots of young natives and old natives, the director is implying a comparison between the traditional and the contemporary. The sequence of shots implies that the children are not interested in learning the skill of bark canoe building from Cesar and, by extension, are not interested in traditional native culture. The logical conclusion of such an implication is the suggestion that traditional native culture is dying. This is evidenced again in a later sequence in which many (too many) young natives are shown in an aluminum canoe departing from the river bank. They jeer at Cesar who tirelessly continues building his birch bark canoe. Again, the juxtaposition of the young and old suggests a comparison between the traditional and the modern. Because so many natives are shown in the aluminum canoe, the implication is that the modern is preferable to the traditional. Implicit in these sequences, and in similar sequences in the other films mentioned above, is the suggestion that traditional native culture is, of necessity or neglect, dying and that natives must pursue more “mainstream” endeavours in order to survive. Because of the presence of this dilemma these films rarely supported the humanistic value Inner harmony. It was implied that natives were tormented by this inner conflict between two cultures.

Other non-native-directed films imply a similar notion of a dying culture in the
choice of their subjects. *Augusta* portrays an eighty-eight year-old Indian woman who lives alone in a cabin without electricity or running water. The film suggests she is the last of a dying people. *The Last Mooseskin Boat* details the return of a native elder to his people, the Shuhtaotive tribe, to build one last boat of mooseskins. He is the only surviving member of his people with such knowledge. *Haida Carver* shows the art of carving as quaint yet dying because no young people, except one, are interested in learning the craft and carrying on the tradition. These films all suggest that dying native culture is tragic yet seemingly inevitable as younger generations of natives pursue other interests.

However, what the films fail to recognize is that native lifestyles have been changing continually and a “traditional” native lifestyle is no longer a real option; it has been modified. The choice, if indeed there is one, would be between a modified native lifestyle containing significant elements of traditional ways of life and an open acceptance of Western lifestyle.

Yet, as can be inferred from the native-directed films, the dilemma of choosing between two lifestyles is a non-issue; it doesn’t exist. In these films natives are portrayed as being native regardless of how their lifestyles have adapted or changed; they remain native ways of life. For example, in *Christmas at Moose Factory*, the children express, through drawings, their way of life which includes travelling with their parents by snowmobile. Such activity is portrayed as no less native or unnatural than travelling by dog-sled. Implicit in this and other native-directed films is the feeling or belief that native lifestyles will continue to adapt and change, continue to be different from non-native Canadian lifestyles, continue to be native.

I would not agree that natives’ belief that their lifestyles will change but continue to be different from non-native lifestyles is a naïve belief for, from the films, it is apparent that natives are aware of the pervasive influence of Western ideology, lifestyles and technology, and they contend that they can and will utilize aspects of these elements, incorporating them into their existing lifestyle. As Redbird (1977, p. 19) maintains,
“whether an Indian extends himself in a traditional way or in a technological way,
whether he lives as a rural Indian or an urban Indian, the important thing is not what he
does, but rather the manner in which he relates to his particular world and universe.”
Thus, as was noted previously, natives seem to proceed from the belief that technology
does not create certain social relationships, instead social structure determines the manner
in which technology will be used (Kulchyski, 1989, p. 51).
CHAPTER 4

I. CONCLUSIONS

It would seem the assumption that the dominant values of one’s society would be reflected in one’s work is applicable to the situation of native and non-native film-makers at the NFB. As the findings of the study indicate, the films had a value orientation similar to the dominant value orientation of the society of which the maker of the film is a member.

This was most readily apparent in the native-directed films in which the difference between the amount of support for the dominant values in their society (humanistic values) and the dominant values in non-native society (material values) was substantial. Further, the overt support of humanistic values and overt non-support of material values suggests that the native film-makers have a clear idea of what they wish to imply in the films: the introduction and reinforcement of traditional native values and, by extension, native spirituality and way of life. Conceiving of the film-makers’ communicative intent in this manner finds support in the contention of one native film-maker, Alanis Obomsawin, (in agreement with Grierson), that film should “transform people,” even instigate “social reform” (Alioff and Levine, 1987, p. 11). Thus, there is a definite communicative intent in using film as a vehicle to stress the importance of one’s culture and, in this case, express the belief that “it’s O. K. to be an Indian” (Alioff and Levine, 1987, p. 13).

The significance of such an intent is elucidated by acknowledging that, apart from being used by schools and other institutions and people worldwide who want to learn about natives, the films are used by natives themselves (Alioff and Levine, 1987, p. 15). Consequently, it is probably through these films that natives are exposed to a more accurate representation of themselves and their way of life than they have witnessed in non-native media products.
While not as great as for the native-directed films, there were differences nonetheless in the non-native-directed films between the amount of support for the dominant values in non-native society (material values) and the dominant values in native society (humanistic values). As with the native film-makers, the non-native film-makers tended to support, in their films, the values dominant in their society. Additionally, they did not support values dominant in native society to any great extent. The fact that the differences were not as large in the non-native-directed films leads one to conclude, as was mentioned in a preliminary cautionary note, that some non-native film-makers may be more sensitive to natives and may not support all of the dominant (material) values in non-native society and, therefore, may have a more humanistic orientation which is reflected in their films. Were a non-native with a more clearly material value orientation to make films about natives this researcher would hypothesize that the difference between support for material and humanistic values would be greater than is present in the non-native-directed films in this study.

The lack of support for the second and third hypotheses tends to provide further support for the first hypothesis by suggesting that the tendency for the dominant values in the film-maker's society to be projected in his or her work is not conditioned by the other two variables in question. Support is consistent within the native and non-native categories without regard for length of production or time period in which the production was released.

The finding that non-native films do not provide as much support for humanistic values as do native-directed films, but provide support for some may have a positive aspect. If people whose value orientation is highly materialistic are exposed to native-oriented productions they may reject totally the native-directed films because they represent a value orientation too foreign or far removed from their own. These people may, however, be more accepting of productions which have a more even mixture of humanistic and material values such as the non-native-directed films. This represents a process of
channeling or gradual exposure and movement toward a more humanistic orientation, or at least a greater understanding or tolerance of those who hold such an orientation.

Nevertheless, there is the problem of misrepresentation, the question of whether the non-native-directed films, providing more support for material values than humanistic values, portray natives inaccurately. Clearly some do and this is problematic. But others, such as *Circle of the Sun, The Beauty of My People* and *Wandering Spirit Survival School* appear to be sensitive portrayals of native lifestyle and culture, and taken individually reflect a largely humanistic value orientation. Therefore, these non-native-directed films may be beneficial in breaking some media stereotypes of natives and promoting greater understanding or acceptance of native lifestyle.

From the findings of this study it is evident that the native-oriented NFB films directed by natives and the native-oriented NFB films directed by non-natives play two different roles in the consensual validation process, each reinforcing the value orientation dominant in their society. Additionally, they each have a different view of native lifestyle. The native-directed films optimistically portray a changing, adapting but, nevertheless, native way of life, while the non-native-directed films generally lament over the disappearance of traditional native customs and imply that native culture is dying. Accordingly, how the films are used and who the audiences are will largely determine what impact or influence they will have in the consensual validation process.

Stopping short of suggesting that non-natives should not make films about natives, this researcher believes that natives are better served by media portrayals created by natives themselves. Dominated groups in society undoubtedly benefit from opportunities to express themselves, to present themselves and life as they see it, both to themselves and to others, with the hope of fostering greater understanding among different groups of people.
II. CRITIQUE OF STUDY

First, it is necessary to re-examine Surlin and Squire’s (1987) classification of the values identified by Rokeach into material and humanistic values, specifically with regard to Self-controlled and Responsible. There may be some difficulty with conceptualizing these two values as material values for acting humanely toward others, being helpful, forgiving, loving and striving for wisdom and a world of peace necessitate some measure of responsibility and self-control.

Second, there may be a possible methodological problem using Rokeach’s values with natives. This researcher concurs with Binck and Surlin (1989) that research should be conducted to determine the validity, not only of the Rokeach Value Survey as used in their study, but also the variation thereof used in this study. Although values are basically universal, because Rokeach’s selection of instrumental values was based on those deemed important in American society, research must be undertaken to ascertain whether Rokeach’s list of values is sufficiently comprehensive as to properly represent all values deemed important in native society.

Third, concerning the sampling procedure, perhaps it would have been beneficial to have done disproportionate sampling or to have taken a larger sample entirely in order to get more native-directed films. This would have eliminated the potential problems in data analysis resulting from too few cases in some of the bivariate tables.

III. FURTHER RESEARCH

The ideal complementary study would be for a native student to replicate this study in order to determine if there are differences in the values projected in the same sample of films when viewed from a native perspective. Further research could compare
the values projected in the same sample of productions as perceived by non-natives and natives. One may also do a similar study comparing Inuit-oriented NFB films by Inuit directors to those made by non-Inuit directors. A study could be conducted using American films directed by native and non-native Americans. Additional research could examine reviews of the sample productions in local and national newspapers, magazines, trade magazines, etc., to determine whether critics are selecting and reinforcing particular values in the productions. Another avenue of research may concentrate on the values projected in native-oriented productions that were not made by, or in affiliation with, the National Film Board of Canada. Additional research may also include an examination of the NFB's archival films, some of which are located at the Moving Image and Sound Archives in Ottawa.
EPILOGUE

Brothers and Sisters the natural law is the final and absolute authority governing 'Etinohah' — the earth we call our mother. This law is absolute, with retribution in direct ratio to violations. This law has no mercy; it will exact what is necessary to maintain the balance of life. This law is timeless and cannot be measured by the standards of mankind. All life is subject, absolutely, to this authority. Water is our bodies; water is life. Fresh water is maintained by the thundering grandfathers, who bring rain to renew the springs, streams, rivers, lakes and oceans. We are nourished by our mother — the earth — from whom all life springs. We must understand our dependence on her and protect her with our love, respect and ceremonies. The faces of our future generations are looking up to us from the earth; and we step with great care not to disturb our grandchildren.

We are part of the great cycle of life, with four seasons and endless renewal, as long as we abide by this absolute law. When we disturb this cycle by interfering with the elements, changing or destroying species of life, the effects may be immediate or they may fall upon our children who will suffer and pay for our ignorance and our greed. The natural law says that the earth belongs to our grandchildren — seven generations into the future — and we are the caretakers who must understand, respect and protect 'Etinohah' for all life.

The natural law is that all life is equal in the great creation; and we the human beings, are charged with the responsibility (each in our generation) to work for the continuation of life. We the human beings, have been given the original instructions on how to live in harmony with the natural law. It now seems that the natural world people are the ones who have kept to this law. The Elder circle of indigenous people of the Great Turtle Island, charged with keeping the first law of life (spirituality), are concerned that the validity of this law no longer is recognized in today's life. We are concerned that the basic principles of the law are no longer being passed on to the next generation. This could be fatal to life as we know it.

The natural law will prevail regardless of man-made laws, tribunals and governments. People in nations who understand the natural law are self-governing, following the principles of love and respect that ensure freedom and peace. We come together because we are alarmed by the destruction of vital life structures. Our faith is intertwined with one another; what affects one will affect all.

Water is primary to life; corn is next. Poisoned water will poison all life; lack of water causes droughts, deserts and death. The nations that sit in the great council of the United Nations must relearn the natural law and govern themselves accordingly, or face the consequences of their actions. There are people in nations who understand this message; and we ask you to stand with us and support our songs and ceremonies in defense of 'Etinohah' (our mother earth). We are, respectfully, a traditional circle of Elders.

— Statement presented by Elders of the Iroquois Nation to the United Nations General Assembly, 29 August 1982
CODA

Civilization originates in conquest abroad and repression at home.

Stanley Diamond

Civilization is just a passing phase like the hoola hoop and the skateboard; if we wait long enough it will disappear.

Clyde Warrior

Each civilization has its own methods of suicide.

H. A. Innis
ENDNOTES

1 A disagreement, beginning in the spring of 1990, over the town of Oka's proposed expansion of a golf course, which would encroach upon land considered sacred by Mohawk Indians from the Kanesatake reserve near Oka, Quebec, escalated into several weeks of armed standoffs between Mohawks and the Surete du Quebec (Quebec's provincial police force) who were later relieved by Canadian Armed Forces. Natives blocked roads in the area to attract attention to their situation and in an attempt to persuade the government to finally acknowledge aboriginal rights and land claims. Natives from the Kahnawake reserve showed support by maintaining a blockade at the Mercier Bridge, thereby disrupting access into Montreal. Similar demonstrations of support by natives occurred across Canada. In September 1990, the Mohawks put down their weapons and allowed themselves to be captured. This ended the armed confrontation but not the debate over native rights in Canada.

2 The terms “legal,” “status,” and “registered” are synonymous.

3 Nations (commonly referred to as tribes) are a “group of native people having common characteristics in terms of language, culture, history and appearance” (Pot Pouri, 1977, p. 11).

4 Basically, all aboriginal nations in Canada belong to one of ten linguistic groups: Algonkian, Iroquoian, Siouan, Athapaskan, Kootenayan, Salishan, Wakashan, Tsimshian, Haida, and Tlingit (Pot Pouri, 1977, p. 11). Within these ten linguistic groups reside fifty-four “separate and distinct” native languages each of which is comprised of several “local dialects and variations” (Ellis, E., 1977, p. 7).

5 This is no longer the case. One may be a status Indian with band membership but not in a particular band, just a kind of general membership.

6 There are about 500,000 status Indians in Canada, about 400,000 to 500,000 Metis and non-status Indians, and about 32,000 Inuit (Walkom, 1990a, p. A1). Perhaps the largest concentration of natives in Canada, between 40,000 and 70,000, is in Toronto (Walkom, 1990e, p. A1).

7 This may, at first, seem problematic but it may not be because values are considered to be basically universal, although more research is needed in this area. See Chapter 4 for more on this issue.

8 Only a few tribes gained the respect of the European colonizers. For example, the Pueblo Indians of the New Mexico region who, as peasant farmers, "gained the admiration of the Spanish because they shared many of the same values" (Matijasic, 1987, p. 46).
9 Macdonald was the first Minister of Indian Affairs at the same time he was Prime Minister.

10 Many of the federal programs developed solely for Indians, such as, "medical care, housing, welfare, and economic development," do not stem from the Indian Act. While some of these services are provided according to treaties, even non-treaty Indians view the provision of these services as the responsibility of the federal government (Weaver, 1981, p. 19). Yet, while the treaties provide treaty Indians with at least some protection of land, hunting, fishing and trapping rights, it is the Act, seen as a means of social control, that regulates the relationship between status Indians and the remainder of Canadian society.

11 Because the Indian Act based citizenship through enfranchisement on cultural characteristics, "only Indians who fit the dominant cultural mode could be full citizens" (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 22).

12 Bands rarely approved requests for enfranchisement for the reason that because the Indian would own land on an Indian reserve, and could leave the land to whomever he chose, the possibility arose that non-natives could secure this land and settle on the reserve (Miller et al, 1978, p. 68).

13 The system of wardship or special status was not applied to Inuit and some outlying Indian groups, for example in Newfoundland and Labrador (Tanner, pp. 17, 18). The system of wardship, as Chamberlain notes, is supported somewhat by non-native attitudes toward native people (Chamberlain, 1975, p. 35).

14 It was not until the mid 1960s that the churches' role declined and education became secularized (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 20).

15 For fear of punishment, natives who participated in rituals such as smoking a ceremonial pipe or burning sweetgrass did so in secret. They even found it necessary to conceal their behaviour from Christian natives (Walkom, 1990e, p. A29).

16 Assimilation was not de-emphasized until after WWII when the idea of cultural pluralism began to become accepted (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 18).

17 The Indian and Inuit Affairs Programme is only a part of DIAND. Sometimes they have views and interests which conflict (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. xv). The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was created in 1966 (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, p. 15). DIAND is also referred to as the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (DINA). It has also been known as DIA and IAD.

18 In the Indian Act of Canada, the definition of an Indian is the "strictest and narrowest" of any country’s definition of a native or aboriginal person (Manuel and
Posluns, 1974, p. 241). This restrictive definition stems from the penchant for non-native society to use “racial characteristics and traditional cultural elements” to define who are Indians (Tennant, 1985, p. 322). Presently, contemporary natives’ deviation from these criteria was proposed as justification for refusal to acknowledge natives’ “claims to aboriginal rights;” they were no longer “Indians” (Tennant, 1985, p. 323). The end result is that racial myths justified non-native expropriation of native land (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 221).

19 Gibbins and Ponting (1984) have demonstrated that native self-governments, if structured as recommended in the Penner Report, would actually have powers that considerably exceeded those of the provincial governments.

20 DIAND health and education programs had already begun being transferred to provincial control during the 1940s and 1950s and this practice was “adopted as policy in 1964” (Weaver, 1981, p. 196).

21 While only half of status Indians are also treaty Indians, the treaties are still considered significant. This view persists because, symbolically, native rights are thought to stem from treaties with the government, although legally the majority of native rights are grounded in the Indian Act (Weaver, 1981, p. 19).

22 The federal government is currently negotiating with seven native organizations to give 29 bands some form of limited self-government. Two of these are the Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en of British Columbia (Walkom, 1990a, p. A8).

23 The disparate perspectives as to the type of relationship between natives and the government “desired” by natives stem from differences in “historical development, culture, and ideology” of various tribes (Long et al., 1984, p. 72).

24 While the Ministry of Indian Affairs was trying to bring native self-government into “fruition,” its efforts were curtailed by more general governmental policies which strictly delineated how funds would be spent (Nicholson, 1984, p. 63). Compounding the problem, the federal government recently cut ten million dollars from the money allotted to native groups and native media (Walkom, 1990a, p. A8).

25 Natives were permitted to hunt, fish, and trap on the land referred to in the treaties except in areas to be utilized for settlement, mining, etc. Additionally, the federal government was obligated to supply a land base (reserve), the size of which was dependent upon the population, for native bands (Whyte, 1984, p. 106).

26 For this reason many bands have filed land claims with the provincial and federal governments. There are 63 claims in Ontario alone which involve large portions of the province (Walkom, 1990a, p. A8).
27 When one considers that there are 573 Indian bands in Canada, the difficulties involved in giving all of them nationhood status becomes apparent (Flanagan, 1985, p. 373).

28 International law is currently searching for some kind of balance between the two (Whyte, 1984, p. 104).

29 There are differences between native government and sovereignty association as outlined by Quebec (Weaver, 1984, p. 66). The notion of sovereignty implies a system of hierarchical authority which entails a “ruling entity” which is not amenable to traditional native political systems (Boldt and Long, 1984, p. 549).

30 Inuit and status Indians are the most similar among all native groups in terms of their “approaches” toward self-government because both have “identifiable land” bases and are under federal jurisdiction. Metis relate predominantly with provincial governments and do not have specified land bases (Little Bear et al, 1984, pp. 179, 180).

31 While Japanese-Canadians have received compensation for being detained in internment camps during World War II, natives have not received an apology for being interned on reserves (Walkom, 1990e, p. A28).

32 This will be demonstrated in subsequent sections.

33 The differences are more distinct in remote and northern communities but are still evident in geographically closer areas.

34 This organization represents status Indians. The Native Council of Canada is the national association for Metis and non-status Indians.

35 The chief-as-local-government system was not deployed in northern regions until recently (1950s) with the introduction of welfare services (Tanner, 1983, p. 17).

36 The band may be likened to a municipality. Yet, it has no “formal relationship” to the provincial government of its area and its relationship to the federal government is through DINA (Tanner, 1983, p. 20).

37 Weaver maintains that DIAND has neglected “people-oriented policy” (1984, pp. 66, 67).

38 Population estimates of natives before European contact are not very accurate and vary widely. Early estimates put the population at between one and three million, but later estimates place it closer to ten or twelve million (Newcomb, 1974, pp. 15-17). More recent estimates suggest there were over seven million aboriginal people on the North American continent in the area north of Mexico, five million in the U. S. and about two
million in Canada (Thornton, 1987). While actual population estimates are still disputed, there is a consensus that the area of the Plains had a fairly low population density compared to other regions.

39 The permanence of these stereotypes can be witnessed in a contemporary example of the stoic Indian sidekick, a "modern version of Tonto," the character Jesse Jim on CBC's television series *The Beachcombers* (David, 1989, p. 7).

40 Native actors were not used for lead roles as this was not yet an accepted practice. When deciding whether to cast a native actor or a well known non-native actor to play a native character, film companies generally opted for the economically safer practice of using an established white actor and painting him red. This was especially true during the height of the studio or star system. When savage Indians were needed the studios often used actors, such as Bela Lugosi, Lon Chaney Jr., or Boris Karloff, who had become popular in the horror genre. Similarly, comic Indian characters were sometimes played by recognized comedians: the Marx Brothers, Buddy Hacket, Joey Bishop, and Buster Keaton (Bataille and Silet, 1985, p. xxiii). The practice of employing non-native actors to play native lead roles is widespread today as evidenced by CTV's television movie *Divided Loyalties* (1990) in which a white actor plays the native hero (Johnson, 1990, p. 52).

41 An example of misrepresentation in this film is the fact that Hiawatha was Iroquois, not Ojibway.

42 Bataille and Silet (1985, p. xxii) argue that the studios felt it was "necessary to keep the American Indian frozen in this stereotype" for economic reasons. The stereotyped image had proven itself commercially viable and the film industry was reluctant to alter or eliminate it.

43 Working in concert with the negative stereotypes in making the displacement of natives from their land more acceptable, were the originally low population estimates of natives on the continent (Newcomb, 1974, p. 16) which made the "problem" seem smaller or more contained, when in reality it just made the extermination of natives more palatable.

44 The detrimental consequences of viewing all natives as ethnically or racially identical have been demonstrated in section ii of Chapter 1.

45 The terms "memorial" and "house" poles were used to describe the poles of the Haida because, according to Waubageshig (1971), "the word 'totem' is an Algonquin term and its usage in describing the magnificent creations of the Coastal Indians can be blamed on the ignorance of the European."

46 Evidence to the contrary is presented in sections vii and ix of Chapter 1.
47 Because an attitude is an orientation toward objects or situations, the result of "the application of a general value to concrete objects" (Surlin and Squire, 1987, p. 11), if one perceives differences in value orientations between oneself and another, it is conceivable that one may have a negative attitude toward the other.

48 These perceptions all correspond to Haycock's (1971, p. 90) findings in print media of natives as "lazy, shiftless and negligent."

49 Some indication that the Board itself recognized some of their films as such is evident in their decision to change the sound track of a native-oriented film, Longhouse People, because it was deemed "patronizing" (Driscoll, 1977).

50 The social significance of the issue of aboriginal rights addressed in the film Our Land is Our Life, becomes apparent when one considers that the James Bay Hydroelectric Project was the "biggest electric power project in the world" and that aboriginal title to the land eventually surrendered by Cree and Inuit in negotiations with the Quebec government involved a "410,000 square-mile area...60% of the province's land mass" (Ianzeo, 1977, p. 28).

51 Others have undertaken similar endeavours with native children using a variety of media (Polaroid cameras, audio recorders, and videotape) based on a similar premise that "media can help to reinforce the child's sense of himself" (Moscovitch, 1977, p. 13). Similarly, Vern Harper (1977, p. 16), one of the founders of the Wandering Spirit Survival School, supports the use of media, especially videotape, citing its usefulness in helping native children develop a "positive image" of themselves. Obomsawin (1977, pp. 23-25) agrees that it is important to work with children or for children. Accordingly, apart from her films she also creates multi-media kits for children using a variety of media, including film-strips, slide sets, posters, toys, maps and photographs. The goal of these multi-media kits is to introduce native children to their tradition and language.

52 The situation at the Board has been changing more rapidly recently as more opportunities for natives to express themselves have arisen. Graydon McCrea, Regional Director of the Edmonton office of the NFB, is currently developing a Native Programme. Also, at the time of writing this thesis, Alanis Obomsawin and other natives were filming the events surrounding the blockades at Oka and Kahnawake, addressing the dispute over land and the larger issues of native rights and native self-government.

53 Other natives have been working toward a similar end. After the dissolution of the native film crew at the NFB, some of the natives worked in other media. For example, Mike Mitchell developed multi-media projects in his capacity as director of the North American Indian Travelling College. They were created in several native languages and also in English to "help the non-native population to a better understanding" (Mitchell, 1977, pp. 2, 4).
54 This is not to suggest that values dominant in non-native society such as ambitiousness or greed are only characteristic of non-natives. As Cardinal (1977, pp. 220, 34) despairingly notes of some Indian bands in Alberta, made wealthy from their oil and gas resources, their goal seems to be, not sharing their wealth with other native people, but attempting to increase their personal riches.

55 This is discussed further in the next section.

56 Warfare among aboriginal peoples resembled rituals; actually taking a life was rare (Diamond, 1974, p. 156). For example, warfare as practiced among some tribes of the Plains region involved touching the enemy either with some hand-held implement (coup stick) or some part of the body. This was referred to as “to count coup on.” Regarded as the bravest act undertaken by any person was to “count coup on” another person leaving him alive, unscathed (George Bird Grinnell in Diamond, 1974, pp. 156, 157). Additionally, as Boldt and Long (1984, p. 547) note, “victorious tribes did not colonize vanquished tribes” as Europeans did; they would not “deprive another nation of its right to self-determination and to sufficient lands and resources to maintain the lives of its people” (David Ahenakew in Boldt and Long, 1984, p. 547). Accordingly, “it is a myth of European warfare that one man’s victory requires another’s defeat” (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 4).

57 While many tribes in Canada used other words, in their own language, they all expressed similar feelings or sentiments to describe the land upon which they lived.

58 With regard to their limited notion of “private” property, in keeping with their belief that “everything in nature is possessed of a spirit, and that the spirits of the articles devoted to the deceased depart with him and are used in the spirit world,” natives burned or buried the deceased’s belongings with the body (McLean, 1889, p. 31; Frazer, 1951, p. 129). This also shows the lack of obsession with personal property which characterizes modern society and the divergent conceptions of inheritance. While natives protected the earth for future generations and passed along the history and customs of their people as their children’s inheritance, non-natives tend to conceive of inheritance as the acquisition of money and personal property. As such, natives appear to have lacked selfishness (Deloria, 1911, p. 50). Again, this native value system based on equality and sharing is contradictory to dominant Western value systems (Page, 1982, p. 153).

59 The government, in 1971, probably in an attempt to appease natives after the White Paper disaster, initiated a program to increase economic development (more likely economic growth) in native communities, the true aim of which, it has been suggested, was to “spur the integration of the Indians’ economy or business sector into the Canadian economy” (Nicholson, 1984, p. 60). This, it was hoped, would hasten the assimilation process.

60 This welfare or situation of dependency, “economic sub-normality,” is a normative condition with regard to natives while many non-natives on welfare consider it
abnormal (Tanner, 1983, p. 32). As one native Canadian, a member of the Tem-Augama Anishnabai tribe, maintains, Canada is built on native land and resources, therefore, natives should not feel guilty or abnormal about accepting welfare, it is owed to them (LaRonde, 1990).

61 A gentils is someone decendent from a person and who bears the same name as that person. Depending upon the tribe and the time period, descent was traced through the male line, female line, or sometimes both (Morgan, 1877, p. 283).

62 In modern terms, tribe and clan have replaced gens (Morgan, 1877, p. 65).

63 “Story-telling,” used for “moral teaching,” “practical instruction,” and “theoretical instruction,” whether concerning politics or astronomy (Finnegan, 1988, p. 64), was an important aspect of native education. As Levi-Strauss contends, “the aesthetic and poetic is fused with the logical and rational in primitive thought” (Heyer, 1988, p.108). Natives did not separate the arts and sciences. Learning was holistic; it began with the whole and studied each segment all the time relating it to the whole. The exploration of knowledge began within the self and was imminently connected to the “natural order” of which the self was a part (Pelletier, 1974, p.104). Thus, interpretation of the stories used to educate was always relative and was to be applied to the listener’s own life and context (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 37). This is contrary to the Western educational system’s inherent “frustrations” and “challenges” which facilitate anger, aggression, and competition (Pelletier, 1974, p. 106). Here individual achievement is rewarded by placing the individual in control of other students or by granting him or her special privileges. This is antithetical to native tradition where everyone was considered equal (Benedict, 1977, pp. 17, 18). Subsequently, the structure of the schools natives were forced to attend did not recognize native culture or their relationship to the land (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 190). European/Western education is antithetical to the native style of learning which was not segmented into subjects or disciplines without relation to each other.

64 One example is the use of portable tape-recorders at various native meetings to bring the words of the speaker to disparate tribes (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 235).

65 The belief that the European notion of progress was an inevitability for all societies was the underlying premise of the assimilation argument (Manuel and Posluns, 1974, p. 252).

66 The closest any conception of the notion of progress comes in native societies is “spiritual transformation” (Diamond, 1974, p. 40).

67 It has already been demonstrated that value orientations among the hundreds of tribes of aboriginal people were largely similar, that traditionally these values differ from the dominant values in contemporary Canadian society, and that the value orientations of contemporary natives continue to differ from those of the majority in Canadian society.
68 Four of the thirty films in the sample (*The Wake, Ikwe, Sauk-Ai*, and *Places Not Our Own*) were dramatic narratives, not documentaries.

69 During the course of this research the author became aware of several other native-oriented NFB films which were not listed in any of the aforementioned NFB catalogues. It is likely that they were not listed because they were removed from circulation. Their release dates are such that it is unlikely they are archival films. Subsequently, the reasons for removing them from circulation remain unknown.

70 A similar pattern was discovered in literature referring to native-oriented films directed by non-natives, specifically *Cold Journey* and *Kevin Alec* (Yesno, 1977; Shaffer, 1977).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Nations in Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abnaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algonguin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assiniboine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atsina (Gros Ventre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Bella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Coola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcotin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipewyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa (Ojibwa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogrib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitskan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Georgia Salish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haisla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiltsuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingalik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iroquois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowhawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscarora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koyukon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwakiutl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillooet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micmac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montagnais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabrasna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naskapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nespellem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nootka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains Cree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains Ojibwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanpoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulteaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahltan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanaina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlingit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsetsaut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsimshian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutchone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowknives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Spencer, 1977, pp. 538-541)
APPENDIX 2–SUB-ARCTIC CULTURE AREA

(Sturtevant, 1980, p. ix)
NORTHWEST COAST CULTURE AREA

(Spencer, 1977, p. 117)
PLATEAU CULTURE AREA

(Spencer, 1977, p. 167)
PLAINS CULTURE AREA

(Western Sub-Arctic)

(Plains Cree)

(Plains Ojibwa)

(Crow)

(Hidatsa, Mandan, Arikara)

(Yankton, Yankton (Dakota))

(Sisseton, Sisseton (Dakota or Santee Dakota))

(Pawnee)

(Southern Cheyenne)

(Arapaho, Wind River Shoshone)

(Atsina, Gros Ventre)

(Piegans, Blackfoot)

(Blood, Sarsi)

(Basin)

(Ute)

(Jicarilla, Apache)

(Comanche)

(Southwest)

(Kiowa, Apache, Wichita)

(Osage)

(Missouri)

(Iowa, Oto)

(Kansa)

(Comanche)

(Lipan Apache)

(Southeast)

(Northeast (Eastern Woodlands))

(Blair, 1977, p. 315)
EASTERN WOODLANDS CULTURE AREA

(Sturtevant, 1978, p. ix)
APPENDIX 3--TERMINAL AND INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Terminal Values

A comfortable life (a prosperous life)
An exciting life (a stimulating active life)
A sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution)
A world at peace (free of war and conflict)
A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)
Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
Family security (taking care of loved ones)
Freedom (independence, free choice)
Happiness (contentedness)
Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)
Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
National security (protection from attack)
Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
Salvation (saved, eternal life)
Self-respect (self-esteem)
Social recognition (respect, admiration)
True friendship (close companionship)
Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)

Instrumental Values

Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)
Broadminded (open-minded)
Capable (competent, effective)
Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)
Clean (neat, tidy)
Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)
Forgiving (willing to pardon others)
Helpful (working for the welfare of others)
Honest (sincere, truthful)
Imaginative (daring, creative)
Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)
Logical (consistent, rational)
Loving (affectionate, tender)
Obedient (obliging, respectful)
Polite (courteous, well-mannered)
Responsible (dependable, reliable)
Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)
APPENDIX 4 -- SAMPLING FRAME

Productions Directed by Non-Natives

Long Productions

1980s
Dancing Around the Table, Part One, 1987, 57m 10s
Ikwe, 1986, 57m
Mistress Madeleine, 1986, about 56m
Places Not Our Own, 1986, 57m 10s
The Wake, 1986, 57m
It's Hard to Get it Here, 1984, 44m 29s
Standing Alone, 1982, 57m 50s

1970s
Fort Good Hope, 1977, 47m 12s
Cree Hunters of Mistassini, 1974, 57m 53s
Our Land is Our Life, 1974, 57m 50s
Behind the Masks, 1973, 36m 40s
Cold Journey, 1972, 75m 29s
Cesar’s Bark Canoe, 1971, 57m 52s

1960s
You Are on Indian Land, 1969, 36m 48s
The Indian Speaks, 1967, 40m 20s
Mission of Fear, 1965, 79m 13s

Short Productions

1980s
Rendezvous Canada 1606, 1988, 29m
Summer Legend, 1986, 8m 15s
School in the Bush, 1986, 15m 2s
A Safe Distance, 1986, 27m 40s
Doctor, Lawyer, Indian Chief, 1986, 28m 52s
Debbie and Sharon: The Recovery Series, 1985, 15m 13s
North of 60: Northerners Take Charge, 1985, 28m
North of 60: The Third New Economy, 1985, 28m
The Moccasin Game, 1983, 13m 50s
New Day--New Horizons, 1982, 28m 24s
The Last Mooseskin Boat, 1982, 28m 4s
Shanaditti: Last of the Beothuks, 1982, 20m 22s
Diary for a Place in Time, 1981, 28m 4s
Rice Harvest, 1980, 11m 40s
The Fiddlers of James Bay, 1980, 28m 42s
Nonoonse Anishinabe Ishichekewin Ka Kanawentank, 1980, 10m 17s
A Visit from Captain Cook, 1980, 15m 22s

1970s
Bill Reid, 1979, 27m 50s
A Pintoo for the Prince, 1979, 16m 40s
The Man, the Snake and the Fox, 1978, 11m 58s
Wandering Spirit Survival School, 1978, 27m 32s
The Red Dress, 1978, 27m 47s
Salmon People, 1977, 24m 43s
Sauk-Ai, 1977, 9m 53s
The Beauty of My People, 1977, 29m 12s
Cree Way, 1977, 26m 18s
Nishnawbe-Aski: The People and the Land, 1977, 27m 50s
Images: Stone: B.C., 1977, 8m 23s
Augusta, 1976, 16m 33s
Kevin Alec, 1976, 16m 28s
David and Bert, 1975, 27m 20s
Medooak the Stormmaker, 1975, 13m 2s
Man Who Chooses the Bush, 1975, 28m 50s
Bella Bella, 1975, 27m 20s
Our Dear Sisters, 1975, 14m 40s
This Riel Business, 1974, 27m 20s
Like the Trees, 1974, 14m 30s
Its Our Move, 1973, 24m 39s
Kainai, 1973, 26m 55s
Some Natives of Churchill, 1973, 27m 20s
Starblanket, 1973, 27m 20s
Paul Kane Goes West, 1972, 14m 28s
Legend, 1970, 15m 11s

1960s
Standing Buffalo, 1968, 23m 3s
Indian Dialogue, 1967, 27m 43s
PowWow at Duck Lake, 1967, 14m 30s
The People at Dipper, 1966, 18m 22s
High Steel, 1965, 13m 59s
Haida Carver, 1964, 12m 13s
Age of the Buffalo, 1964, 14m.
Attik, 1963, 29m 27s
Glooscap Country, 1962, 13m 45s
Village in the Dust, 1962, 18m 55s
Circle of the Sun, 1961, 29m 13s

Productions Directed by Natives

Long Productions

1980s
No Address, 1988, 56m (approx.)
Foster Child, 1987, 43m 8s
Incident at Restigouche, 1984, 45m 57s

1970s
Amisk, 1977, 40m 10s
Mother of Many Children, 1977, 57m 50s
The Other Side of the Ledger: An Indian View of the Hudson's Bay Company, 1972, 42m 22s
1960s

Short Productions

1980s
Poundmaker's Lodge: A Healing Place, 1987, 29m 27s
Richard Cardinal: Cry from a Diary of a Native Child, 1986, 29m 10s

1970s
Whose Were the Ones?, 1972, 7m 28s
Christmas at Moose Factory, 1971, 13m 7s

1960s
Charley Squash Goes to Town, 1969, 4m 26s
These Are My People, 1969, 13m 18s
The Ballad of Crowfoot, 1968, 10m 18s
APPENDIX 5 - SAMPLE

Productions Directed by Non-Natives

Long Productions

1980s
Ikwe, 1986, 57m
Places Not Our Own, 1986, 57m 10s
The Wake, 1986, 57m

1970s
Fort Good Hope, 1977, 47m 12s
Cesar's Bark Canoe, 1971, 57m 52s

1960s
You Are on Indian Land, 1969, 36m 48s

Short Productions

1980s
Doctor, Lawyer, Indian Chief, 1986, 28m 52s
North of 60: The Third New Economy, 1985, 28m
The Last Mooseskin Boat, 1982, 28m 4s
Diary for a Place in Time, 1981, 28m 4s
Rice Harvest, 1980, 11m 40s
A Visit from Captain Cook, 1980, 15m 22s

1970s
Wandering Spirit Survival School, 1978, 27m 32s
Sauk-Ai, 1977, 9m 53s
The Beauty of My People, 1977, 29m 12s
Augusta, 1976, 16m 33s
Man Who Chooses the Bush, 1975, 28m 50s
Bella Bella, 1975, 27m 20s
Our Dear Sisters, 1975, 14m 40s
This Riel Business, 1974, 27m 20s
Starblanket, 1973, 27m 20s

1960s
Standing Buffalo, 1968, 23m 3s
High Steel, 1965, 13m 59s
Haida Carver, 1964, 12m 13s
Circle of the Sun, 1961, 29m 13s
Productions Directed by Natives

Long Productions

1980s
Foster Child, 1987, 43m 8s

1970s
Amisk, 1977, 40m 10s

1960s

Short Productions

1980s
Poundmaker’s Lodge: A Healing Place, 1987, 29m 27s

1970s
Christmas at Moose Factory, 1971, 13m 7s

1960s
The Ballad of Crowfoot, 1968, 10m 18s
### APPENDIX 6 - RESPONDENT SELECTION FORM (TERMINAL VALUES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPORTED</th>
<th>NOT SUPPORTED</th>
<th>NOT PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A comfortable life (a prosperous life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An exciting life (a stimulating active life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A world at peace (free of war and conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family security (taking care of loved ones)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom (independence, free choice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness (contentedness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security (protection from attack)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation (saved, eternal life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect (self-esteem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social recognition (respect, admiration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True friendship (close companionship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESPONDENT SELECTION FORM (INSTRUMENTAL VALUES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPORTED</th>
<th>NOT SUPPORTED</th>
<th>NOT PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadminded (open-minded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable (competent, effective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean (neat, tidy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving (willing to pardon others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful (working for the welfare of others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest (sincere, truthful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative (daring, creative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical (consistent, rational)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving (affectionate, tender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedient (dutiful, respectful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite (courteous, well-mannered)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible (dependable, reliable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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