

Articulations and Mis-articulations: Is This an Informal Enterprise, A Social Economy Enterprise, or an Extralegal Harvesting Operation?

Wendy Russell, PhD  
Assistant Professor  
Centre for Global Studies  
Huron University College  
London, Ontario  
Canada  
[wrussell@huron.uwo.ca](mailto:wrussell@huron.uwo.ca)

**Abstract**

*This paper examines how a small community-based enterprise in a rural First Nation in northern Ontario challenges the distinction between 'private sector' and 'social economy', fitting comfortably in neither sector while some of its functions are excessive of both. The case considered is a micro-enterprise which produces small amounts of lumber for sale, donation and furniture manufacture, relies on both paid and volunteer labour, and upon traditional land tenure systems in order to access timber. This is officially a private enterprise but its community functions draw it more obviously into the arena of the social economy. In this case the distinction between private and social is blurred, as are divides between 'formal' and 'informal', 'private' and 'community', and 'legal' and 'extralegal'. This paper examines how the distinction between the private sector and the social sector obscures social, political and cultural functions of enterprise.*

The social economy holds enormous appeal for community development agents working at every scale of human organization, from the local to the transnational. As Graefe points out, the ubiquity of 'the social' in current policy formulation signals the (re)emergence of awareness of the interplay between 'society' and 'economy' (2006). The

concern with the interpenetration of economic and social forces marks a growing will to 'put the economy in its place', firmly within social, political and cultural practices (Bezanson, 2006; Molyneux, 2002, p. 168; Moolaert and Nussbaumer, 2005). For individuals and communities whose economic autonomy, and thus social life, is constantly compromised by the 'normal' operation of the dominant economy, the social economy holds out hope for change. While the promise of social economy promotion to reinsert non-economic concerns and priorities into the work of economic development, (or to at least have them stand alongside economic concerns), is yet to be realized (Graefe, 2002 p. 248), the intellectual space opened by this shift is ripe with potential. This paper sets out from the idea that social economy promotion opens a particularly useful- though not complete-intellectual 'space' for thinking about the problem of economic development from the point of view of structurally marginalized communities, using the case of an enterprise in a First Nation community. As I argue here, the 'promise' of the social economy is certainly, in part, its potential to draw attention to causes of material hardship, but it is also in acknowledging the persistent viability of highly local socio-economic traditions to address those causes and create change. It is this latter promise, to

acknowledge pre-existing economic pluralism that poses the greatest challenge to social economy practitioners and theoreticians alike. The following discussion then is intended as an extended reflection on this problem based on my previous research on community development, civil society promotion and volunteerism in Fort Albany First Nation, and interviews and discussions about the case introduced below, Peetabeck Lumber.

### *On The Path to Economic Justice?*

Despite that it seems obvious in the extreme to point it out, one of the most appealing functions of discourses on the social economy is that some social economy scholars note that economic inequality- in its guises as material poverty, shortage of opportunity, lack of economic security- has causes located beyond the control of the individual. This theme is worth noting because of the implications this idea has for communities seeking change through economic development, specifically the implication that the work of economic development could be to achieve something like 'economic justice', rather than simple economic advancement. Conversely, the goal of achieving equity for 'excluded' communities and individuals can also be interpreted as a responsibility of the government, which is being downloaded to civil society where this social justice project will be carried out by volunteers and social economy enterprises (Graefe, 2002 p. 249; Swift, 1999 pp. 58-64).

The contest between these two positions- on the one hand highlighting the emancipatory potential of the social economy, the other underscoring that it allows society as a whole to shed its responsibilities and dump them on unpaid and underpaid sectors- is a

critical one, because it reflects what is at stake for recipients of community development. That is, this contest flows from a potential 'gap' in social economy theory, which is the lack of a thoroughgoing political economy of the role of structural inequality in creating and reproducing economic inequality. This particular concern is also central to debates about the promotion of other allied social projects, namely civil society, volunteerism and social capital, all of which hold potential for creating critical transformation, potential that can be subverted. For example, scholars point out that civil society can be harnessed as 'self-help' (volunteering) to meet urgent and immediate needs (Robinson and Friedman, 2005), while it can also represent a launching point for projects building political solidarity and influence outside of the apparatus of the market or the state (Robinson, 2004, pp. 163-178). Similarly, the promotion of social capital can celebrate and encourage specific kinds of social action to the exclusion of other more critical and progressive mobilizations, exclusions that nullify the radical potential of some kinds of social capital to build solidarity around common concerns (Molyneux, 2002, p. 174), and more than 'self-help' in the face of crisis (Bezanson, 2006, p. 433).

The contest between the 'hopeful' and 'suspicious' takes on the celebration of the social economy (and 'the social' more generally) will have to play out, certainly, in response to real world contexts, real world applications of social policy, and attempts to measure outcomes. But in the mean time, the contest sparks an important question about the problem of theorizing and composing policy promoting the social economy at the macro level, and that is finding and accounting for context as a feature that will delimit and stretch policy and the concepts it is meant to

operationalize. To put this another way, context matters, both because context will shape policy, but because context brings with it history, pre-existing practice and strategies for adapting to changing circumstance (Moulaert and Nussbaumer, 2005). The precursor forms of the social economy, and the constellation of pre-existing conditions under which it is performed, succeeds and fails, will in fact be crucial to understanding the future utility of this sector to make change as it comes to capture legitimacy in institutions and policy (Graefe 2002). I turn now to a discussion of how such pre-existing economic pluralism poses an important challenge to the promotion of the social economy.

#### *Acknowledging Economic Plurality*

Following from above, one of the promises of promoting the social economy, is that by its very nature this is a concept which acknowledges locality as important, while social economy functions might themselves also perform localization, building dense and strong ties (or social capital) in an immediate social setting. In these regards, the social economy is thus not 'all new', but must accommodate and flow from pre-existing socio-economic practices and conditions that are at once local and distant. As Moulaert and Nussbaumer point out, the social dimensions of social economy enterprises are best understood as deeply contextual: "Ethical norms, behavioural rules or political visions do not drop from the sky, but form part of the development trajectories of communities. They unfold through the multiscaler dialectics that embrace local and non-local struggling and bargaining as well as the capacity of the local culture to reuse norms of behaviour that are adapted to contemporary challenges" (2005, p. 2086). In

acknowledging context as a complex, multi-layered, multi-scaled terrain against which and in which the social economy is formulated, practiced and undermined, the promotion of the social economy can thus drive the recognition of economic diversity, as well as the challenges to the persistence of that diversity.

While most social economy literature is silent on the persistence of economic diversity, the promotion of the social economy is generally the promotion of activities that straddle the social/economy divide in their goals, function and operational structure: not-for-profits, cooperative and voluntary organizations. In part, then, social economy discourses expand definitions of 'economic activity', but they also present the opportunity to re-insert pre-existing economic forms into these definitions. Social economy definitions thus might 'make room' for marginalized economic forms, those economic forms rendered invisible in most quantitative assessments of economic activity, namely informal and subsistence sectors.

Informal economic activity encompasses those activities which are unregulated, unlicensed and untaxed, and which likely co-exist with formal and regulated forms within the same larger economy (De Soto, 2000; Reimer, 2006; Sassen, 1994). The informal sector is universal in cash economies (Portes and Castells, 1989), whether it is a temporary, short-term and low paid labourer cutting a lawn or babysitting in a Canadian suburb or an independent vendor selling snack foods at a bus stop along the highway in Honduras. These economies are spatially confined, in the sense that their operations tend to be highly dependent on immediate resources and markets, but they can also link

seemingly separate locales, as when informal markets in towns and cities rely on produce from rural family plots, or when rural residents use regional bus routes (the stops and the buses themselves) as informal markets for everything from manufactured goods to homemade 'fast food'. The subsistence economy refers to those activities through which households provide resources and wealth for their immediate and exclusive use, and which do not enter the market. Self-provisioning activity is inclusive of harvesting 'wild' resources for food, materials, fuel or medicine, as well as gardening and other small-scale agriculture. In practice, informal and subsistence sectors tend to overlap, though not always. Take for example the informal arts and crafts industries of a number of Indigenous communities across Canada, where artisans have access to local materials such as hide, fur, bone or antler (among other materials) derived from local subsistence uses, such as hunting. The items manufactured from these materials can be sold for cash, while the same production system has produced a consumable resource for non-market uses, community sustenance. In turn, cash incomes derived from production of arts and crafts work are reinvested in the household, and possibly in the means to harvest, which includes investments in equipment and transportation.

This same kind of overlap is well documented as well in other settings, again speaking to the ubiquity of these forms 'alongside' formal capitalism, while each also highlights how they blend social and economic functions. In her study of the socio-economic networks that sustain formerly collectivized rural communities in post-Soviet Siberia, Metzko (2001) shows that informal cash economies rely heavily on both subsistence agriculture and forest produce, and on informal bonds of trading

and sharing used to redistribute these resources. Tripp's *Dar es Salaam* study (1997) shows how the informal urban sector is in an even more complex relationship with subsistence and social production, as vendors produce food on family plots outside of the city or in city gardens for the market and their own consumption while they also receive gifts of food from rural family. These studies also show that informal and subsistence activities are mutually reinforcing, and that they take place alongside formal economic engagements and (sometimes deliberate) disengagements. Nash shows, for example, how the loss of industrial wages in Pittsfield, Massachusetts in the 1980s was met with intensification of informal and subsistence activities, from craft production for informal marketing to hunting on public lands (1994, p. 21). When nationalized tin mines in Oruro, Bolivia were closed in 1986 in response to pressure from the International Monetary Fund to avoid the risk of an unstable world market for tin, women similarly intensified informal and subsistence activities to make up for men's lost wages (Nash 1994, p. 20). While much informal activity is not blended with subsistence, their interdependence in such cases demonstrates key similarities: these studies demonstrate that an informal/subsistence sector exists somewhat independent of, and even 'in spite of' formal economies, formal economic development policy, or formal economic policies at the national level.

Instances of overlap between informal and subsistence activity also underscore the social and political wealth (social capital) that these economies are capable of reproducing in their normal functioning. Returning to the example of the subsistence/informal sector which supports an informal arts and crafts sector, the

production of the 'by-products' which feed into that economy are harvested within social networks, reliant upon ecological and environmental knowledge derived from and practiced within dense local social networks. The interaction of informal and subsistence can further enhance these networks, as the work of producing resources through hunting, and the work of producing items for sale are both instances of production often shared in cross-generational relationships, reproducing both social ties and cultural knowledge within immediate social locales (Brascoupe, 1993). Both informal and subsistence sectors and their combination thus tend to perform functions attributed to the social economy- building social capital and building bonds of mutual aid.

Acknowledging such diverse forms of economic activity that make up livelihood strategies for households and communities which meet similar needs in the face of similar macro processes is thus to acknowledge 'the economy' as it exists. But this recognition is of key importance to understanding the future potential of the social economy, I argue here, because these are the pre-existing economic forms that might shape new social economy enterprise, most especially in marginalized or excluded communities. The challenge here is in the degree to which social economy promoters can acknowledge that these economies are often, by their very definition, also at odds with or even suppressed by the operation of the dominant economy. The status of First Nations subsistence economies in Canada illustrates this point well. In northern First Nations, subsistence hunting and gathering economies are well established and acknowledged as providing significant portions of community and household incomes (see for example Berkes, George and Preston, 1994; Berkes et al, 1995; Cummins, 2004; Feit, 1995). Following the

account in *The North in the Final Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*, the most recent comprehensive account of life for First Nations in Canada as a whole, consumable wealth derived from hunting and gathering is a part of the economies of the majority populations of large parts of Canada, including the territories and the vast northern portions of the largest provinces (Canada, 1996). The social and cultural priorities that are protected and reproduced within the practices of these economies are also widely, making their wealth at once material and social (Brody, 1988; Cummins, 2004; Fast and Berkes, 1994; Feit, 1995, 2004; Myers, Fast, Berkes and Berkes, 2005; Russell, 2004; Tanner, 1979). It is also important to note that this recognition has been hard won, so to speak, as evidenced by the cases put forward in the MacKenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry and by the Cree of Northern Quebec in opposition to Hydro Quebec's plans in their territories (see Berger, 1988 and Brody, 1988 for discussions of the pipeline inquiry, and Salisbury, 1986 for the early case put forward by the Cree of Northern Quebec). These struggles speak to the tension between dominant and 'official' economic forms and subsistence economies, a tension that persists today to some degree as discussed below in relation to the case of timber harvesting in Fort Albany.

Less often noted in analysis of northern economies are the informal economic activities, small cash based enterprises, which also persist in northern communities, though these are most often acknowledged as they represent enterprise tied directly to harvesting practices, specifically in the arts and crafts work that uses wild-gathered materials, eco-tourism and guiding (Cummins, 2004; Hedican, 1986). These informal activities have been less visible

given more prevailing interest in subsistence harvesting, though they are more accurately informal cash sector activity as discussed above. Like more direct harvesting activities, such informal cash sector activity also relies upon and reproduces social wealth. In this, the subsistence/informal alliance meets the demands of the social economy in its broadest terms to meet immediate needs for individuals and communities, while building social capital in bonds of mutual aid and interdependence.

And so: can these sectors be recognized under the rubric of the social economy? Is the social economy only inclusive of the 'new' enterprises that emerge through the deliberate application of development policy, or can it be inclusive of existing sectors and enterprises no matter how 'troublesome' these are from the point of view of the formal, official, dominant economy? Looking at a specific case, I now consider the prospect of including existing enterprise, in all of its local complexity, in the definition of 'social economy'.

### *A Case*

Peetabeck Lumber is a new (2006) private enterprise in Fort Albany First Nation on the west coast of James Bay in northern Ontario that produces finished lumber and stripped logs for local household use and road construction. The enterprise is self-funded and run by Edmund Metatawabin, and housed in his family's self-built log home and in a small frame structure in the bush surrounding their house. The enterprise has twice benefited from funding to subsidize trainees' wages, employing up to two men from the settlement. This funding, the liability insurance that is a requirement of this funding and the sale of some materials for cash make up the 'formal' traits of this

enterprise. The enterprise is thus identifiably 'formal' to the degree that it participates in the cash economy, can be insured and has waged employees. The enterprise is also informal in significant ways, while its harvesting practices also overlap with subsistence practices.

Two features of the enterprise distinguish it as informal, first that it engages in exchanges which take place outside of the cash economy (gift giving and bartering), and second, that at present, the enterprise's harvesting activities are extra-legal, meaning that they are performed without a lease on land officially designated as Crown Land. This extra-legal status mimics subsistence practices of harvesting resources for households use within the large traditional territory of the Fort Albany First Nation, territory which is not identified specifically as part of the First Nation's reserve, but which is continuously used as part of a collective resource base providing food, fuel, water, medicines and materials for manufacture of household items, tools, art and craft items.

Peetabeck Lumber thus sits astride various analytical divisions among economic forms, formal and informal, cash and subsistence, legal and extralegal. Despite not articulating distinctly with any of these, however, the enterprise 'makes sense' within the life world of the Fort Albany settlement, in that it blends subsistence and informal activity, derives its wealth from the territory that is collectively used, redistributes this wealth within the settlement, and thus functions as a highly localized economic practice. In this set of qualities, the enterprise is clearly more than economic, functioning at the intersection of social and economic forces. I want to propose then that Peetabeck Lumber is indeed usefully viewed as a social enterprise, though this same attempt

discloses the limits on the notion of the social economy. I take up each of these concerns below.

Peetabeck Lumber meets the criteria for definition as a social enterprise on a number of grounds. First, the enterprise provides much needed building materials in a remote fly-in community where the price of lumber to the consumer must include the cost of shipping it to the village, either by air or by barge. Add to this that barge service is unreliable, sometimes arriving only once a year from Moosonee. While the costs of producing lumber in Fort Albany are high, given the high cost of fuel to travel to harvest timber and to run the saw, Peetabeck Lumber can provide these products at much lower prices. Thus, Peetabeck Lumber is providing an important service to the community, and a much needed alternative to importing building materials. Secondly, Peetabeck Lumber provides wage employment in a settlement with unemployment rates between 60 and 80 percent. While short-term employment as a trainee does not solve the problem of underemployment, it provides seasonal incomes to households with a member employed in the sawmill. As an enterprise set up to do training, however, a third quality of Peetabeck Lumber's social functions is evident, and that is in its use of sustainable harvesting methods, methods derived from local traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) (see Berkes, 1999 for a definition and general discussion of TEK). Specifically, the enterprise exclusively harvests trees that have reached the end of their life-cycle (trees that are beginning to die), or that seasonal flooding has dislodged from the banks of the Albany River and washed downstream closer to the area of the village. These practices are an expression of TEK in that they use and reproduce knowledge of the region's topography,

seasonal cycles, the life cycle of regional flora, as well as knowledge of Boreal forest ecology as a whole. The training function of Peetabeck Lumber thus reinforces significant knowledge about the region, the same knowledge that is required to perform subsistence harvesting.

A fourth feature of Peetabeck Lumber that arguably links it to the social economy is that it operates outside of the cash economy in trading its products for technical assistance (the use of heavy equipment), and in gifting finished lumber to Elders. Like informal sector enterprises broadly, these aspects of the enterprise are at once economic and social, in that they are dependent upon and productive of social bonds and obligations. Most significantly, in the gifting of wood to Elders the enterprise operates as a reflex of social obligations to care for and share with members of the community. While Elder's material circumstances are often the most strained in the settlement, given that they have small cash incomes and that they are part of large extended families which also routinely face cash shortages, this hardship is not the primary reason this enterprise gifts finished lumber to Elders. Rather, sharing with Elders is a priority dictated by prevailing ethical norms which privilege redistribution of wealth over accumulation, spiritual orientations which promise a long life for those who help Elders, and by a sense that the resource base, its products and the harvesting practices used to produce them are the collective wealth of the Fort Albany First Nation. The collective orientation to this wealth is most evident in the redistribution of locally harvested food (meat, fish and berries), which are gifted to other households within an extended family, for the asking from a successful hunter, or for community feasts and celebrations (Gillies, 2004; Russell, 1998; Sutherland,

2006). The persistence of the ethic that this wealth should be shared is also evident in the negative stigma attached to the highly limited practice of selling this food (Sutherland, 2006, but see Flannery, 1999 for a complaint from early in the 20<sup>th</sup> century). The practice of gifting finished lumber to Elders, thus, resonates with a larger set of practices and ideals in which key resources- water, fuel, food and medicine- are shared as collective wealth within reciprocal exchange networks.

Peetabeck Lumber thus operates in accord with the commonly held belief that the land base yields collective wealth, but as it operates as an enterprise, it is also consistent with a tradition of economic innovation that has emerged in the history of the people of the region. That is, the regional economy simultaneously permits the use of some of the wealth of the land as commodities, most notably in the fur trade, which here began in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century and persists today for a small number of trapper/hunters. Other forms of limited market oriented production, of art, craft items and wood for cooking and heating fuel are also tolerated in Fort Albany, though they have received very little analytical attention (Russell, 1998, see Cummins, 2004 for a discussion about neighbouring Attawapiskat). The production of wood for sale as heating and cooking fuel to settlement households, for example, began during the period when regional families began to spend more substantial periods in the settlement during the winter, and when new opportunities for cash incomes emerged (Russell, 1998). Antoine Koostachin ran his firewood operation from 1965 (when he purchased a chain saw) until approximately 1999 along with other informal enterprises (including home building, household repairs, a small store, gas station and vehicle repair shop) with his family (Koostachin, 1994, 1997). Moreover,

he and his family also typically derived some of their household income from subsistence, because, as he put it, he "kept his skills" as a trapper and hunter (Koostachin, 1994) as did his wife and her relatives in Fort Albany. Like Antoine Koostachin's enterprises, Peetabeck Lumber demonstrates the subsistence/informal hybrid economy that has evolved in the settlement. Moreover, the informal cash economy has evolved alongside and helped reinforce the subsistence economy in which resources are redistributed within the community. The 'whole' economy of the settlement's traditional territory thus includes a locally regulated balance between subsistence and market oriented informal economic forms.

As a social enterprise, then, Peetabeck Lumber meets immediate and pressing needs for material and economic development in the settlement, its harvesting methods reinforce traditional knowledge systems and traditional networks for sharing, while the enterprise also reinvigorates a long tradition of economic innovation within the region. These qualities of the enterprise are worth considering as creating both meaningful economic and social benefits, benefits most evident within the life world of Fort Albany. To return to Moulaert and Nussbaumer's view of the 'social' aspects of social enterprise, Peetabeck Lumber demonstrates how "ethical norms" and "behavioural rules" shape a local enterprise (2005, p. 2086). Further, Peetabeck Lumber also demonstrates a unique "development trajectory", as Moulaert and Nussbaumer term it (2005, p. 2066). Economic modernization has taken a distinct path in Fort Albany, maybe best understood as the development of an economy based on small investments, innovation and a functioning social order has evolved to meet local needs. Recognizing this unique development path,

as in part a diversion from dominant capitalism but also a competent form of capitalism, is certainly within the reach of definitions of the social economy, which champion the localizing and community building functions of social enterprise.

Yet part of the function of Peetabeck Lumber arguably exceeds our definition of a social economy enterprise. Given the highly local tradition of innovation and autonomy, it is thus not surprising that Peetabeck Lumber is also 'extralegal', meaning that it currently operates in contravention of Provincial legislation governing Crown Land in Ontario. I hurry to add that is not at present an urgent concern, because the operator of Peetabeck Lumber has kept local Ministry of Natural Resources officials informed of the enterprise's activities, and it is well known that these same uses of the resource base have been tolerated for decades by the community, the Federal government and the Provincial government alike. In particular, aside from the commercial uses of local timber identified above, from the mid-1930s until approximately 1968, the Roman Catholic mission to Fort Albany ran a steam sawmill in the settlement which produced building materials that were sold to other Roman Catholic missions on both coasts of James Bay, traded with Fort Albany First Nation families and, in the mid-1960s, sold to the Federal government of Canada (Russell, 1998). The 'extralegal' status of Peetabeck Lumber is thus most compelling because it pits one system regulating use against another, here the local conviction that these are the collective resources of the Fort Albany First Nation and the Provincial government's similar conviction that this is the wealth of 'all' of Ontario. For Peetabeck Lumber to conform to the Provincial system is to in fact consent to the authority of that system of regulation, which has implications

for all subsistence and commercial uses and users of the Fort Albany First Nation territory. Moreover, the Provincial government has a competing interest in the land, as well, which is to manage its resources on behalf of the population of the entire province. Today, this responsibility means that the Province is seeking new ways to accommodate both Aboriginal communities and the mining companies that are flooding into- and building roads across- Fort Albany's traditional territory (Russell, 2008). Peetabeck Lumber's extralegal status clearly leaves it vulnerable to losing access to its resource base if competing interests, which are technically 'legal', continue to be supported by Provincial institutions without equal consideration for other users and uses of the same territory<sup>1</sup>. In this contest, Peetabeck Lumber represents the users of the territory whose interests are 'invisible' in the face of new resource development.

This register and type of economic difference reveals a fundamental challenge to definitions of the social economy: can definitions of the social economy account for and leave room to respond to this level of difference? As I have discussed here, they in fact might be forced to, if the notion is to be usefully applied to the work of creating economic justice for marginalized and excluded communities. As discussed above, the extralegal status of Peetabeck Lumber's harvesting operations is a consequence of long standing economic, cultural and political differences, differences that at present are not thoroughly and completely acknowledged in Provincial policy regarding the use of timber on Crown Lands. While its

---

<sup>1</sup> To date, the Provincial government, rather than protecting these rights and interests, has instead simply encouraged individual First Nations to craft Impact Benefits Agreements directly with mining companies, agreements which presume that non-renewable resource extraction will proceed in the region.

operations are tolerated, as similar uses have been for decades, the future of Peetabeck Lumber is at risk under current political and legal conditions. Like Moulaert and Nussbaumer, I would argue that these dimensions of the functioning of the enterprise demonstrate a social function that stretches to the political (2005, p. 2086), where the enterprise reasserts and reaffirms the legitimacy of local control, even in the face of potential conflict. The legitimacy of Peetabeck Lumber stands for the legitimacy of a broad range of uses and a large number of users.

### *Conclusions*

The promise of social economy promotion to re-embed the economy within the social also provides room to reconsider economies as having crucial and complex social functions. In the promise to direct economic change to improving the economic autonomy of marginalized and excluded individuals and communities, the social economy holds the potential for recovering or even rediscovering concealed, invisible and suppressed economic forms, economies which provide crucial material and social wealth within the spaces of day to day life. As argued here, fulfilling this promise requires acknowledging more than just the existence of pre-existing economic diversity, here informal and subsistence activities, but also the reasons for their concealment, invisibility and suppression. As discussed here in relation to Peetabeck Lumber, these economic forms are also capable of generating 'new' enterprises that conform to the definition of the social economy, while also remaining true to a long tradition of innovation and independence within a traditional territory. The case of Peetabeck Lumber thus demonstrates that the idea of the social economy will need to be

'stretched' to be inclusive of pre-existing economic diversity of the kind presented here if it is to effectively capture local visions of improved economic futures, serve to reproduce such forms or improve their potential as strategies for helping people make a living on their own terms and in pursuit of their own vision.

### Acknowledgements

I wish to extend my thanks to Edmund Metatawabin for the information and insight reported on in this paper, as well as his family Joan Metatawabin and Cedar Metatawabin for their hospitality. I would also like to thank Robert Gillies, Christopher Metatawabin, Helen Spence and Bernard Sutherland for sharing their insights about the sharing of food, the sale of food and the importance of sharing with Elders. I would like to thank Meg Pirie for her French translation of the abstract, and Sheila Gruner for her Spanish translation of the abstract. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance of Yodit Tsegaye and Ibtisam Yusuf with this research.

### References Cited

- Berger, T. R. (1988) *Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry (Canada, northern frontier, northern homeland: the report of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Berkes, F. (1999). *Sacred ecology: traditional ecological knowledge and resource management*. Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.
- Berkes, F., Hughes A. , George P. J., Preston R. J., Cummins B. D. & Turner J. (1995). The persistence of aboriginal land use: Fish, wildlife and harvest areas in the Hudson and

James Bay Lowland, Ontario. *Arctic*, 48 (1), 81-93.

Berkes, F., Peter G. & Preston, R. (1994). Wildlife harvesting and sustainable regional native economy in the Hudson and James Bay Lowland, Ontario. *Arctic*. 47, 4, 350-360.

Bezanson, K. (2006). Gender and the limits of social capital. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 43, 4, 427-443.

Brascoupe, S. (1993). Strengthening traditional economies and perspectives. In *Sharing the Harvest, The Road to Self-Reliance: Report of the National Round Table on Aboriginal Economic Development and Resources* (pp. 101-118). Ottawa: Canada Communication Group.

Brody, H. (1988). *Maps and dreams: Indians and the British Columbia frontier*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

Canada (1996). Final report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Volume 4, perspectives and realities, chapter 6 the North. [http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ch/rcap/sg/sj34\\_e.html#7.1%20Part%20Approaches%20to%20Northern%20Economic%20Development](http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ch/rcap/sg/sj34_e.html#7.1%20Part%20Approaches%20to%20Northern%20Economic%20Development)

Castells, M. & Portes, A. (1989). The world underneath: the origins, dynamics, and effects of the informal economy, in Portes, A., Castells, M. & L. A. Benton (Eds.), *The informal economy: studies in advanced and less developed countries* (pp. 11-39). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cummins, B. D. (2004) *Only God can own the land": The Attawapiskat Cree, the land and the state in the 20th century*. Toronto: Pearson and Prentice Hall.

De Soto, H. (2000). *The mystery of capital: why capitalism triumphs in the west and fails everywhere else*. New York: Basic Books.

Fast, H. & Berkes, F. (1994). Native land use, traditional knowledge and the subsistence economy in the Hudson Bay bioregion - technical paper prepared for the Hudson Bay Programme. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Natural Resources Institute.

Feit, H. (1995). Hunting and the quest for power: the James Bay Cree and whitemen in the twentieth century. In R. B. Morrison and C. R. Wilson, ed. *Native Peoples: The Canadian Experience*, second edition, (pp. 181-223). Toronto: McLelland and Stewart.

Feit, H. (2004) James Bay Crees' life projects and politics: histories of place, animal partners and enduring relationships. In M. Blaser, H. A. Feit & G. McRae (Eds.), *In the way of development: Indigenous peoples, life projects and globalization*, (pp. 92-110). London and New York: Zed Books in association with the International Development Research Centre.

Flannery, R. (1995). *Ellen Smallboy: glimpses of a Cree woman's life*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Gillies, R. (2004). Personal communication, Fort Albany First Nation.

Graefe, P. (2002). The social economy and the state: linking ambitions with institutions in Quebec, Canada. *Policy and Politics*, 30, 2, 247-62.

Graefe, P. (2006). The social economy and the American model: relating new social

policy directions to the old. *Global Social Policy*, 6, 2, 197-219.

Hedican, E. J. (1986). *The Ogoki River guides: emergent leadership among the northern Ojibwe*. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Metzo, K. R. (2001) adapting capitalism: household plots, forest resources, and moonlighting in post-Soviet Siberia. *Geojournal*, 55, 2-4, 549-556.

Molyneux, M. (2002). Gender and the silences of social capital: lessons from Latin America. *Development and Change* 33, 2, 167-188.

Moulaert, F. & Nussbaumer, J. (2005). Defining the social economy and its governance at the neighbourhood level: A methodological reflection. *Urban Studies*, 42, 11, 2071-2088.

Myers, H., Fast, H., Berkes, M. K. & Berkes, F. (2005). Feeding the family in times of change, in F. Berkes, A. Diduck, H. Fast, R. Huebert & M. Manseau (Eds.) *Breaking ice: renewable resource and ocean management in the Canadian north* (pp. 23-45). Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Nash, J. (1994). Global integration and subsistence insecurity. *American Anthropologist*, 96, 1, 7-30.

Reimer, B. (2006). The informal economy in non-metropolitan Canada. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. 12, 1, 23-49.

Robinson, M & Friedman S. (2005). Civil society, democratisation and foreign aid in Africa. IDS Discussion Paper 383. Retrieved July 17, 2007, from

<http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/dp/dp383.pdf>.

Robinson, W. I. (2004). *A theory of global capitalism: production, class and state in a transnational world*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sassen, S. (1994). The informal economy: between new developments and old regulations. *Yale Law Journal* 103, 8, 2289-2304.

Russell, W. (1998). *Regaining control: Community development and self-determination in Fort Albany First Nation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

Russell, W. (2004). 'The people had discovered their own approach to life': Politicizing development discourse. In M. Blaser, H. A. Feit & G. McRae (Eds.), *In the way of development: Indigenous peoples, life projects and globalization* (pp. 130-150). London and New York: Zed Books in association with International Development Research Centre.

Russell, W. (forthcoming 2008). Globalism, primitive accumulation and Nishnawbe-Aski territory: The strategic denial of place-based community. In D. Brydon & W. D. Coleman (Eds.) *Renegotiating community: Interdisciplinary perspectives, global contexts*. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.

Salisbury, R. F. (1986). *A homeland for the Cree: regional development in James Bay, 1971-1981*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Sutherland, B. (2006). Personal communication. Fort Albany First Nation.

Swift, J. 1999. *Civil society in question*.  
Toronto: Between the Lines.

Tanner, A. (1979). *Bringing home animals:  
religious ideology and mode of production  
of the Mistassini Cree hunters*. St. John's,  
Newfoundland: Institute of Social and  
Economic Research, Memorial University of  
Newfoundland.

Tripp, A. M. (1997). *Changing the rules: the  
politics of liberalization and the urban  
informal economy in Tanzania*. Berkeley:  
University of California Press.