

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL REINTERPRETATION OF
CONTACT, CONFLICT, AND CRISIS AT OKA 1990:
FROM WESTERN AUTHORITY TO POST-MODERNITY

by

MARIA DE LA SALETTE CORREIA

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
of the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

The Department of Anthropology

©1995
Winnipeg, Manitoba



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13048-7

Canada

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL REINTERPRETATION OF CONTACT,
CONFLICT, AND CRISIS AT OKA 1990:
FROM WESTERN AUTHORITY TO POST-MODERNITY

BY

MARIA DE LA SALETTE CORREIA

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1995

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to
microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and LIBRARY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive
extracts from it may be printed or other-wise reproduced without the author's written
permission.

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.

I authorize the University of Manitoba to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Maria de La Salette Correia

I further authorize the University of Manitoba to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Maria de La Salette Correia

The University of Manitoba requires the signatures of all persons using or photocopying this thesis. Please sign below, and give address and date.

Abstract

The Oka crisis is the departure point for a study of prolonged and sustained contact between cultures. Based upon a central tenet which recognizes the bidirectional nature of contact, the textual body of this thesis is arranged into the following four broad themes: 1) nations and nationalism; 2) the Indian; 3) the Mohawk; and 4) Oka as a post-modern crisis. The contact that occurred between civilizations in the Western Hemisphere (indeed the contact that occurred between cultures around the world) created a mixed reality of multiple codes, overlapping histories and shared experience and ideology. Nationalism is a product of modern, Western ideology. The First Nations became nations in the Western sense through a process of nationalism developed through contact between traditional aboriginal societies and modern European ones. Conversely, the transplanted European culture and society developed into the North American sociocultural complex through contact with the indigenous societies and cultures. By the middle of the twentieth century, well over three-quarters of the earth's surface had been colonized. Consequently, Western Civilization attained a privileged position against which all other global nations, societies, institutions or structures were measured. Western epistemology has only recently been challenged by social critics who question the precepts of Western authority. Within the discipline of anthropology, alternate avenues of authority help create a more inclusive portrait of humanity. The post-modern, variously described as an aesthetic trend, a body of theory, or the culture of late capitalism, is ultimately characterized by its absence of master-narratives. The processes of global decolonization and textual deconstruction have created a new economic, political and social reality. Western Civilization has tumbled from its Archimedean position. The critique of colonialism has questioned Western authority and presentation in almost all Western disciplines, including anthropology. In the post-modern age, anthropology now acknowledges the differences within cultures and the similarities between cultures. The formerly colonized continue to criticize and challenge Western authority, representation, and knowledge. The breakdown of Western authority positions Oka as a post-modern crisis and reveals Mohawk society to be complex and heterogenous, struggling against the Canadian nation state and those who still accept the Canadian master-narratives.

Acknowledgements

Gratitude is so very difficult to measure or express.

I received support from the University of Manitoba in the form of a Graduate Fellowship during the 1991-1992 academic year.

Thank you.

Beyond the requisite thank you to the members of my committee, I would like to remind them that the thesis is bound with their work (of course all mistakes and omissions are mine);

Professors Y. Georg Lithman, John S. Matthiasson, Charlotte Reinholtz and Raymond E. Wiest,
um sincero obrigado do fundo do meu coração.

A warm thank-you to the Doyle, Hunt and Nassar families.

Um beijinho de agradecimento para a minha querida família, Maria José, Pedro Aires e John Peter.

I have chosen those with whom I wish to share my blessings and I believe that I have chosen well.

And to Tim, I say,

Let's go
Come on
Let's go

IN MEMORIAM

MARIA ISABEL MARQUES DOS REIS COSTA MENDES
1949-1994

Table of Contents

Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vi
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PREAMBLE	1
1.2 THEMATIC ORGANIZATION	2
1.2.1 Thesis Statements	3
1.2.2 Literature Search	3
1.3 FRAMEWORK OF DEFINITIONS	6
1.3.1 Micro Level and Macro Level Analysis	6
1.3.2 Terminology	9
1.4 BEYOND A LITERATURE SURVEY – METHODOLOGY AND JUSTIFICATION	10
2 NATIONS AND NATIONALISM	18
2.1 PREAMBLE	18
2.2 THE PROCESS OF MODERNIZATION: NATIONALISM	19
2.2.1 The Development of Individualism	21
2.2.2 Traditional and Modern: A Basic Construction	23
2.3 AN IDEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL EXAMINATION OF CONTACT	25
2.3.1 Ontologies as Ideologies within Ideologies	27
2.3.2 The Ethnic Enclave and A Model for Two Type Nationalism	31
3 THE WHITE MAN’S INDIAN	36
3.1 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS OF SELF AND OTHER	36
3.1.1 Western Constructions of Self and Other: Before the Indian there was the Oriental	37
3.1.2 The Historical Construction of Other: Anthropological Discourse and Deconstruction	40
3.1.3 Academic Text as Literature: Anthropology and History in Historical Context	42
3.2 THE NOBLE SAVAGE	45

3.3 THE WHITE MAN'S INDIAN	51
3.3.1 The Changing Face of the Indian	55
3.3.2 The Canadian Version	59
3.4 SUMMARY	66
4 THE MOHAWK: AN ACCOUNT OF HISTORY AND ETHNOHISTORY	68
4.1 PRE-CONTACT	70
4.1.1 The Iroquois	70
4.1.2 The Iroquois Confederacy and the Mohawk	72
4.1.3 World View	74
4.2 CONTACT: THE SPECIAL CASE OF ETHNOHISTORY	75
4.2.1 An Ethnohistorical Examination of Contact	75
4.2.1.1 Early Contact	75
4.2.1.2 The Missionaries and the Fur Trade	78
4.2.2 The Specific Case of the Mohawk at Oka	83
4.2.3 The Indian in Canadian History	84
5 OKA: A POST-MODERN CRISIS?	95
5.1 BEGINNINGS	95
5.2 THE POST-MODERN PROJECT	96
5.2.1 Introduction	96
5.2.2 The Modern and the Post-Modern	97
5.2.3 The End of the Meta-Narrative	100
5.2.4 The Referential Emptiness Produced by High Technology	103
5.2.5 The Interchangeability of Signs: Parody	105
5.3 THE CRISIS AT OKA	109
5.3.1 A Sequence of Events	109
5.3.2 Oka as a Post-Modern Crisis	112
5.3.3 Anthropology and the Post-Modern Crisis at Oka	113
6 CONCLUSION	121
6.1 RECAPITULATION	121
6.2 COMING FULL CIRCLE	125
REFERENCES	127
NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AND FILMS	127
BOOKS AND JOURNAL ARTICLES	129

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 PREAMBLE

The summer of 1990 hosted one of the most poignant and tragic crises that the Canadian polity has ever witnessed. The usually faceless and generic Indians, “the people without history”, to paraphrase Eric Wolf, were clearly engaged in the making of history as it is commonly understood in the Euro-American tradition. There have been many conflicts in the North American experience of Indian-White interaction, where even Canadian history has been largely taught as faith affirmation of Western supremacy complete with romanticized, vilified, or trivialized noble Indian sidekick. However, the images of the crisis, experienced vicariously by most of the Canadian population, made an imprint in an age when the interaction between nations is more symbiotic than either side is willing to acknowledge.

The series of events, symbols, and images that enveloped the crisis began innocuously enough on 11 March 1990, with a barricade erected to stop the extension of a golf course after talks between the Kanesatake Mohawk and the Municipality of Oka broke down. Even by 9 July 1990, when Quebec Minister of Native Affairs, John Ciaccia, urged the Mayor of Oka, Jean Ouellette, to stop the golf course development (after an injunction had been issued to and rejected by the Mohawk on 30 June) the affair was only minimally newsworthy as far as Canada’s national newspaper was concerned. Consider the small piece found in Toronto’s *The Globe and Mail* (30/6/90):

Mohawks Refuse to End Blockade

MONTREAL – Indians on the Kahnesatake Mohawk reserve in Oka near Montreal say they have no intention of taking down a barricade today that has blocked a dirt road between the town and a nearby forest since March 11.

Sam Elkas, Quebec Minister of Public Security, has indicated that if the Mohawks do not remove the barricade today, Quebec provincial police may have to move in and do the dismantling for them.

It was only after the Sûreté du Québec (SQ) raid of the Kanesatake staffed barricades at Oka on 11 July, which resulted in the death of Corporal Marcel Lemay and the sympathy blockade of the Mercier Bridge by Kahnawake warriors, that the confrontation became extremely newsworthy – a conflict, a crisis, and perhaps even a disaster. The haunting images were quickly and publicly disseminated on radio, newsprint, and video screen.

1.2 THEMATIC ORGANIZATION

The Oka crisis pointedly and dramatically raises a myriad of issues surrounding a very complex reality of contact, conflict, and crisis which neither begins nor ends at Oka, 1990. In order to better understand the crisis the essential issues may be gathered together into four basic themes. Of the four points of reference, then, the first is the dual notion of nations and nationalism, as outlined by Dumont and expanded in situational context by Lithman. Second, through the contact that existed and continues to exist between east and west, comes the notion of the *Indian*. What is the Indian? Third is the Mohawk. An attempt is made to look beyond the surface of the generic North American Indian and the over-arching Indian nationalism which came from the contact between the Western Europeans and the many aboriginal societies of the North American continent. At this point, an exploration of the Mohawk/Iroquois ethnohistory is very important. And fourth, the thesis concludes with a discussion of Oka as a post-modern crisis. What are the implications, both ideological and practical, for those involved? What became significant during the crisis and what will be significant for the future in a post-modern age where the Other is politically shrewd, adept at media manipulation, and unwilling to patiently endure? What is to become of the generation of Mohawk children who experienced first hand the reality of war, and what will the Canadian state (premised as it is on the tenet of Peace, Order and good Government) with its War Measures and Indian Acts do about it? And finally, what does a thesis like this one, written under the aegis of anthropology, attempt to do?

1.2.1 Thesis Statements

White interest in the American Indian surges and ebbs with the tide of history. While white fascination with things Indian never entirely fades, it has discernible high and low points... [Unfortunately,] the appearance of numerous dissertations and monographs on a topic usually marks the end, not the high point... (Berkhofer 1979:xv).

In the thesis I attempt to reinforce a pivotal point: that contact between cultures occurs and results in a bi-directional give-and-take, as well as determining or affecting ideology and everyday interaction between people. If First Nations nationalism has been produced by Indian-White contact, then the North American sociocultural complex has also been, in the words of Georges Sioui (1992), tempered by its contact with traditional, aboriginal societies.

Fundamentally, then, the thesis is a processual attempt to analyze the contact between cultures, while recognizing the limits of a Western sociocultural framework. Through a selective theoretical approach, beginning with a critical review of the relevant anthropological and historical literature, a frame of definitions, and a rationalization for the approach taken, contextual interpretations may be enriched through an analysis that does not ignore the crisis and its power to affect the social organization of the group or groups of people it spatially or temporally envelopes. Using a framework which recognizes the Oka crisis as a post-modern episode allows for an exploration of the social as well as anthropological ramifications.

Indian-White contact exists, both under White and Indian terms; furthermore, it affects our sociocultural reality, a part of which includes sociocultural anthropology. Anthropologists may be no better because they study anthropology and are now aware of its imperial past, but they can fruitfully contribute if the discipline and its self-critique are used to highlight the themes and events of everyday reality (Lithman 1988; Nader 1988; Said 1977; Wolf 1982).

1.2.2 Literature Search

A thorough search of the anthropological literature on Indian-White contact in Canada provides only a scanty supply of articles, books, or theses which combine micro and macro level analyses. In fact, until recently, as Norman Klippenstein notes in his MA thesis titled *The*

Haida Struggle for Autonomy on the Haida Gwaii, 1966-1990, the micro or local level was emphasized “to the neglect of all or important aspects of the wider connection to the macro level...” (Klippenstein 1991:8). But while the work of contemporary anthropologists, including Michael Asch, Harvey Feit, Y.Georg Lithman, Douglas Sanders, Adrian Turner and the late Sally Weaver, may focus on the macro level of aboriginal politics and the nation-state while incorporating a micro dimension (Klippenstein 1991:9), most of it relies almost exclusively on paradigms of political economy which focus on the political or economic relationship between First Nations and the Canadian nation state..

In *Cultural Anthropology* (1981), Roger Keesing critiques those who study the non-Western world within the parametres of the “dominant ‘liberal’ tradition of western politics and scholarship” wherein the traditional is strongly (and adversely) opposed to the modern, and development is a process by which traditional social structures evolve into modern social structures (Keesing 1981:443). Traditional ways are believed to hinder development:

The implication is that these ‘traditional’ modes of life, structures of economy and society, were there when colonialism began, were only partly transformed in the colonial period and must now be left behind if modernization is to succeed (Keesing 1981:443).

As Keesing points out, ‘third world’ underdevelopment is justified and propagated with the myth of the traditional and characterized as a “family of problems the third world countries will have to overcome as best as possible if they are to develop” (1981:443). It is perhaps because of the static and accusing depiction of traditional society (in Western ‘liberal’ ideology) that scholars working within the paradigms of political economy, which may be defined as “the study of the relationships among economic systems, political power and ideology” (Keesing 1981:516), have rebelled against and abhorred the use of the ‘traditional’ as an academic or economic construct. Andre Gunder Frank, foremost proponent of dependency theory, argues that in order to understand underdevelopment one needs to analyze the interrelationships between different “economic, geographical, and cultural systems on a global basis over historical time”; in other words, “underdevelopment is [not] an original state, characterized by ‘backwardness’ or ‘traditionalism’” (Frank 1972:xi). Still, we need to move beyond the Frankian view and “attempt a more sophisticated and complex analysis

of class relationships and modes of production in colonial and post-colonial societies” as well as challenging “liberal stereotypes of the ‘traditional sector’” (Keesing 1981:448).

And while it may be true, as Klippenstein notes, that “the obsession in the anthropological literature with ‘the traditional’” seems to suggest that aboriginal culture is only interesting or study-worthy insofar as it retains exotic (read traditional) elements (Klippenstein 1991:9), of particular interest is a discussion of the traditional as ontology, and not as social structure or economy. Therefore, it may still be significant, for present purposes, to explore the concept of the traditional in situational context. If there has been a preoccupation with the traditional and the micro in past ethnographic works of historically particular or structurally functional anthropology (Klippenstein 1991:11), then the current focus on politics or economy (two good examples are Bruce Alden Cox’s *Native People Native Lands* and Menno Boldt’s *Surviving as Indians*) may explore the economic and political life of indigenous peoples while neglecting symbols or ideology. It may be important to understand, at this point, that the separation or compartmentalization of politics and economics from other social dimensions can also be analyzed as a ‘modern’ as opposed to ‘traditional’ development (Dumont 1986).

An anthropologist’s work should address the needs of a people in some significant way, or at least investigate questions for which they too are seeking answers. [A study should seek] to be relevant to the academic and the native world by using anthropological method and theory to address issues of concern to [aboriginals] and... Canadians today (Klippenstein 1991:9).

There may indeed be a moral reason for anthropological address of aboriginal concerns (Klippenstein 1991:9) and the way in which Indians articulate with non-Indians on a macro-level, but there may be a greater reason for understanding and comprehension of contact on both sides. Canadians are not synonymous with the Canadian nation-state, and thus a study which focuses on the relationship between an aboriginal group and the political economy of a nation-state may be missing a very important aspect of both macro and micro level interaction. Feit, a proponent of political economy, argues that because

anthropologists have turned to the analytical tools of political and administrative sciences... there has been a tendency to omit traditional

anthropological emphasis on local level processes, cultural/symbolic factors and traditional/historical contexts (Feit 1985:27).

For example, is there cause to believe that the Oka crisis may have happened as it did because of the special, local cases of Quebec national and Mohawk national interaction?

Ovide Mercredi, vice chief [now chief] of the Assembly of First Nations, said that Quebec has become distinct in its use of force in its treatment of native peoples. "It happens more frequently there than it does in any other province in Canada". (*The Globe and Mail* 14/7/90).

Furthermore, can a study which focuses on a crisis involving three nations and a plethora of 'modern' and 'traditional' symbols, including both feather and gun, camouflage and sweetgrass, limit itself to a strict framework of, for example, dependency theory?

More general theories than those which make underdevelopment a special field of inquiry are better suited in attempts to analyze the Canadian Indian situation (Lithman 1988:1).

1.3 FRAMEWORK OF DEFINITIONS

1.3.1 Micro Level and Macro Level Analysis

At the base of current, critical discontentment with the paradigms of political economy that focus exclusively on politics or economics (i.e., dependency theory) lies the academic struggle for focus on either the micro level or the macro level. To choose either the micro or the macro as a focus of study may depend largely on one's theoretical orientation, political agenda, or even personal preference.

The anthropologists working in Canada who use dependency or world systems theory (i.e., Frideres and Elias, respectively) usually focus, to the exclusion of the micro level, on the politics of aboriginal societies at the macro level. The exclusive focus is not necessarily negative. Rather, the problem lies in the inherent, limited and polemic nature of focusing on one dimension of the sociocultural reality.

No single investigator or theoretical explanatory system can possibly handle everything one would like to know about humans..., however,... theories about different systems of human behavior at different levels may be potentially complementary to one another rather than directly competing explanations (De Walt & Pelto 1985:11).

The unfortunate conflict between the micro-theorists and the macro-theorists arises “from the fact that they are really addressing different questions with different spatial, causal and time scales” (De Walt & Pelto 1985:7). But, because certain levels of analysis might be more suited to specific explanations, it may be a good tactic of academic strategy to compromise between micro and macro levels of analysis, according to one’s needs.

Since the boundaries between the micro level and the macro level are not always clear, a temporary division between units and processes is useful (De Walt & Pelto 1985:2). In this way, a division could be made between social or cultural units (Mohawk; Iroquois; Indian-White; Longhouse-Chief and Council; Canadian-Aboriginal) and processes (contact; conflict; crisis; and nationalism – inter-nation as well as intra-nation) at both the micro and macro level.

In all of these dimensions, the concepts ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ cannot be defined as absolutes but have meaning only in terms of the inter-relationships of the units, processes, and time frames under construction (De Walt & Pelto 1985:2).

Units are levels of organization, consisting of either individuals or aggregates. Traditionally, anthropologists have either focused on the individual whereby social organization can be reduced to the strategic self-interest of the individual, or on the collectivity whereby knowledge can only be derived from the study of social facts (De Walt & Pelto 1985:3). But there is much more give-and-take between the individual and the collectivity than either level allows. Thus without assigning labels of micro or macro, the discussion of nationalism herein presented is informed by the De Walt and Pelto breakdown of social groups or behaviour into micro and macro level domains, revealing a creative interplay between the needs of the individual and the collectivity. Reduction to the level of the individual may leave the Western scholar with a piece-less puzzle. It is necessary to look beyond the essentially cavalier dichotomy of individual and aggregate as defined by Western disciplines and ideology. An understanding of both First Nations and Six Nations nationalism, as well as the internal factionalism or the individual behaviour of the Mohawk, could not properly emerge without a framework flexible enough to accommodate interaction at both the micro and the macro level.

The 'new breed' of anthropologist, with his or her focus on the economy or politics, has arisen from a need, real or perceived, to move the traditional realm of anthropological study far beyond the 'exotic' parameters of the local level domain.

Anthropologists have typically focussed on local communities, or perhaps kin groups, that are ordered hierarchically in a 'nesting fashion'. That is, minimal lineages are components of middle range lineages. Similarly, villages are socially, politically, economically, and religiously linked with a regional center that is one of a number of such centers making up a state or province, that in turn are a component of a nation, continent and world (De Walt & Pelto 1985:3).

The current trend for this 'new breed' is an inversion of the traditional anthropological analysis. The micro level is no longer the emphasis, although present; rather, it is the macro level which is prominent.

...Many anthropologists are now pursuing theoretical strategies designed explicitly to consider the effects of more global forces, including world-wide politico-economic systems...

There is some danger, however, in the over-zealous use of such research paradigms. It must be recognized that emphasis solely on global or world systems forces often ignores the dynamic nature of processes in the local communities... The micro level is not passively shaped by macro level forces, but reacts to these forces, often in ways that change the larger system (De Walt & Pelto 1985:5, original emphasis).

The relationship between the local reality and the larger world is of great interest; furthermore, a focus on the historical causes may help to show how outside forces impinge upon the local community and how that community in fact affects the outer world. Under this rubric will fit an ethnohistorically grounded discussion of contact, conflict, and crisis, while expanding the boundaries into a larger discussion of the contribution of the Other vis-a-vis the Self and the creation of a post-modern condition and analysis. How have we affected them, and how have they affected us? Attempting a positive balance between the micro and the macro level, the focus of the thesis may be the crisis at Oka, summer of 1990. However, the crisis is merely the sounding board for a broader discussion of many issues under the general guidance of the four central themes: nations and nationalism; the Indian; the Mohawk; and Oka as a post-modern crisis.

1.3.2 Terminology

In addition to our delineation and clarification of what constitutes the micro and macro levels, notwithstanding the theoretical or ideological concepts such as nationalism and individualism which will be clarified in context, other parameters for some key words or phrases need to be established or at least acknowledged. For example, terms such as Indian or White are always grounded in academic and situational context. The original inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere did not, before the arrival of the Europeans, have a homogenous sociocultural reality or identity which required a general nomenclature. For the most part, the small-scale societies had specific names for themselves and others which were overlooked by the Europeans in favour of the more general, geographically and socioculturally incorrect *indio* label.

The use of the label “Indian” has special implications for the construction of social reality in both white and aboriginal terms. The propensity of the Western European to characterize, rationally, what ‘p’ is in terms of ‘not p’ facilitated the creation of a new Other in the North American Indian. There had long been a tradition of Otherness in continental Europe, in contra-distinction to the European self, which ironically had more to do with the European Self than the foreign Other.

From the time that Chinese visitors had first arrived in Europe at the close of the seventeenth century, their appearance produced its own anamorphosis... During the eighteenth century Chinese vogue, the cultural other was an occasion for reflexivity in the form of satire... A variety of individuals were set loose from their moorings in cultural context and consequently aestheticized [as]... aristocrats and Bourgeois [writers] collaborated in the production of a ‘written folklore’ (Stewart 1989:44-52).

According to what has been read, and will be presented in this thesis, it may be posited that the process of the North American Indian was arranged and developed in much the same way – an aesthetic cleansing and representation which comes quickly to mind is the Wild West Show phenomenon featuring dressed-up Indians ripped out of cultural context and folklorized. The central question, then, is:

How is otherness always an imaginary and reciprocally self-inventing relation?
 How is the imaging of the Other shaped through [common] language?
 (Stewart 1986:44).

In responding to the question, which is relevant and worthwhile, it is necessary to use the questionable and loaded labels like Indian and White, while acknowledging that such terms may not adequately describe the complexities of the sociocultural reality – nor should they, one supposes; rather, they help trace the cultural construction of social realities and categories, including our own Western-based, North American ones.

1.4 BEYOND A LITERATURE SURVEY – METHODOLOGY AND JUSTIFICATION

The literature search yielded few anthropological works which actually focus on the nation and nationalism vis-a-vis the Canadian First Nations. Most scholars are confined to a dependency or systems theory type of analysis which focuses on internal colonialism (e.g., Frideres, following Frank) or the metropolis-hinterland model (e.g., Elias, following Wallerstein). The problems with the exclusive use of dependency or world systems theory for an analysis of contact and conflict in the post-modern age are several: (1) They do not address the moral dimension in the *Amerindian* history in ways acceptable to both aboriginal and critical historians, nor do they acknowledge the impact made by aboriginal culture(s) on Euro-Canadian culture(s). (2) They do not allow for a specific, grounded discussion of why the Oka crisis happened, and why it happened in Quebec. (3) They do not complement a discussion of the intra-Mohawk factionalism so evident throughout the crisis. (4) Such theories relegate discussions concerning the cultural dimension to the corner; the plethora of concepts (land is an example which comes quickly to mind) and symbols bandied about during the conflict are lost in the periphery. And (5), they do not encompass an analysis of both the micro and the macro-level.

In following Dumont, who follows Durkheim and Mauss, the presentation of a we-they dichotomy combines concrete reality and a philosophy that rests upon the dualism first closely illuminated by the Enlightenment. The general dichotomies of we/they, traditional/modern, or Western/non-Western are tools with which to expose and comprehend the nature of social cohesion through a study of ideology and symbols as expressed in

sociocultural behaviour. In keeping with Durkheimian tradition, social behaviour cannot be reduced to the level of self-interest.

Aimed at understanding or explaining the wide variety of human cultural, social or physical diversity, anthropology retains the eclectic and inclusive nature of its birth and accommodates those who study glass or bone fragments as well as those who observe primate or human behaviour and interaction. In fact, "one of the advantages of anthropology as a scholarly discipline is that no one, including its practitioners, quite knows exactly what it is" (Geertz, cited in Borofsky 1994:1).

As in general intellectual currency, contemporary anthropology is also experiencing fragmentation. Indeed, anthropology has come to be crudely denounced by its many critics as colonialism and the culture concept is no longer the exclusive domain of anthropology; appropriated or attacked by other academics, culture is now at the centre of the broad interdisciplinary effort of cultural studies.

Still there is a coherence in the broad definition of anthropology as the study of human variation through time and in space, despite the disciplinary divisions and sub-divisions which are possibly as numerous as their practitioners. Upon the diverse intellectual platforms and the multifarious theoretical roots of working anthropologists, anthropology has maintained a real continuity from generation to generation. Teachers influence students and key disciplinary issues, no matter how they are argued or delivered, contain threads and pieces of academic and social, political or cultural continuity (Borofsky 1994:xi).

Anthropology was and continues to be conducted within very specific historical, cultural and political contexts. "Knowledge of other cultures and eras depends on the cultures and eras doing the knowing" (Boon 1990:45). Part of anthropology's fragmentation, as well as its present breadth, is based upon its expansion beyond the 'heroic mentors' and 'founding fathers', changes in world politics and a "high tolerance for a variety of tools and subjects" (Tax, cited by Borofsky 1994:11).

Within anthropology, structuralism is an approach which essentially searches for deep, hidden structures of a psycho-biological nature that are universal to all humans. These hidden structures are subtly evident in the surface behaviour that is observable but which varies from

culture to culture. At the heart of structuralism we find a dualism: Durkheim's mechanical/organic solidarity, Mauss's theory of exchange, Dumont's traditional/modern dichotomy as well as the general assumption that we know ourselves only in opposition to others. "...Each part of structuralism constitutes itself only in counterdistinction to another: an embrace without unity..." (Boon 1990:217).

Dumont takes Durkheim into areas of comparative epistemology and methodology (Boon 1990:65) by advancing the Durkheimian assumption that the individual is abstracted from the social. "According to this structuralist outlook 'social' stands to 'individual' as 'language' would stand to 'speaker' (Boon 1990:65). The primacy of structural systems is found in all institutions. Hence, a study of nations or nationalism is one good way to get at the underlying structures which organize human societies.

The core of this thesis is the attempt to account for contact, and the existence of nationalism, as a process couched within the ideology of western individualism through continuous interaction between both people and ideas, short and long term, including an acknowledgement of aboriginal influence on North American society. Thus, despite the construction of a somewhat sharp but nonetheless academically useful dichotomy which arises from a *we-they, traditional-modern* approach to analysis, the thesis holds that people do differentiate between *we* and *they* in order to conceptualize the interaction between their own selves and others. Therefore, the use of a dichotomous model is not a tool for the reification of structures or concepts; rather, it is an aid to understand an interaction between two different groups of people. How have *they* shaped us and how have *we* shaped them?

The thesis has been written under the current anthropological rubric of process. Partly old and partly new, the concerns of process are twofold: 1) how do we conceptualize the cultural, as well as the actual processual dynamics of a culture complex? 2) What limits our cultural comprehension and how do regional and global forces shape the cultural over time and in space? (Borofsky 1994:468) A larger breadth of ethnographic material and a greater appreciation for historical data has facilitated anthropological questions of a wider nature. For example, I not only ask how the Mohawk of the late twentieth century are like the Mohawk of the sixteenth century, but how they have been affected by and been able to influence the

Europeans and their descendants, through contact, over a sustained period of time. The shift toward process is discernible in the changing conceptions of the cultural, contextual perceptions, and the dynamics of change (Borofsky 1994:469). Thus, it would have been highly desirable but not necessarily essential to visit Kanesatake and Kahnawake. My purpose is less to give an ethnographic account of the Mohawk and the Oka Crisis and more to, following Barth, provide some kind of “generative model of process” or “how people achieve and reproduce a degree of conceptual accommodation and shared premises” (Barth, cited by Borofsky 1994:354).

Beyond the literature search, and the objective rationalization necessary for thesis construction and defense, there exists a more modern (post-modern) need to address the contemporary concerns of our reflexive epistemology, or system of knowledge, both within and without the discipline of anthropology. A recognition of shared human existence and over-lapping histories has blurred the once clear distinction between us and them. But all is not lost; as the colonized learned to speak the language of the colonizer and, in some cases, to appropriate anthropological texts and knowledge for their own purposes, the tenets of Western society and epistemology also began to expand (Clifford & Marcus 1986; Said 1977; Wolf 1982).

As Max Weber, I think, once said, seventeenth century capitalists were not only economic men who traded and built ships, they also looked at Rembrandt's painting, drew maps of the world, had marked conceptions of the nature of other peoples, and worried a great deal about their destiny (Rabinow 1986:241).

From the strongest critics, anthropologists have learnt that there is no truth outside of that truth which is historically, culturally, or socially mediated (Foucault 1976; Rabinow 1986; Rorty 1979). Further, they tell us, anthropologists have no objective way of studying or ‘writing’ culture which is not based on some historically particular sociocultural complex (Clifford 1986; Crapanzano 1986; Marcus 1986; Rabinow 1986), nor do they really possess the authority to assuredly and positively say that culture x possesses a, b, or c characteristics or that the people of culture x are fierce, proud, peaceful, gregarious, or primitive (see Robert

Paine, 1990, "Our Authorial Authority"). Such anthropological characterizations, critics say, are based upon parasitic study that is patronizing, paternalistic, or even colonial:

The intellectual readership began to 'relativize' the professional authority beyond that of anthropology... Books like Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) [attacked] Europocentrism..., castigated Western authors [and] helped serve to demystify the authority of the anthropologist (Paine 1990:40).

The emperor has no clothes! He or she is just as naked as the anthropological Other ever was. The anthropologist can no longer even hide behind the respectable royal cloak of ethnography. The 'I was there' justification just does not do in a world where we now admit that the Others were there first. The ethnographer, or anthropologist, is no longer the only legitimate collector, reporter, witness, or participant (Anderson & Chock 1986:51), and thus anthropology is no longer the epistemological source of non-Western knowledge documentation.

[It] may happen through a 'missionary' attitude or chauvanistic enhancement of the Native culture. It is all too easy to create some scheme (on behalf of the Native Other) that cannot exist without us. We build, so often, 'models of native life in a native world, instead of 'models for' native life... in a world that is both native and non-native (Paine 1990:44).

In order to abandon the often one dimensional Western or Euro-American way of looking at the world, we must, argues Paul Rabinow in *Writing Culture* (1986), open up the "production of truth in our own current regime of power"; we must isolate our own epistemology as the ultimate or unique study or body of knowledge and deconstruct it into the complex historical, social, or political process that it really is:

We need to anthropologize the West: show how exotic its contribution of reality has been; emphasize those domains most taken for granted or universal (this includes epistemology and economics); make them seem as historically peculiar as possible; show how their claims to truth are linked to social practices and have hence become effective forces in the social world (Rabinow 1986:241).

Despite the reflexive efforts of some anthropologists practicing anthropology, there still remains much doubt regarding the anthropological enterprise by 'Aboriginal America': "native minority groups [have] used anthropology as a whipping-boy in their defiant anger against Euro-domination" (Paine 1990:40). So anthropology, and its practitioners, need to

move beyond self-reflexive meditation: “After demolition, reconstruction – or after deconstruction, reconstruction...” (Paine 1990:40). What self-reflexivity affords us, then, is the opportunity to really see ourselves, vis-a-vis our own culture:

Perhaps the most important anthropological application of ‘deconstruction’ is defamiliarization: to help us to really know what we think we know, we must put our own taken-for-granted categories under the anthropological microscope (Marcus and Fischer 1986:149).

In essence, anthropology should use the post-modern reflexivity to explore the political, social, and ideological realities and not simply to wax poetical in grandiose and literary self-indulgence. The post-modern anthropological concern with epistemology and hermeneutics should not exclude a concern with the more tangible realms of ideology and politics; in fact, the two should be complementary (Paine 1990:43). The epistemology of post-modernity, if indeed there is such a thing, forces us to ask: is there anything we can know? And if we cannot really know anything, then how do we study ideology or politics?

In Canada, anthropological writing on or about indigenous peoples has changed, and is shaped by interaction in both analysis and context. According to Dyck (1990:41), the literature is divisible into three phases, notwithstanding the evolutionary overtones, of one, traditional ethnology; two, acculturation studies; and three, studies of relations between aboriginal peoples and the Canadian state (Dyck 1990:41):

However, since the 1960s the foci of anthropological study have undergone fundamental changes... The changing nature of the field of study, the development of new working relations with aboriginal communities, the expectation that anthropologists should be addressing current issues, and the implementation of new forms of control and scrutiny over anthropological scholarship have all influenced anthropological studies of an involvement with native peoples and issues in Canada (Dyck 1990:43).

There is an unmistakable interaction here between ideology and politics, epistemology and hermeneutics.

Anthropologists (in Canada and Elsewhere) have, in effect, been encouraged to navigate the practice of their discipline between two equally blunt critiques of it: on the one hand, the frequently repeated charge that they are parasitical exploiters of native peoples, e.g., Deloria 1969, and on the other, the stricture that they must avoid becoming ‘biased’ pro-aboriginal advocates who are

devaluing the anthropological coinage of objective scholarly expertise (Dyck 1990:43).

The navigation of anthropology between these two critiques opens up two issues of academic or scientific credibility: one, if anthropologists are pro-aboriginal, do they really and objectively analyze or document the social field, and two, authorial authority: do anthropologists have the authority to speak about others? Furthermore, the latter question opens up an even larger can of worms, “not of [anthropological] making” (Paine 1990:43).

Who can speak for the ‘native’ in an ‘other’ world which is factionalized and segmented, where in our particular example, Longhouse Mohawk argue with Chief and Council Mohawk? Perhaps we need to realize that different people – to use post-modern language – read the text of their culture in different ways; maybe, then, “we should think of cultures, not culture. Of Others, not Other” (Paine 1990:44). In other words:

Because we are ‘re-presenting’ this activity of theirs, we don’t suppose that we are bearers of *the* truth or *the* reality. [Thus we should also not suppose that one native Other is *the* bearer of *the* truth.] But the task we do usefully fulfill in this way, is precisely that of Them-Uss interlocation, both in respect of Thems and Uss within the society itself, and between ‘it’ and institutions and persons external to it (Paine 1990:45).

In John Stephen Matthiasson’s review article, “Lived Experience and the Present: New Directions in Anthropological Writing”, we learn that when Arjun Appadurai writes about the ethnoscape (found in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, Richard G. Fox, ed., 1991) as a possible substitute for ‘culture’ he is suggesting that because “territorial boundaries are changing” and “individuals come from a variety of different cultural backgrounds and experiences” it is more appropriate to say that “we live in a post-modern world which is composed of ethnoscaples rather than tidy little cultural systems” (Matthiasson 1994:275). “How do we draw on the past as we move into the future?” (Borofsky 1994:480). Anthropology offers a cumulative and vast ethnographic data base, the ability to uncover bias over time and to build on the past by rooting our own contributions in the figures and schools of the past as well as incorporating other voices which are apparent “beyond our own coteries” (Borofsky 1994:480-5).

The tidy little “culture” is gone and no one can be reduced to either one thing or another. And so, to paraphrase Paul Rabinow, who paraphrased Max Weber, I am not just a naturalized Canadian of Southern European birth and parentage who is colonizing people – or, more appropriately, texts – in the post-modern age (and here I am afforded the irony of post-modernism and thus of being someone else’s Other studying another Other), I am also looking at paintings of Panguitong’s Joe Pee and Spain’s Pablo Picasso, drawing cognitive maps of the world as a graduate student in cultural anthropology and as an ‘assimilated’ immigrant in a complex, industrial nation, and worrying about my destiny and how it interacts with the destiny of others, in a world where nuclear technology and economic collapse may level all of us, without regard for Self or Other.

CHAPTER TWO

NATIONS AND NATIONALISM

2.1 PREAMBLE

A fairly extensive search of the literature has yielded a great deal of academic discourse on the aboriginal populations of the North American continent. For present purposes, the most compelling is that which discusses Indian-White interaction in historically-grounded examinations of both micro and macro level processes (i.e., Lithman 1987 and Miller 1989). In other words, the focus is multifarious and flexible. By contemplating the cultural dimension of Indian-White interaction, through the study of concepts like time, person, territory, and nation, a balanced treatment may slowly emerge. But this treatment does not necessarily denigrate other aspects of Indian-White interaction nor does it ignore the “day-to-day, person-to-person relations by discussing only economics, politics, or other macro-structural factors” (Lithman 1988:1).

The interaction of Indians and non-Indians has not just been an oppressive relationship whereby one subjugates the other (J.R. Miller in *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* divides contact into three periods: cooperation; coercion; and confrontation), nor has it only been the history of colonization whereby one group has exploited the other in order to maintain its way of life; rather, the on-going relationship has been mutual and situational, affecting both individuals and groups through a continuous interaction. The disparate ideologies have also been influenced by a grounded interaction which juxtaposes cultural notions of time, person, state, territory, and nation in both the formation of ideology and in the continuous day-to-day relations between people, groups, institutions, and more largely, nations (Lithman 1988).

Without impugning or ignoring the political or economic dimensions of aboriginal affairs in a post-modern nation state, an exploration of the cultural or ideological dimensions allows for a focus on the behavioral or discursive interaction at both the macro and micro

levels of both people and ideologies. First Nations nationalism represents a good example of the way ideology is influenced and then created by interaction.

2.2 THE PROCESS OF MODERNIZATION: NATIONALISM

The concept of the nation, as the West knows it, is a modern one. It is the product of a modern ideology, enacted through the process of nationalism. Modern ideology was developed in the West through a 'mental revolution' which placed paramount value on the individual and supported a transition whereby traditional societies evolved into modern ones (Dumont 1986). "Through what process did the Indians move from an aboriginal population into a situation where nationalism is a significant issue?" (Lithman 1988:16).

Once the process of nationalism as constructed in modern ideology has been outlined, the discussion may continue with an historical examination of subsequent contact between traditional and modern populations during the fur trade, the missionary movement, agricultural encroachment and settlement by both British and French, the signing of treaties, the Indian Act and the creation of reserves.

One can see how a specific conception of modernity underpinned much of the efforts of White Canada at the time: the Indians were to develop into individuals, invested with all the attributes of modern individuals... So... we meet the phenomenon of measures designed to promote modernity contained within a state-sponsored ethnic enclave system (Lithman 1988:12).

The processes of Modernization were sustained by contact between aboriginal societies and Western European societies, beginning during the European age of discovery. The Doctrine of Discovery was proclaimed by the papal office early in the Era of Discovery. The doctrine granted, to any Christian prince, the power to claim any land once it had been purchased from any indigenous inhabitants. Thus, despite the eventual exploitation which would invariably occur, the claim to land was based upon consensual agreement between the European discoverer and the Indigenous discovered (Deloria & Lytle 1984).

After the American Revolution had occurred, the government of the United States claimed to have inherited from Great Britain the right to buy land from the Indigenous peoples of North America. Once the American constitution was written, and subsequently

adopted, the collection of American states transferred to the federal American government the right to deal with the American Indian tribes. Federal policy (1984) features the euphemism of "government to government" to describe the interaction between the United States and the Indian tribes.

It is no mistake, in view of the accommodation the tribes and the United States have worked out that many tribes have erected signs proclaiming their nationhood, that traditional Indians believe themselves to be entities endowed with almost mystical powers, and that groups of Indians have recently appeared on the world scene demanding some form of representation in the United Nations (Deloria & Lytle 1984:7).

The ideas of nationhood and the concepts of the nation are relatively modern creations. The Indian tribes had an ordered existence, based upon a spiritual and holistic acceptance of their place in the universe. It was not until the arrival of the White European that the Indian glimpsed the compartmentalization and complexity of institutional life.

The idea of peoplehood, of nationality, has gradually been formed over the past two centuries into a new idea, one derived primarily from the European heritage, and with a singular focus distinct from the old Indian culture and traditions (Deloria & Lytle 1984:12).

The First Nations of the North American continent are not necessarily bound by borders of either political or economic creation. The nation may indeed be a tangible, geographically discrete entity, but it may also be much more. There is a sense of nationhood that goes beyond the corporeal reality of one particular community or band. Furthermore, the nation is a developing concept and reality that extends further than its physical properties.

The processual character of nationalism has prompted one scholar, Walker Connor, to ask not 'what is a nation?', but "When is a Nation?". Connor contends that the question is ponderable along four lines. (1) National consciousness is a mass phenomenon, first entertained by the elite. (2) Nation-building is not an event, incident, or occurrence, but rather a process. (3) Nation formation is not pre-ordered or ordained. (4) Finally, the common origin of masses (typically perpetuated in a myth of origin) is forced into rhetoric and is usually not based in ethnographic fact (Connor 1990:92). How did the aboriginal populations develop into nations in a largely unfamiliar yet quickly encroaching modern, western world? A macro-

level analysis of modern ideology will begin a more detailed discussion of ideological development between Aboriginal, or non-Western, and Western.

2.2.1 The Development of Individualism

When anthropologists conduct anthropological analyses, they must be careful not to apply the general Western rubrics (economics, politics, or ethics) to non-Western societies or cultures. *Essays on Individualism* contains the outline of Dumont's theory of individualism, and his programme for proper anthropological discourse. Modern or Western ideas possess a more or less exceptional character, different from other non-modern or non-Western ideas. Dumont believes that anthropology, principally through ethnographic text, provides a double reference: to both the global society on the one hand and to a comparison between observer and observed on the other (Dumont 1986:5). Thus anthropology contains an implicit comparison between us (modern) and them (non-modern). Dumont is anxious for anthropology to move beyond this implicit comparison and acknowledge who is being measured against whom (Dumont 1986:9). But in order to do this, anthropology should first acknowledge its own modern foundation while recognizing that the subjects of its inquiry are often on the other side of the world, so to speak.

In rough and ready terms, the problem of the origin of individualism is very much how, starting from the common type of holistic societies, a new type has evolved that basically contradicts the common conception. How has the transition been possible, how can we conceive of a transition between two antithetic universes of thought, those two mutually irreconcilable ideologies? (Dumont 1985:94).

First, Dumont separates the two parts of the individual. On the one hand, the individual is simply the empirical, tangible entity representative of the human species and present in all societies. On the other hand, the individual is also the ideal, non-social being or symbol at the basis of modern ideology. This latter individual is not found in all societies (Dumont 1986:62). Second, Dumont traces the development of individualism in context by defining the paramount values of a given society. Paramount value can either be placed on the whole social body or on the ideal, individual, human element (Dumont 1986:61). The idea may also be expressed as a distinction between *universitas*, which regards the individual as just a part

of the social whole, and *societas*, which regards the individual as a part of a partnership or association. Because Dumont is working within the French sociological tradition, his dichotomy of *universitas* and *societas* is predicated upon the Durkheimian dichotomy of mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. It goes almost without saying then that the evolution of modern society, also known in this case as the development of individualism, consists of movement from *universitas* to *societas*:

When there is no longer anything ontologically real beyond the particular being, when the notion of 'right' is attached not to a natural and societal order, but to the particular human being, he becomes an individual in the modern sense of the word (Dumont 1986:65).

The birth of the modern state, and modern ideology, began with the idea of the individual as a moral, non-social individual in relation to God. The supremacy of the church in the middle ages, based as it was on the idea of the individual in relation to God within an holistic milieu, eventually developed into the supremacy of the state, featuring the individual as bearer of supreme value engaged in partnership or association with other individuals.

In the middle ages, the church was not a state, it was the state; the state or rather the civil authority (for a separate society was not recognized) was merely the police department of the church (Dumont 1986:67).

The installation of the state in the place of the church was an arduous process with irrevocable results.

The Renaissance and Reformation profoundly affected the order of the medieval church and the Holy Roman Empire. The Lutheran doctrine proposed that the core of religion be transferred to the individual "conscience of each and every individual Christian" (Dumont 1986:71). And so evolved the modern individual's right to "freedom of conscience" – this Dumont calls the root of political freedom and the seed of modern ideology.

Once the individual inherently possesses supreme value, and once the group becomes a collection of individuals, then group maintenance and social control changes entirely. Thus, the divorce of church and state also contains significance for the maintenance of group solidarity. Such is the movement from *universitas* to *societas*. Following the Reformation, medieval scholars, many Jesuits among them, were quick to compose a natural law, as catalyzed by the Western separation of church and state. Group solidarity had to be preserved

and natural law was an attempt to express the unity of the social or political body. In order to maintain group solidarity, a functioning collection of individuals had to be created; an ideal society was erected through a vehicle known alternately as a 'compact' or a 'contract' (Dumont 1986:75).

Once the individual is separated from the group, as a single component of it, traditional hierarchy disappears and so does the "attribution of authority to a ruling agent" (Dumont 1986:76). Once hierarchy and the "attribution of authority to a ruling agent disappears", the new group of individuals must justify the attribution of authority to a leader. Without the entrenched hierarchy of the traditional society there is no ontologically acceptable rationale to explain why some individuals should rule over others. Thus, the justification comes in the form of the 'common consent' of the members of an association or a nation.

The nation... is the sociopolitical group corresponding to the ideology of the individual. It is thus two things in one: a collection of individuals and, at the same time, a collective individual, an individual on the level of groups, facing other nations – individuals (Dumont 1986:30).

Through contact, the development of modern ideology has made a significant impact on non-modern, or traditional, societies. The creation of the collective individual as nation has taken hold globally. Anthropology is a discipline traditionally concerned with the primitive, the exotic, or to quote Dumont, "the archaic".

Now we are asked what will happen to anthropology once economic progress has made all archaic groups into modern citizens of the world, we may perhaps answer that by that time anthropology will have progressed enough for us to be able to build our own sociology, something that would probably have been impossible if the existence of different societies had not forced us to get out of ourselves and look scientifically at men as social beings (Dumont 1986:200).

2.2.2 Traditional and Modern: A Basic Construction

The encounter between two civilizations provides an opportunity for a complex study of ideology and organization. But the study of such encounters also poses special problems that require special solutions. How do we distinguish between modern society and traditional society? A distinction may be made between modern and traditional by focusing on, as

Lithman suggests, concepts such as time, person, territory or nation. In this way, the common assumptions, ideas and values of the “several societies partaking of a common civilization” become the object of scrutiny (The programme becomes later extended when we add to it the question of the post-modern). For example, the distinction between Western and non-Western conceptions of time is very marked indeed.

In contrast to the western (occidental) way of relating to the world – namely in a linear and singular conception – the aboriginal philosophy views the world in cyclical terms. A good example of linear thinking is the occidental conceptualization of time. Time is conceptualized as a straight line... Native people [however] think in terms of cyclicity. Time is not a straight line, it is a circle (Little Bear 1991:244-5).

But the point is not to label the First Nations of Canada traditional or holistic, but rather to see or acknowledge the traditional elements which they have retained, in most cases at some cost, within a modern, increasingly post-modern, individualistic milieu.

The process of individualism occurred over centuries of time; furthermore, it encompassed a revolution in social values rooted in the idea of the individual. The individualistic value present in the Christian religion, which sees the individual-in-relation-to-God, fostered a lengthy and convoluted revolution that resulted in the differentiation of values and manifested itself in the compartmentalization of the social or cultural reality.

We [can] observe a simple opposition between four entities. On the one hand, politics and economics are fundamentally linked with the individualistic valuation, indeed they are products of its concomitants; on the other, religion and society taken in the traditional sense, are closely linked and constitute the holistic counterpart. They represent the continuity with the traditional universe that remains in the modern universe, while the two modern concepts represent the modern innovation (Dumont 1970:33).

As Western society retained elements of the traditional following metamorphosis into the modern, so have aboriginal societies retained elements of the traditional as their contact with the West resulted in a shift to the modern. Concepts like time or land retain traditional elements for aboriginal societies as they function in a largely individualistic milieu. They represent the continuity with the traditional universe that remains in the modern universe. Other concepts such as nation or politics are modern and therefore representative of the modern revolution or innovation. The creation of the First Nations (as reality and construct);

the use of the word nationalism to understand the processes of group identification and politicization; and the able manipulation of modern structures or institutions all point to the modern metamorphosis of once traditional societies.

For both Western and non-Western societies, the creation of nations and the process of nationalism rest upon the historical development of individualism as based on the idea of the individual, first in relation to God, and then as social being fused with rights and socially ordered vis-a-vis other individuals by compact or contract. The compact or social contract binds the individuals together in collectivity. The nation is simply, in this case, the normal form of the global society in an individualistic universe. In other words, a nation is both a collection of individuals and a collective individual: the nation is the individual writ large.

2.3 AN IDEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL EXAMINATION OF CONTACT

In the course of historical interaction between the Aboriginal and the European, the ideologies and practices of both were catalytic as well as influential. For example, the very constitution of the United States borrowed largely from the *Gayeneshakgowa*, or the Great Law of Peace, of the five (now six) nation Iroquois Confederacy; furthermore, the Canadian constitution, which was based on the British and American models, also indirectly borrows from it (although there is great debate in the literature, see: Wissler, 1940; Wallace, 1946; Grinde, 1977; Baxendale & MacLaine, 1990; Grinde & Johansen, 1990). But traditional, often conservative historians are rarely wont to acknowledge the aboriginal view-point or the aboriginal influence on the transplanted Europeans. Georges E. Sioui, who holds the Ph.D. in history from Laval University, argues for a revision of conventional 'Amerindian' history and the inclusion of a moral dimension.

A moral dimension allows one to go a few steps farther: beyond attempting to prove that Amerindians were not, at first, any more bloodthirsty, cruel, or socially repugnant than other peoples... [In fact] such a complementary dimension authorizes one to argue that the Aboriginal Amerindian society inspired and produced the metamorphosis of a decadent, feudal European society into a so-called American society, infinitely more humane and alive, from which the rest of humanity has drawn physical, intellectual, and spritual sustenance (Sioui 1992:65).

Canada may well be a product of colonialism wherein the so-called Indian problem and its policy solutions can only be understood in analyses of post-colonial context (Dickinson & Wotherspoon 1992:465). The explicitly assimilationist policy aimed at the eradication of the Indian problem is bent upon the economic, political, and social integration of aboriginal people despite its marginalization of “natives from both White and Indian society” (Dickinson & Wotherspoon 1992:406). It is therefore comprehensible that a focus on the economic development of the Canadian state and its relationship to “Indian policy” (Dickinson & Wotherspoon 1992:406) should be the avenue of choice for scholars of relations between the First Nations and the Canadian nation state. However,

The emphasis on economic and class factors has been criticized... for failing to account adequately for the autonomous effects of race and gender as policy determinants... or for failing to recognize the interactive effects of major characteristics... (Dickinson & Wotherspoon 1992:407).

The interactive effects are of great significance, particularly for a thesis concerned with contact between cultures. This contact between cultures, this process of interaction, coupled with the damaging and dangerous practice of cultural appropriation, lends poignancy to the critical aboriginal lamentation and demands a less authoritarian and more inclusive study of aboriginal societies, cultures, or nations.

The stories we would have liked to tell were largely appropriated and re-told by non-aboriginal experts in such fields as anthropology, art and history... Underlying this paternalistic and damaging practice is the supposition that these ‘experts’ have the right to retell their stories because of their superior status within the cultural and political constraints of our society (McMaster & Martin 1992:17).

The other side needs to be included in both academic and non-academic discourse and not simply eradicated or exalted. It becomes a matter of the cooperative contribution to a multi-dimensional understanding of a sociocultural reality that we all, in one way or another, share. “Columbus did not discover a new world”; he established contact between two worlds, both already old” (J.H. Parry, cited in Jennings 1976:39).

2.3.1 Ontologies as Ideologies within Ideologies

The prime aim... is to address some puzzles in situations [of interaction] as exemplified by the Canadian native/non-native one, viz the co-existence within a minority of a consciousness distinct from that of a larger society, in spite of the fact that the minority in a variety of areas may appear to have majority-derived notions (Lithman 1988:3).

How can this distinct consciousness within a larger society be revealed? One way may be through the study of the ontology. The ontology is an ideology within an ideology; it is a way to reach the configurational aspect of culture; it is a way to reveal the key symbols. Thus, the importance of concepts like nation or person, time or land, is revealed in the interactional creation of ideology as expressed in symbol. A focus on a key concept, such as nation, reveals the configuration of a culture, its key symbols, and, hence, the ontology. Therefore, despite the ideologically Western-based nationalism of the First Nations, the configurational aspects of the culture, the key symbols or ontology, are still traditionally indigenous. Crudely re-phrased, time is still a circle.

The existence of different ontologies within an ideology is not a contradiction: "it must be clear that ideology [is] immediately part of and expression for lived realities [actively] engaging different ideologies" (Lithman 1988:3).

Ontology denotes a kind of ideology within ideology... laid down in history [with] a form of internal logic [that] acquires its meaning and exerts the force of its logic, only through the ideological action of human beings in a social and political world (Kapferer 1988:80).

Thus the Mohawk have evolved as a collectively centred, yet individualistically based nation; the product of interaction between ordinary people in day-to-day discourse, including contact between nations on ideological (for example, religious proselytization or education) as well as more practical dimensions (or less overtly ideological planes like the Indian Act or the Fur Trade), and between value systems containing key symbols (the Longhouse vs. Parliament) or concepts (nation or time).

An argument assessing interaction on the ideological or ontological plane moves beyond the economic, macro analyses, which focus on the interaction between the Canadian state and aboriginal societies, toward an analysis of symbolic as well as practical interaction.

During the Oka crisis, there was a good deal of symbol manipulation, ideological and practical interaction: the occupation of the golf course and the use of golf-clubs or golf-carts (innocuous little recreation vehicles turned into utilitarian war horses carrying as many as three or four warriors at a time); the creative use of police cruisers and front-end loaders; and the collective camouflage uniform of the post-modern faceless warrior further enforced by the practical-yet-symbolically significant castration of individual identity with face kerchiefs. But on the other hand, what of the flamboyant, idiosyncratic, and colourful names adopted by the individual members of the warrior collectivity? Why Spudwrench? Why Lasagna? Lasagna has particularly curious implications because Ronald Cross, a.k.a. Lasagna, is a Mohawk from Upper State New York with an Italian-American mother. From the push and pull between collectivity and individual, and the ideological interplay, it is clear that a minority does exist with a consciousness different from that of the majority, despite the presence of majority-derived values and concepts. Unfortunately, "there is no immediate and clear-cut functional specificity involved" (Lithman 1988:3) and the problem neither begins nor ends at Oka.

How does the individual claim membership in the nation? According to the tenets of modern ideology, the ontological accent is on the individual as bearer of supreme value. Therefore, the nation is the collective entity within which the individual, both ideationally and corporeally, exists. Nation and individual are not polar opposites; rather, they are two sides of the same coin. In other words, nation and individual are mutual expressions of the same ideological process (Lithman 1988:5). No matter how the interaction between indigenous societies and the transplanted European societies is historically divided, the basis of the tension may be found in the nuclear ontologies of the modern and the traditional, of the individual and the collectivity.

Aside from the abortive Norse attempts to colonize North America, the first Europeans were more interested in fish than in anything else. However, the arrival of a different type of European, with different fishing practices, began a new form of contact.

When the French navigator Jacques Cartier was cruising the coast in 1534, he met some Algonkians in the area of the Bay of Chaleur. The encounter was instructive... The Indians initiated both contact and commerce... 'They bartered all they had' (Miller 1989:26).

The fur trade complex introduced the First Nations to a larger structure, not contained within the band or village. The strain between the traditional collectivity of the indigenous populations and the modern individualism of the Western fur-procuring societies was already evident in the early days of the fur trade.

As individuals, good hunters could establish individual careers in the [form] of a family economy based upon a credit allowance system with the trade posts. At the same time, this professionalization and individualization of the Indian hunting pursuit was rooted in the ethnically organized division of labour. So, in fact, these first processes of incorporation of the Indian communities into the White world were, if one chooses to designate them, a modernization within the native communities and resting upon the 'non-modern' feature of an ethnically structured production system (Lithman 1988:11).

The merger of the fur trade companies in 1821 and the eventual collapse of the fur trade complex significantly decreased the utility of the Indian ally and lessened the political power of aboriginal societies in general. Furthermore, the influx of white settlers onto aboriginal territory created greater stress as they "dispossessed the Indians of their lands" in one way or another (Miller 1989:98).

Chief Golden Eagle of the Lake Simcoe Ojibwa in Upper Canada complained as early as 1805 that the authorities had 'told us the Farmers would help us, but instead of doing so when we camp on the shore, they drive us off and shoot our Dogs and never give us any assistance as was promised to our old chiefs (Miller 1989:98).

Once the Indian was no longer militarily useful, when even his dog was a nuisance, the interaction between Indian and White became markedly different:

Prior to 1830, the men who dealt with Indians had acted diplomatically, treating the Indians as powerful nations with whom they had to parley to achieve agreement upon a course of action (Miller 1989:99).

In the quest for control, the British Canadians began to actively employ methods of assimilation, rather than extermination. The new orientation was buttressed by ideological justification (see M. Harris 1968).

This Social Darwinism, as it became known, was used to legitimize the tendency of Caucasians in Europe and North America to regard other people as inferior... In British North America [it] served as handy rationalization to justify attempts to coerce and change Indian societies (Miller 1989:88).

The euphemism for the coercive and destructive assimilation was labeled “the only possible euthanasia of savage communities” (Smith 1987, found in Miller 1989:100). The foundation for the policy of assimilation had already been laid by the Christian missionary endeavours.

Since the 1790s, the Moravian Brethren had been working among Indians that one of their leaders had brought from the United States and the Church of England..., by virtue of the Anglicans’ lengthy ministry, was well established on the Grand River (Miller 1989:100).

The Jesuits also settled down among the Iroquois, eventually conflicting with both the Iroquois and the previously settled Sulpician missionaries. The important point is that the churches were not only preaching, they were also educating: assimilation through socialization. The church, then, as a main agent of civilization, had the responsibility of overseeing the development of holistic, collective, *savage* societies into individualistic, atomized, *civilized* ones, complete with “the proper appreciation for private ownership” (Lithman 1988:12).

The programme was designed to promote modernity and, despite the coercive aspects of forced assimilation, astute chiefs realized that “they needed new skills and economic pursuits in an era of Euro-Canadian settlement and agricultural development”.

Yellowhead... reported that: ‘Our native brothers are desirous of forming a settlement, and we will avail ourselves of this opportunity to address our great father on a subject of such deep interest to our tribe’ (cited by Miller 1989:101).

The creation of reserves and educational programmes, along with the making and signing of treaties, continued to affect the deteriorating egalitarian interaction.

The downward slide of Indian policy between 1830 and confederation was both a reflection of the changing relationship and a portent of things to come. The move towards interference and compulsion was intelligible only against a shifting background in which Indians became increasingly marginal to the desires of the newcomers, but in which Indians refused to concede their defeat (Miller 1989:115).

The fact that the “Indians refused to concede their defeat”, that they still continue to refuse today, sets the stage for formal confrontation in the historical development of interaction between Indian and White.

By the second third of the twentieth century, changes in Canadian Indian policy were inevitable. Missionary organizations and Ottawa bureaucrats had come to recognize that directed change and economic development were not occurring as they wanted... The failure of the nineteenth century policies and a rise in the numbers of Indians made attempts to redefine Indian policy unavoidable. And, as that process began on the governmental side of the relationship, coincidentally among the native population there was a growing restlessness and a desire to control their own affairs (Miller 1989:211).

Furthermore, there was a “contradiction between individualism and ethnic enclosurement in the early reserve situation” (Lithman 1988:13).

2.3.2 The Ethnic Enclave and A Model for Two Type Nationalism

In the case of the Mohawk in the Oka area, at Kanesatake, Kahnawake, and Akwesasne, there has been a considerable amount of tension between the traditional and the modern, as well as in the expression, interaction, or inherent contradiction of the two.

...It must... be [made] very clear that as the Indian communities became subjugated to outside forces, particularly the churches and Indian affairs,... a process in which the relatively declining economic status of the Indians assisted, the Indian communities became affected in a number of ways (Lithman 1988:13).

It is of interest to recognize which aspects of Western society or culture the Mohawk chose for their own needs and which they chose to ignore. “Despite the containment within the ethnic community of forms imported from the outside” (Lithman 1988:13), a multi-functional and multi-situational combination of old and new has evolved.

The creation of the Chief and Council system, designed ostensibly to promote local government in the ‘60s and ‘70s, has created a division of power in the Mohawk communities of Kanesatake and Kahnawake. The division of power between the *modern* Chief and Council and the more traditional institution of the Longhouse has created a community division which goes beyond mere semantics or Euro-Canadian Acts and laws. Presumably this division of power was predicated by the federal government on a traditional, pan-tribal form of aboriginal government – yet it was strangely generic in its application and more a reflection of Euro-Canadian images of aboriginal government than specific and local institutions of traditional aboriginal government.

The idea of an Indian Act transcends the notions of collectivity or nationhood on the part of the aboriginal societies, ignores the traditional patterns of settlement and alignment, and creates common areas of residential settlement where all (or almost all) inhabitants happen to be *Indian* (and here are found the racist rationalizations). The fact that aboriginal societies have withstood this assimilative attempt is a testimonial to the give-and-take nature of Indian and White interaction as well as to their collective and individual tenacity. The ability of the First Nations to use the measures of governance imposed by individualistically-centred acts and bureaucracies, while retaining traditional, collective forms of organization or ritual, lends credence to the existence of a dual cultural logic (Lithman 1988) that has developed during centuries of contact. There are disparate ontological configurations within the overarching modern ideology upon which First Nations nationalism is based.

For the Mohawk of Kahnawake and Kanewake, the current Longhouse is not more traditionally Mohawk or Iroquois than is the Indian Act's Chief and Council: both have been shaped by modern ideology through interaction with Western society. "New ingredients, as well as evanescent elements and qualities and transformational possibilities, are surely as 'cultural' as old ones" (Falk Moore 1994:366). Sally Falk Moore tells the interesting story of Danieli, a Wachagga man and a Christian, who had retired from government service in the Tanzanian capital of Dar es Salaam, and was about to re-settle permanently in his house on Kilimanjaro. Danieli spoke English very well, had met and carried on correspondence with Malinowski and later, Falk Moore, and still owned property in Dar es Salaam which he had rented to a foreigner. Against the principles of President Nyerere's socialist government, Danieli continued to rent out his house because he had circumvented the law by consulting a lawyer and working out a deal whereby he had 'sold' his house to the foreigner while retaining a large 'mortgage' toward which the foreigner made monthly 'payments'. Once the foreigner left Dar es Salaam, he would default on the mortgage and Danieli would foreclose. Thus, what looked legally like a mortgage was actually a rental agreement (Falk Moore 1994:366-7).

But enough is apparent in Danieli's story to ask some questions about the usefulness of the classical idea of a 'culture'... Was the new legislation not as much part of 'the culture' of property then current among the Chagga as was

the local practice of living in patrilineal cultures. And what about the fact that Danieli had to consult a lawyer to generate a scheme of evasion? (Falk Moore 1994:369).

Moore's point is made to demonstrate the flow of process; it hints at a linkage between the micro and the macro level; the individual and his or her society; and intra-cultural divisions of knowledge. "A processual approach on such activities seems highly appropriate" (Falk Moore 1994:370). Despite the inherent traditionalism of the Longhouse, and in spite of the superficially individualistic aspects of the Chief and Council imposed by the Indian Act, the contemporary organization of Mohawk/Iroquois society must be understood vis-a-vis the contact between cultures and the consequent dual cultural logic found in the First Nations. The dual cultural logic refers to concepts and ideas. The two types of nationalism outlined by Lithman in the following model are the outcome of centuries of contact between Aboriginal and European. These two types do not consist of a number of traits; rather, they are systems of internal logic and therefore extremely relevant to an understanding of both contact and nationalism (Lithman 1988:16).

Features of Nationalism

	Type I	Type II
Ontological emphasis:	on nation.	on individual.
Relationship between person and nation:	individual weak; nation strong.	nation weak; individual strong.
Principle in defining territory:	emphasis on nation.	emphasis on state.
Conception of time:	comprehensive.	segmented.
State oriented toward goals of:	the nation.	the individual.

Adapted from Lithman 1988:16.

Nations are not homogenous. Despite their common ideological bases, nations do not feature identical, ontological conceptions of individual and nation. The two types of nationalism presented in Lithman's model are not amenable to amalgamation. They each possess respective frameworks of "unassailable internal logic" (Lithman 1988:16). And in spite of the curious fact that they may co-exist in a totality, the behaviour which follows from the base of one ontology or another is always distinguishable from its counter-part. Within a First Nation, individuals may engage either type as a conceptual guide; in relations with other groups, the First Nation is collective, usually unified in opposition, with an emphasis on the nation.

During the Oka crisis, the Mohawk were unified against the immediate outside world, a nation strongly engaged in the Type I kind of nationalism. As individuals, however, the Mohawk were and are free to act in either Type I or Type II kinds of nationalism: for example, the many high profile players involved in the Oka crisis who had successful, individual careers in Canadian society; and of course there are the celebrated Mohawk steelworkers who perform both individually and collectively – perhaps engaged in both types of nationalism as the occasions warrant

The emergence of both types of nationalism must be seen as lodged in history,... resulting from the exclusion of Indians from White society and the ethnic enclosement as well as the penetration of Indian communities of individualistic thought models (Lithman 1988:17).

The development and emergence of the two-type ideology of nationalism is entirely predicated on the influx of Western European culture and ideology, the contact which occurred and continues to exist between the two sociocultural complexes, and the ability of people to grasp meaning, form thoughts, and construct behaviour in more than one sphere.

If nationalism is the result of Westernization through contact with Western culture and ideology, then nationalism could be, for the indigenous peoples of North America, the result of sustained interaction, including formal education and informal socialization or enculturation within Western parametres. Nationalism begins slowly and then is quickly spread. Those most in contact with the West are aware of the existence or possibility of alternatives to the status

quo (Connor 1991; Rahman 1991). These are the people who are most influential in the construction and maintenance of nationalism.

The reality of prolonged contact requires an exchange between societies and cultures, of people, material artefacts, and, among other things, ideas. The 'foot in either camp' ability of Aboriginals in Canada today has less to do with ability and more to do with necessity. And as has been repeatedly pointed out, the case of contact between Indian and White has not been one-sided, flowing from White to Indian. In fact, the "decadent feudal European society" (Sioui 1992:65) was irrevocably transformed by its contact on the North American continent with Aboriginal societies and cultures, and further arguments (Grinde and Johansen 1991) specifically pinpoint the political influence of the Iroquois Confederacy. The acknowledgement of this bi-directional interaction is found in most of the principal sources upon which this thesis is predicated.

CHAPTER THREE

THE WHITE MAN'S INDIAN

In the New World accounts of explorers and travellers, government records and missionary reports, evidence of the incredible diversity of societies and cultures is abundant. In fact: "The original inhabitants of the western hemisphere neither called themselves by a single term nor understood themselves as a collectivity" (Berkhofer 1979:3). For a tangled host of political, social, economic, and religious reasons the complexities were ignored; the popular and official word was Indian. Through a series of legislative and sociocultural mechanisms, a focused agenda of assimilation accompanied the creation of an easily classified Other. The creation of the Indian Act in 1876 made Indian not only a folk category of ascription and self-ascription but a legal category as well (Lithman 1984:3). Who is an Indian; or more appropriately, what is the Indian? There are a range of issues to be discussed within the contextual reality of Canada, with special allusion to the Oka crisis: post-modern explorations of self and other; academic text as literature; European and North American images of savage nobility; and the changing face of the Indian.

3.1 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS OF SELF AND OTHER

According to its critics, the anthropological enterprise has erroneously and usually purposefully given its audiences, both academic and lay, the distinct impression that what ethnographies detail and ethnology theorizes is a cultural exposé and objective manner of inquiry. Hidden is the actual imposition of values, schema, exotic facts, and fantasy that combine to create cultural descriptions or explanations which reveal more about the discipline and its Western cradle than about the societies or cultures that it purports to portray. With respect to the indigenous American then:

One can thus descry in anthropological texts the noble but blurred outline of a savage who, being nearer to nature than we are, must have refused in advance all that oppresses us (the Oedipal triangle, the state, abstraction), and whose trace, memory or testimony one may still find in the Amazonian forests or in the Australian deserts... (Augé 1977:4).

To use another culture to measure one's own may be "one of the most imperialist of ethnocentrism", harkening forth the ghost of Rousseau's noble savage as cultural critique for the present day. History has not yet ended – has no end? To project the "shadow of our own terrors and phantasies on to a magnified image of others" without acknowledging the projection or placing the projectionist and his or her tool within the context of Western history is a dangerous practice (Augé 1977:11).

3.1.1 Western Constructions of Self and Other: Before the Indian there was the Oriental

The criticism which Edward Said levels at the discipline of Orientalism is two-fold and generally applicable to traditional anthropological studies of non-Western sociocultures: (1) the image that the Western academics have constructed of the Orient "stresses radical separation from and opposition to the west"; and (2) a timeless "essentialism" (Carrier 1992:195).

More than any other discipline, anthropology tends to seek out "the alien, the exotic, [and] the distant" (Carrier 1992:195). Despite the political changes in the Third World, the new economic reality in Western universities, and the changing intellectual climate in anthropology, many anthropologists still focus on the anthropological epitome as village fieldwork in exotic (or at least hot) locations (Carrier 1992:195). Western studies have increased in number but have neither attained the status of African or Latin American studies, for example, nor have they strongly affected anthropological theory. Furthermore, the appearance of Western studies is not enough. Until they are incorporated or institutionalized in the discipline of anthropology, they are going to remain marginal.

It is not difficult to see how critics of anthropology have been able to lump ethnography of the exotic in with the other more general Oriental Studies. The focus of these critics has usually been on the product of Orientalism – the textual description of ethnography

rather than the process. According to Carrier (1992), it is the process of Orientalism (which contains in its generic state the discipline of anthropology) that should be of concern. Because a general understanding of how Selves create Others may be reached by delineating the “social, political, and intellectual factors that led to Orientalist constructions of alien societies” (Carrier 1992:196),

What Said calls Orientalism is the construction of the Orient based on its unique status for the Western academic. The Orient is very close to Europe; it is the source of its languages, the place of its wealthiest and oldest colonies, the birthplace of its civilization, its cultural contestant, and “one of its deepest and most recurring images of the other” (Said 1977:1). The Orient also contains a fundamental process of self-definition in opposition. Thus, there is a more general interpretation of Orientalism which transgresses its obvious geographic connotations. “Orientalism is a style of thought based upon ontological and epistemological distinction between ‘the Orient’ and (most of the time) ‘the Occident’” (Said 1977:2). Seen in this way, Orientalism is the production of a privileged Western juxtaposition (Said 1977:5). As the West understands itself, and defines Others on its own terms, so do Others understand and define themselves on Western terms (Carrier 1992:197). The West is granted the privileged status because that is the reality. By the World War’s end, Europe had colonized 85% of the global surface. To admit that colonialism and imperialism had two hands in the creation of a Western/non-Western dichotomy of interpretation is not, to paraphrase Said, to say anything overly contentious or avant garde.

The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony... The Orient was orientalized because it was discovered to be “oriental” in all those ways considered commonplace by an average nineteenth century European, but also because it could be – that is submitted to being – *made* oriental (Said 1977:5-6).

The topic of Orientalism provides a viable metaphor for the comprehension of Western power. To understand the pervasiveness of Western power, Gramsci (1971) made the useful distinction between civil and political society. A civil society is composed of voluntary or non-coercive affiliations like schools and the military whose role in the polity is direct domination. Within civil society, culture also operates in the maintenance of order,

where the influence of certain ideas, institutions, and persons works not through domination but consent. In non-totalitarian societies cultural leadership is called hegemony (Said 1977:17).

European cultural hegemony, as couched in Western ideology, has ideas about the Orient which continuously reaffirm the central Western notion of its superiority and overrides the independent or skeptical paradigms that challenge it. Neither meaning nor efficacy would be lost from the following passage were Indian to be substituted for Orient. In fact, "Indian" referred to "Oriental" in the Western classification of things.

Under the general heading of knowledge of the Orient, and within the umbrella of western hegemony over the Orient during the period from the end of the eighteenth century, there emerged a complex Orient suitable for study in the academy, for display in the museum, for construction in the colonial office, for theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial and historical theses about mankind and the universe, for instances of economic and sociological theories of development, revolution, cultural personality, national or religious character. Additionally, the imaginative examination of things oriental was based more or less exclusively upon a sovereign western consciousness out of whose unchallenged centrality an Oriental would emerge, first according to general ideas about who or what was an Oriental, then according to a detailed logic governed not simply by empirical reality but by a battery of desires, repressions, investments and projections (Said 1977:7-8).

Despite its usually hidden reality, Otherness is always imaginary and self-inventing, shaped through language and historically lodged. The cultural Other was sometimes a form of critique or even satire, able to provide reflexive contemplation for its creator society. The Other was literary, artistic and critical fodder for the masses, able to evoke contemporary, civilized or historical society through its opposition to the created, prehistoric past. The Other was and remains fluid, expanding as *us* contracts and contracting as *us* expands (Carrier 1992:197). *Us* can be synonymous with humanity, as witnessed by the anthropological search for human universals; *us* can also exclude those who are not members of the middle class academia (Carrier 1992:197). The anthropological push and pull between *us* and *Other* may also be seen in the anthropological play between the universal and the particular. But, the

underlying dialectical approach is not the problem; rather, it is the rootless effect of the dialectical.

Anthropologists have thrown out the dialectical baby with the evolutionary bathwater. As a consequence, these constructions of alien societies have become detached from the west to which they are opposed, and have instead come to be treated as substantive. What had only been a distinguishing characteristic, albeit an important one, becomes a defining characterization (Carrier 1992:204).

The problem plagues the non-anthropologist as well; making sense between *them* and *us* has dogged Western scholars since the time of the ancient Greeks (Carrier 1992:203).

3.1.2 The Historical Construction of Other: Anthropological Discourse and Deconstruction

As so many have said in so many ways, history is written by the victorious. In order to cut through the meta-narrative of a teleological, Western-based history which usually begins in ancient Greece, a deconstruction of official histories must occur. Questions need to be asked. How does historiography arrange what the Others have to say? Furthermore, with what authority does it do this? And is the authority fully accepted either by *Ourselves* or by *Others*?

The questions are also asked of anthropology. Robert Paine's "Our Authorial Authority" (1990) presents a bifurcated inquiry that examines both the nature of the authority appropriated by the anthropologist and the strategies used to convince the anthropological audience of his or her authority. Paine's treatment (and others like it) may be a response to the damning and explosive concerns found in a watershed like *Writing Culture* (Clifford & Marcus:1986). The deconstruction of anthropological knowledge and authority has been part and parcel of a larger movement of deconstruction within the social sciences. There has been a change in the presentation of knowledge and authority for Western historians, scholars, and social scientists; largely wrought by critical and non-Western social philosophers or academics, a revolution of knowledge presentation has occurred.

For anthropology, then, the most important question of all may be where the balance is between the subjective and the objective. How is the extremely subjective experience of

fieldwork transformed into the objective account of the ethnography, and with what authority? Paine writes a litany for the changing history of authorial authority within anthropology, from the lament of Clifford for a hallowed inter-subjective middle, to the older praise of difference sung by Meyer Fortes, which creates a dynamic tension between *us* and *them* and the anthropological ability or authority to tell the difference. From the authority of Frazer's classic erudition, based upon the "highly-trained mind of the rational European" (Paine 1990:36) to the relativistic contextual interpretation of exotic behaviour by Malinowski's participant observation, and even further to Lévi-Strausseau-Aristotelian intellectual conjecture. First the anthropological reader made a commitment to the legitimacy of the Western, scientific, empirical order and then he or she granted legitimacy to the cultural Other (Paine 1990:39). In the 1960s, ethnocentrism became suppressed as the Evans-Pritchard programme, with its emphasis on fieldwork as the *sine qua non* of anthropology and participant observation as the *sine qua non* of fieldwork, brought objective respectability and distance from 'subjective bias' (Paine 1990:40).

But the field really only opened with those first attempts at subjectivity: Laura Bohannan's fictionalized account *Return to Laughter*; Gerald Berreman's *Behind Many Masks*; and of course, all along, Malinowski's *Diary*. These attempts pushed the anthropologist towards new heights of accountability, with particular attention to the relationship between informer and anthropologist. And the tension between the objective (scientific) authorial authority and the subjective or personal authority of the anthropologist came under scrutiny. The authority cried out "I was there, not you!". The strain between the highly subjective, implicit, "I was there!" authority and the objective, explicit, third-person account, complete with quantitative tables, opened up with the alteration of anthropological knowledge or authority (Paine 1990:40).

Alternate channels of authority erupted and flowed. Books like Said's *Orientalism* and Vine Deloria Jr.'s *Custer Died for Your Sins* questioned the generally accepted anthropological authorial authority. Some anthropologists and some kinds of anthropology escaped into the text of theory or ethnography. As text, anthropology was no more or less than genre writing, written within and evaluated by the parameters of the Western literary

tradition. Thus some anthropologists like Marjorie Shostak in *Nisa: The Life and Words of a !Kung Woman* use literary strategies and literary devices in the creation of their ethnographies so as to bypass the problem of relativism and authorial authority in the creation of relations between the anthropologist and other culture, or the anthropologist and his or her readership, in order to convey “alien ideas across cultures” (Paine 1990:41). Still, they are trying to do ethnography.

3.1.3 Academic Text as Literature: Anthropology and History in Historical Context

Notwithstanding the cries of some critical Western historians and other scholars, the institutions of exploitation, conquest, genocide, and ethnocide – “the planned destruction of ways of life” – are ancient (Keesing 1981:381) and may be traced far beyond the establishment or creation of Western Civilization. The deconstruction of the official views of history, as written by the scribes of Western Civilization, could be applied to other histories of other civilizations, had they been written into the sorts of histories that we in the West understand as history. The official histories of the Western world are open to deconstructive analysis by “Western historians who have broken loose from the smug assumptions of empire... and by growing ranks of Third World historians” (Keesing 1981:380). A reinterpretation may be beginning, but to fully understand from a multifarious position the histories of Europe and the Western world, the systems of colonialism, and the scourges of exploitation and genocide, would “take hundreds of volumes” (Keesing 1981:380).

While the work is being done slowly, the citizens of Western societies need to turn the mirrors of study on themselves – to understand or acknowledge the myths that complete their history, their cultures and societies. Unfortunately,

Americans brought up on the myths that are a national heritage... are not likely to have a critical perspective of their own history and the history of the Western Civilization to which they are joint heirs, unless they have worked very hard to re-educate themselves (Keesing 1981:379).

The deconstruction of official histories has in some circles facilitated the movement from anthropological text as objective, positivist truth to genre writing, highly subjective and fictional – in the very literal sense of creating or making-up text. And this has allowed the

anthropologist who is sensitive to the critique – the accusation of Western cultural hegemony – a cover for excuse. As fiction, or genre writing, ethnography becomes just another literary strategy and anthropology loses its scientific or objective authority. The anthropologist is just one of many recounting myths or telling stories. He or she is only one of the many voices emerging from the anthropological or ethnographic text, as opposed to the sole, authoritative voice. This solution to the critique being levelled at Western social science disciplines by non-Western academics or social critics seems temporary at best and pusillanimous at worst. “It is essential to realize that the history of Canada... has been written mainly by English-speaking Euro-Canadians, specifically of British ethnicity” (Frideres 1983:5). The same holds true for the histories of the Western world. The trick is not to be the sole voice or authority but to be one of many voices explaining, analyzing, understanding, or telling histories in a vehicle that permits anthropological text to be much more than fiction or literature.

To properly deconstruct the historiography which still guides the Western world, academia included, an unpacking of images in context needs to occur. More questions need to be asked. The important historical inquiries are those which ask the questions that the everyday practitioner or reader of history would not: (1) What is the structure of a particular historical consciousness? (2) What is the epistemological framework of any given historical explanations? (3) What are the possible forms of historical representation? (4) What is the authority of the historical account? (White 1978:81). The historian is responsible for the plotting of historical events in a particular sequence so that the historical events are imbued with special kinds of meanings as drawn from a given context, a particular historical age. This by no means renders the fiction-making aspect of historical construction shameful, or without value; nor, by the same token, does it “detract from the status of historical narratives as providing a kind of knowledge” (White 1978:85).

What the chronicler of history essentially does is to provide both a personal and transpersonal (sociocultural) account of historically arranged events in context. Because the historian jointly holds, with his or her audience, general notions regarding the forms of human interaction (White 1978:86), he or she is responsible for the writing of accounts which make sense to the participants (his or herself included) of a particular age. It is a way of rendering

the unfamiliar familiar, comfortable to the senses and well-understood in accordance with the morality, thoughts, and codes of a specific time and place.

The historian takes the raw cultural myths of historical events as they occurred in sequence, and shapes them into comprehensive historiography by establishing the events as a story of a particular kind, keeping in mind its meaning and accessibility for members of a specific audience; essentially, it is the audience of the historian.

And when he has perceived the class or type to which the story that he is reading belongs, he experiences the effect of having the events in the story explained to him. He has at this point not only successfully *followed* the story; he has grasped the point of it, *understood* it as well (White 1978:86).

Thus it is the duty of the skillful historian to arrange people and events in the frame of a familiar historical form or configuration.

The ascription of fiction-making to the process or the production of history is in no way an attempt at the wholesale discreditation of the discipline and its practitioners; furthermore, the ascription is not meant to invoke the ire of historians who may believe (and rightly so) that they are of a different breed than the novelist, in that they write the real and not the imagined. The point is, rather, that history shares with literature a bit of the process which makes sense of the unsensible and transforms the unfamiliar into the familiar by endowing what originally appears to be problematic

and mysterious with the aspect of a recognizable, because it is familiar, form. It does not matter whether the world is conceived to be real or only imagined; the manner of making sense of it is the same (White 1978:98).

This sort of perception of history does not necessarily denigrate historiography to the commonly-held status of propaganda or ideology. In fact, quite the opposite should happen. With an acknowledgement of history as a kind of literature and the isolation of the literary mechanisms or characteristics found in history or the plotting of the historical process, one is able to place particular histories in the familiar sociocultural contexts of a time and place – to answer the important questions and to recognize our own place in history.

We are always able to see the fictive element in those historians with whose interpretations of a given set of events we disagree; [yet] we seldom perceive that element in our own prose... [but] if we recognized the literary or fictive element in every historical account, we would be able to move the teaching

of historiography onto a higher level of self-consciousness than it currently occupies (White 1978:99).

3.2 THE NOBLE SAVAGE

Hayden White begins his discussion on the Noble Savage theme as fetish precisely where he left off in his analysis of the historical text as literary artefact. By immediately establishing the remoteness of any new understanding regarding the Noble Savage, he sets the stage for a re-interpretation of the theme using different or new cultural meanings in order to tell a new or different cultural story, and hence, to cover the topic in a valuable and pointed historical way. In other words, upon what epistemology or framework of knowledge is the Indian of history based? How has the unfamiliar savage become the familiar Indian?

The Noble Savage finds its genesis in the more unruly roots of the Wild Man, but possesses all of the attributes of a fetish, which for White unfolds in three parts: (1) “a fetish is any natural object believed to possess magical or spiritual power”, (2) “any material object regarded with superstitious or extravagant trust or reverence”, and (3) “any object or part of the body obsessively seized upon as an exclusive source of libidinal gratification” (White 1978:184).

Fetishism may be regarded as a devotion or belief. The general utility of the Noble Savage as fetish, which putatively describes a type of humanity in historical context, provides a “magical..., extravagant and irrational” type of belief, meaning to simultaneously inspire devotion and displaying “the kind of pathological displacement of libidinal interest that we normally associate with the forms of racism that depend on the idea of a ‘wild humanity’ for their justification” (White 1978:184). Expressions like Noble Savage and Wild Man are also metaphors, useful in their necessity as mechanisms which render the unfamiliar familiar; in other words, they are extremely useful in the face of a phenomenon which escapes or transgresses the normal forms of conduct or experience of a given cultural or social group (White 1978:184). These metaphors allow the unfamiliar to become familiar as constrained, then grasped, and finally understood in sociocultural context.

The fetishism of the Noble Savage is not an absurd proposition, although it may be a scientific fallacy, and the social scientist is not necessarily interested in the rightness or wrongness of the proposition as fallacy; rather,

the social scientist is much more interested in *how* a given fetishistic practice functions in a given culture, individual, or group, whether it is oppressive or therapeutically efficacious, than in exposing the error of logic or rationality which underlies it (White 1978:184).

The focus on the *how*, on understanding the process, is a very useful tool for the analysis of a fetish like the Noble Savage. The curious ascription of wildness to the inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere fell under two blanket categories: Wild Man and Noble Savage. The dialectic of fetishism has two poles here, one positive and one negative (White 1978:187).

How was the idealized Noble Savage constructed from the degenerate and sub-human Wild Man? How were the two poles able to simultaneously and contemporaneously exist? "Let us imagine an archaic community which has only two terms to designate every possible kind of human being: a term equivalent to 'man' and a term like 'barbarian or alien'" (Eco 1985:163). The universe here is black and white, split into *Us* and *Other*. Through prolonged contact, *Us* begins to realize that there is more to *Them* than just opposition to *Us*.

In the same way, for the member of our fictional ancient society it will be difficult to ascertain the difference between [say] a Viking and a Phoenician, as well as the difference between their languages; at first they will all be 'barbaroi' speaking a non-language. Eventually, at a more advanced stage... of contact, someone will discover that Vikings are more aggressive and Phoenicians more eager to entertain commercial relationships, thus facilitating the reformulation of the content and 'the discovery' of new pertinences, and the invention of new expressions to designate these pertinences (Eco 1985:164).

Thus will emerge a new, improved system of categorization that not only reflects the changing reality but helps to govern it as well. With even further contact, new pertinences will continue to emerge and help define and interpret experience. Using the Viking-Phoenician example supplied by Eco,

Our society could split into castes. Priests and merchants will be able to distinguish Vikings from Phoenicians, probably for different reasons (merchants because they are interested in dealing with the Phoenicians and

priests because they suppose that Vikings can be easily converted) (Eco 1985:164).

The rest of society, not needing to share the new distinctions because they do not require them (being neither priests nor merchants) will retain their old code, their old expressions. Both Phoenicians and Vikings will remain Barbarian until such a future time as contact between the general citizenry and the Barbarians changes.

Thus at the same moment in the same society there will be two different ways of thinking, perceiving, and speaking, based upon two different systems of signification or, better, upon two different stages of complexity of the same system (Eco 1985:164).

On the North American continent, Natives were both continuous (hence the great push of proselytization and conversion) and contiguous (an inferior breed treated to policies of war and extermination) with humanity. The great metaphor for this contradictory conceptualization of the Indian is the debate between Las Casas and Sepulveda regarding the point of humanity. Of course, the polar conceptualization also contained a mirror for the critique of European or Western Civilization. Nobility as ascriptor was used as a sardonic label for the savage as well as a satirical comment on the degeneration of the European upper class. A savage cannot be noble: the paradox is evident and its absurdity was not lost on the critics, like Jean Jacques Rousseau, of eighteenth century European society.

The two archetypes of the Wild Man, traceable to Medieval (principally German) Europe, have merged together to define difference, both physical and cultural (a short brute with a club) and moral and metaphysical (lacking clothes, shame, and God). The state of wildness was not without redemption, however, and social reformers generally accepted the task of conversion. The ambivalent nature of the Wild Man also facilitated a distinction for social philosophers, historians, and curious lay people. Hayden White pinpoints the distinction as a struggle between archaism and primitivism. Archaism presents a conception of nature in general that is unfriendly and wild, an antagonist to the Wild Man who ultimately and inevitably – but not without struggle – carves out the beginning of a human niche. For the archaist, nature is violent, turbulent, ‘red in tooth and claw’. Primitivism, on the other hand, features a peaceful nature, harmoniously supporting life in an Arcadian environment where

the lion lies down with the lamb (White 1978:172). The oppositions began as a metaphor for life in the Middle Ages. Highly oppressive, the distinct sides of the Wild Man were woven into the very fabric of socioculture. Each side represented, in context, the possible alternatives to quotidian life that men (of course women were not discussed in this way) could take with respect to both society and nature (White 1978:173). The descendants of the primitivists, Locke and Spencer, Montesquieu and Rousseau – and even Camus and Lévi-Strauss – agreed that society, with its fall from nature, had slid away from perfection in nature. The Wild Man, later in the form of the Noble Savage, became the symbol for resistance, the anti-type of the oppressive social existence. The descendants of the archaists “extending from Machiavelli through Hobbes and Vico down to Freud and Jean-Paul Sartre”, agreed that despite the shortcomings of society, its institutions and norms were still preferable to the natural state and its personification in the image of the Wild Man (White 1978:173).

The state of wildness is part of a well-stocked and well-contained cabinet of “culturally self-authenticating devices” which not only delineates a particular state of being but also supports and gives value to antithetical conditions or states of being, i.e., civilization. Wildness does not just constrict a state of being or condition, it also (and perhaps more significantly) formulates and maintains “a particular attitude governing a relationship between a lived reality” and an unconventional existence not readily categorized into the pigeon-holes of normal or familiar experience (White 1978:151). Thus the undesirable condition serves, in a subordinate way, the needs or requirements of the desirable condition. By evoking the undesirable as undesirable (and hence abnormal or unfamiliar), the desirable (which is both normal and familiar) becomes more desirable. Constructs of desirability and undesirability are extremely important for a group, particularly in times or periods of sociocultural stress. It is during these times that people may say, despite not actually knowing what they are, ‘at least I am not like that!’ (White 1978:151) while they point fingers of ridicule and scorn at that which is ‘like that’; or, that which is not like one’s own self.

But despite the need that a group or society feels to colour in the consciousness not yet colonized by scientific knowledge with “conceptual designators affirmative of their own existentially contrived values and norms” (White 1978:153), not all culturally-endowed

concepts are completely able to touch all bases. Furthermore, cultural constructs are only as powerful as their strength to convince or control apathetic members of a sociocultural complex; as unconvincing myths are revealed, they become, as Hegel would say, “a shape of life grown old” (cited by White 1978:153).

Many of the myths governing Western Civilization have fallen. The myths of nature, God, and man have entered the realm of cultural neurosis, of fiction, or mere prejudice (White 1978:153). The fall of the Wild Man, however, has followed a slightly different, less beaten path. It has been due to the accretion of knowledge concerning the wild parts of the world wherein the Wild Man was said to reside that the myth has been slowly deconstructed; as one wilderness to another was tamed, the very idea of the Wild Man was slowly left with concrete space (White 1978:153). One could recall Desmond Morris’s *The Naked Ape* (1969), or Lionel Tiger’s *Men in Groups* (1969). But instead of joining its more repressed cousins, nature and man, in the wilderness of cultural neurosis, the Wild Man was interiorized, encapsulated, in the psyche of both the civilized and the primitive man. The Wild Man is now lurking within all of us.

Thus, in our time, the concept of wildness has suffered... there are no true Wild Men anymore, except in the sociopsychological sense [sometimes appearing as a threat to humanity and at other times as a Utopian fantasy; at other times simply presenting an abyss into which mankind may either fall or climb from]... but always as a criticism of whatever security and peace of mind one group of men in society has purchased at the cost of the suffering of another (White 1978:179-180).

The Western traditions of Judeo-Christian morality and Greco-Roman civility favoured the myths of “Eden and Arcadia or Paradise and the Golden Age” to counter everything their own lands were not. The primitivist and archaist traditions helped shape the vocabulary and imagery that the settlers, explorers, travellers, and missionaries used in the writing of logs, reports, and relations.

In this way, the American Indian became part of the *bon sauvage* or Noble Savage tradition so long an accompaniment of the Golden Age or paradisaical mythology of Western Civilization (Berkhofer 1979:73).

The Noble Savage was a critic as well – a tool for the social philosophers intent on the criticism of Western institutions and customs. The height of the Noble Savage as critique

occurred during the Enlightenment (notwithstanding the stronger force of it in France than in Britain). However, it was not without counter-attack and the Noble Savage swung back and forth between the poles of nobility and ignobility according to need or circumstance.

It is no surprise that the degeneration of the American Indian coincided with the philosophical attack on the Noble Savage and a more general fight in the realm of political and social reform as couched in the arena of ideas (Berkhofer 1979:78). It was the twin reality of the American and French Revolutions that marked the watershed in the use of the Noble Savage as critique or foil to the European of Western Civilization. The revolutions were able to tangibly show the real possibilities for social or political living not found in the status quo. At this point, the Noble Savage became the Romantic Savage. Whereas the Noble Savage of rationalism understood the laws of nature, the Romantic Savage acted only on pure impulse and passion (Berkhofer 1979:79). The new, Romantic Savage found a home very quickly in the United States, in the writings of authors like James Fenimore Cooper and in the portraits of painters like Charles Bird King.

The Noble Savage only became truly noble in the nineteenth century, once the nation-states of the North American Continent had eliminated their Indian problem. Artists, writers, and anthropologists alike hurried to paint and write their portraits of a dying race. While the Noble Savage might be pitied as he passed on, his way of life demanded equal censure to that of the Ignoble Savage according to the historical scales of order and progress (Berkhofer 1979:91). Of necessity, anthropology "reproduces visions of assumptions deeply embedded in a predatory European culture" (Fardon 1990:6). It is not radical to say that anthropology was of a colonial birth. Besides, there are scores of critics who are altogether too eager to denounce the entire anthropological enterprise as a bourgeois sport.

Colonization provided the political and economic contexts for anthropological fieldwork as well as making it practically feasible... The inversion of a self-image was generalized to some fictive collectivity based on geography, skin colour, tribe or whatever. To counterpose to an enlightened Europe we produced an African Heart of Darkness; to our rational controlled West corresponded an irrational and sensuous Orient;... our maturity might be contrasted with the childhood of darker humanity... (Fardon 1990:6).

The critique is damning to be sure, but not necessarily debilitating. It seems obvious that anthropological commentators are going to mirror the ideas, attitudes, and ethics of their ages. There is nothing evil or subversive in this practice. In order to move on, however, Western academics (anthropologists included) need to acknowledge the traces of the social, political, or economic age found in their writings and to repudiate “our criteria of rationality” as universally valid. The West may, according to Stephen Tyler (1984), have developed a way of looking at the non-West “which is a barrier to our understanding”, but it can be and often is surmounted.

3.3 THE WHITE MAN’S INDIAN

Robert Berkhofer Jr.’s book, *The White Man’s Indian*, explores the ideas and images of the North American Indian used by White North Americans in their attempt to understand those whom they call Indian. Where do the present ideas come from and why do we think them the way we do? The historical focus used in the answer provides continuity between past images and present ideas. And despite the important influence that the North American Indigenous societies had on the transplanted European ones, it is also the history of Western ideas, values, and explanation that must be dissected in an effort to understand the imagery and how it has affected and helped to create both ideology and interaction.

The single most important question here, the base, was perhaps first posed to the missionary John Eliot in 1646 by an unknown aboriginal male: “Why do you call us Indians?” (Berkhofer 1979:4).

That the term survives into the present, evokes imagery and emotion yet today, and constitutes an intellectual [and legal] classification of Native Americans in our own times and raises the second major question: Why has the idea of the Indian persisted for so many centuries? (Berkhofer 1979:4).

The incorrect label *Indio* could be simply, as it often is, explained as an accident or error of geography. The so-called discovery of the New World was, for the burgeoning European nation-states, an expansion of their compact, tripartite world. The inclusion of America into the European world necessitated the projection of understood terms, concepts,

or ideas onto unknown, unfamiliar people and societies – a need to render the unfamiliar familiar.

The Europeans came to understand the New World in familiar conceptual values and categories – so much is evident from the language and imagery found in Spanish, French, or English accounts (Berkhofer 1979:4).

Whether Columbus thought he had landed among the East Indies or even elsewhere..., he would probably [still] have used the same all-embracing term for the natives, because Indian stood as a synonym for all of Asia west of the river Indus (Berkhofer 1979:5).

From the Spanish term for other, *Indio*, came the French *Indien*, and the English Indian. Conversely, the basic imagery of the *Indio* began with the Spanish and then spread to the French and English. The judgements were not always harsh, nor entirely negative; nonetheless, the Indian was, without *Kynge*, *Lorde*, or God, entirely lacking the attributes and amenities of Western Civilization. The later French and English descriptions or accounts would not overtly differ from the Spanish prototype. The French and the English were joint heirs to the same complex of Western Christianity and Civilization and hence made the same general comparisons that the Spanish adventurers and settlers had made (Berkhofer 1979:13).

A new term came to be used by the English and the French to describe those whom they encountered. The term was *sauvage* in French. Savage because there were no Aztec or Inca civilizations awaiting discovery (Berkhofer 1979:13). The Indigenous societies were slaves to their environment, living off the land and its game, worshipping trees and rocks, and aimlessly wandering across the Plains.

Because they did nothing with the resources of the land – built no cities, tilled no fields, dug no mines – Indians deserved to be superceded by a civilization that recognized the potential for material progress (Francis 1992:52).

It was the English use of the Savage and Indian almost interchangeably that especially likened the Wild Man to the Indian (through the use of metaphor, likening something they knew much about with something they knew very little about). The translations of Richard Eden in the middle of the sixteenth century provided the first consistent use of the word Indian in place of *Indio*. Whereas Richard Hakluyt, also published in the sixteenth century, substitutes Wild Men for the *sauvages* of Jacques Cartier's journals, employing the word

savage quite literally as well as liberally. Others used neutral terms like inhabitants. Nonetheless, the term Indian stuck and became widely employed in the seventeenth century (Berkhofer 1979:14).

Roger Williams, founder of Rhode Island, provides the following typology of nomenclature.

First, those of the English giving: as *natives, salvages, Indian, Wildmen*, (so the Dutch call them *wilden*) *abergeny men, pagans, Barbarians, Heathen*. Secondly their *Names* which they give themselves. I cannot observe that they ever had (before the coming of the *English, French, or Dutch* amongst them) any names to difference themselves from strangers [presumably Europeans], for they knew none... They have often asked mee, why do we call them *Indians, Natives, & C.* And understanding the reason, they will call themselves *Indians*, in opposition to *English, & C.* (cited by Berkhofer 1979:15).

The Europeans were definitely aware of tribal differences; the quotation further suggests that the aboriginal tribes also needed a terminology to distinguish themselves from the newcomers. In addition, as the Europeans gained more knowledge about the people of the world, they also gained a recognition of the similarities amongst themselves (Berkhofer 1979:23). Thus was formed a collective, nation-centred idea of Europe in contradistinction to the rest of the world. The European generally considered himself the pinnacle of Western Civilization; supported by Christianity and therefore superior.

The confusion between culture and biology, nation and race, maintained and exacerbated the national collective stereotyping commonly exercised by the European (Berkhofer 1979:24). They tended to attribute uniformity of thought and action to whole nationalities or people (Berkhofer 1979:24). The categories of nation, race, and culture were used interchangeably to understand people, usually judged not as individuals, but as members of their collectivity. The collective Indian persisted in spite of actual sociocultural diversity. The particular was made general as traits from one tribe were generalized to all others. Traits or cultural practices were interpreted and judged according to Euro-North American notions of correctness instead of being looked at according to tribal practice. And of course Western morality was the yardstick against which all was measured (Berkhofer 1979:25).

Missionaries encouraged no second thoughts, no guilty consciences, among their supporters. The Indian was being given an opportunity to join a superior civilization. Those who did not take it were doomed to ultimate extinction by their own inexplicable attachment to an inferior, obsolete way of life (Berkhofer 1979:53).

Because the creation of the Indian image and the appraisal of the Indian way of life was a Western creation, the ambivalence of Euro-America is plainly exposed by its judgement of Indian life. Positively, the Indian lived a “life of liberty, simplicity, and innocence” (Berkhofer 1979:28). Negatively, the critics substituted “license for liberty, a harsh lot for simplicity, and dissimulation and deceit for innocence” (Berkhofer 1979:28). The positive or negative portrayal was usually enhanced by an implicit or explicit statement and understanding that real Indians were pre-contact Indians.

In spite of centuries of contact and the changed conditions of Native American lives, whites pictured the ‘real’ Indian as the one before contact or during the early period of contact (Berkhofer 1979:28).

Canadians were staunch believers and defenders of progress. The Indian had no recourse but to give way, either by dying or assimilating, to the superior civilization. The inferior Indian civilization was romantic, to be sure, but a definite millstone around the neck of real progress, of Western Civilization. Ironically, and quite unlike their southern neighbours, Canadians prided themselves on the fact that they did not believe that the only good Indian was a dead Indian; assimilation was the preferable option (Francis 1992:60). While Canadians may not have engaged in policies or open practices of extermination, they very clearly did favour assimilation.

In this view of the world, the only good Indians were traditional Indians, who existed only in the past and assimilated Indians, who were not Indians at all. Any other Indian had vanished (Francis 1992:60).

As discipline, anthropology only reflected the ideas or ideology of its age when its practitioners wrote in the ethnographic present (such as, for example, Lowie on the Crow) or conducted salvage ethnography. People, anthropologists included, truly believed that whole cultures were disappearing due to prolonged and dangerous contact and therefore had to be preserved and saved in the chronicles of Western history and social science. The Indian became static and ahistorical, existing really only in the ethnographies and histories which

outlined pre-contact reality or in antithetical opposition to Western Civilization. The Indian that did die was regarded with nostalgia. The Indian that lived usually picked up White vices and became an imperfect, loathsome creature – the Reservation or Reserve Indian, neither assimilated nor pre-contact, “neither noble nor wildly savage but always scorned” (Berkhofer 1979:29-30), exhibiting the worst vices of both societies according to the judgemental standards of Euro-Canadian society.

3.3.1 The Changing Face of the Indian

The Indian continues to exist in a timeless state and affects both Euro-Canadians and Aboriginals. The image of the Indian is traceable in one of two ways, either in cultural context and intellectual history, or by socioeconomic analysis of vested Euro-Canadian interests. The former describe the fluctuating Indian image as a product of North American Western culture; the latter explains the changing history in terms of the political and economic relationships occurring in North American society (Berkhofer 1979:31). A review of the image consists of a fair number of parts: first, one which extends beyond the ‘scientific conception’ of the Indian in its voyage from Christian cosmogony to modern anthropology; second, a survey which examines the dual nature of the Indian image as changing in intellectual climes and mirrored in art and literature; third, an exposure of the Indian image as justification or rationalization during changing political and economic institutions (Berkhofer 1979).

The Christian cosmogony paved the way for a degeneration theory, a fall from grace, which became capable of explaining all of the social and economic conditions found in the degenerate Indian societies. Interestingly, degeneration theory was not necessarily a racist conception. As long as scientific or secular explanations of human origin argued for a single origin for all people, then the monogenetic assumption of Christianity continued to have profound influence (Berkhofer 1979:38). And when the Enlightenment thinkers came to substitute natural law for supernatural law, the view still presented a picture of an unchanging universe, immutable and highly regular. Sociocultural diversity remained to be explained.

Carolus Linnaeus accommodated the immense variety of flora and fauna in a systematic classificatory scheme. The American Indian was *Homo Sapiens Americanus*, the traditional white image of the Indian:

reddish, choleric, erect *Hair* black, straight, thick; *Nostrils* wide; *Face* freckled; *Chin* beardless, *Persevering*, content, free *Paints* himself with skillful red lines *Governed* by custom (cited by Berkhofer 1979:40),

as opposed to the white Europeans who were “easygoing, active, ingenious nature, wore tailored clothing, and were governed by laws” (Berkhofer 1979:40). Environmental determinism was accepted as an explanation of Indian diversity in opposition to the white man, while maintaining monogenetic origin.

The idea of progress initially developed during the Age of Enlightenment when social philosophers attempted to extrapolate, in current and past societies, uniform types of human behaviour in order to juxtapose them to unfamiliar or unique events. Comparison became the hallmark, the cornerstone of a natural history of humanity and developed along the following four comparative lines: (1) between modern Europeans and non-modern peoples; (2) between modern Europeans and non-modern non-contemporaneous uncivilized peoples. (3) between peoples of other times and ‘modern’ uncivilized peoples; and (4) comparisons among known ‘modern’ uncivilized peoples (Berkhofer 1979:45).

The idea of progress, and the image of the good Indian and the bad Indian, came from the type of conjectural history which arose from comparative natural science and the search for uniformity. The assumption that contemporary savage societies resembled past savage societies allowed the social philosophers to infer that there had been a progression, from an uncivilized state to a civilized one. Along with this progression came the ranking of societies, and the ambivalent image of both a good and bad Indian showed what life had been like at one time, without the trappings of Civilization. A society passed through the stages of Savagery and Barbarism before reaching the pinnacle of Civilization, just as a person passed from infancy to youth before reaching adulthood (Berkhofer 1979:47). There were stages in human development. It was in this intellectual climate that Civilization became imbued with its modern meaning and evolution became the foundation for many disciplines created in the nineteenth century (Berkhofer 1979:49).

Speculation became fact as Charles Darwin's evolutionism was established in the sciences. Hence, if human beings could be analyzed or discussed as the products of a long process known as evolution, then was it not possible as well that the institutions of a civilization were also the end result of an evolutionary process based on the same natural laws? Anthropological evolutionism arose from the comparative method and conjectural history and gained much popularity in the form of ethnography or ethnology (Berkhofer 1979:51).

The scientific image of the Indian found in evolutionary typology came from the man called father of American anthropology, Lewis Henry Morgan. In the *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois* (1851), Morgan placed the Indian just beyond the zero-point of lower savagery but well below the superior Aryan race. He did not hide his motives: "to encourage a kinder feeling towards the Indian", nor his generalization that the Iroquois were representative of all Indians (Berkhofer 1979:52). Lewis Henry Morgan was also at the forefront of salvage ethnography, a movement to acquire masses of data on Native Americans before they disappeared. In the early decades of this century, culture and biology were still inextricably linked. Science was chiefly used to rationalize policies toward the Indian as based upon the 'scientific' fusion of culture and biology. Culture was singular and often confused with biology, thus, ethnographers

frequently had to adopt the racial characterization typical of their day to explain the diversity of human cultures... in spite of... the uniformitarian and egalitarian assumption of the psychic unity of all mankind (Berkhofer 1979:54-5).

They did not really know *how* culture was transmitted.

Scientific racism accounted for the *biologization of history* and used an antiquated culture hierarchy under the umbrella of progress to account for the diverse range of physical and mental difference believed to exist in human populations (Berkhofer 1979:56). White people, then, of Northern European descent, happened to rule the world not by accident, but due to inevitable, immutable, and superior biological inheritance. Scientific racism continued for awhile in the early decades of the twentieth century. However, new ideas of cultural pluralism and a relative study of culture emerged as racism lost scientific credibility and

became a political or social ideology wielded by those eager to dominate other people for either political or economic reasons (Berkhofer 1979:61).

The discipline of anthropology has long affected the basic assumptions which govern the study of indigenous societies. The conjectural approach of evolutionary history was replaced with a more scientific method rooted in empirical research. Thus, the comparative method was disregarded in favour of particular studies rooted in context. The Boasian School irrevocably changed the way anthropologists conducted anthropology; it “questioned and sought to test what most previous anthropologists had presumed as given” (Berkhofer 1979:63).

Culture became plural and fieldwork was conducted among many cultures and many tribes; judgements were suspended in favour of the cultural relativism which presumed all things equal. The result may have been a new scientific image of the Indian, with a stress on cultural holism as grounded in pluralism and relativism, but ethnographies were still being written in the ethnographic present and the policies of the North American governments were still designed to speed up the process of progress (popularly identified as manifest destiny).

The Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (1969), known more commonly as *The White Paper*, was a turning point in the history of government Indian policy. Predicated on a new vision of Canada as held by the rationalist and individualist Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, and following in the wake of the Hawthorn (1966-67) Report, “it signaled the official rejection of assimilation as a policy goal” (Campbell & Pal 1992:307).

The Indian problem was to be solved in another way; their special status was to be revoked and they were to become ‘Canadians as all other Canadians’. But here there was conflict between the federal government and the First Nations. On the side of the government the problem had been reduced to colonization and paternalism; “the solution would therefore be the recognition of natives as free individuals, equal in every respect to other Canadian citizens” (Campbell & Pal 1992:307). On the side of the First Nations, the problem could also be reduced to colonization and paternalism, but it required substantially more work. Treaties had been made and needed to be honoured; aboriginal title to land had been created by the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and, no matter how tenuous or ill-conceived (see Menno Boldt,

1993), had to be acknowledged and reconsidered; and finally, there were the damaging effects of well over a hundred years under The Indian Act. "Canadian governments and the Canadian people had to provide special assistance and support" (Campbell & Pal 1992:308).

With the goal of assimilation removed, the arena opened up to new possibilities. The image of the Indian also changed. The new Indian was both peaceful (the calm monotone of an Ovide Mercredi) and war-like (the incendiary monologue of Robert *Lasagna* Cross on the Mohawk lines); articulate and debonair (Phil Fontaine and Georges Erasmus) or manipulative and assertive (Louis Stevenson and Billy Diamond). The female also emerged, sophisticated (Mary Ellen Turpel), attractive (Kahn-Tineta Horn), aggressive and bold (Ellen Gabriel), artistic (Alanis Obowasim) and respected (Tantoo Cardinal and Gloria Cranmer Webster). But to contradict these new, more positive images still remain the skid row Indian, drunk or stoned, and the low-track prostitute, all supposedly enjoying the benefits of Western Civilization without paying for them. Although the playing field is much wider now, and the entire ideological assumption of assimilation has been, at least formally, removed from policy, the new paradigm thinking (Weaver 1990), based as it is on the constitutional recognition of aboriginal rights and self-determination, has forced a re-orientation of Western and non-Western, Indian-White, interaction in Canada.

3.3.2 The Canadian Version

Canadian history began with the arrival of the European. The respected Canadian professor of politics and economy, Stephen Leacock, reflected the racism of the Canadian intelligentsia in his writing.

We think of prehistoric North America as inhabited by the Indians, and have based on this a sort of recognition of ownership on their part... But this attitude is hardly warranted. The Indians were too few to count. Their use of the resources of the continent was scarcely more than that by crows and wolves, their development of it nothing (1941, cited by Francis 1992:55).

At the time of contact, aboriginal societies did not even make it onto the bottom of the scale; although Leacock did not lament or care about the passing of the Indian, he did acknowledge that the Iroquois had some virtues. Stephen Leacock was a professor of political economy

at McGill University, he was a leading humourist and Canadian intellectual, and he expounded his racist views as late as the middle of the twentieth century.

The Canadian version of manifest destiny, based on the trinity of peace, order, and good government, was forged largely through the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. While ostensibly protecting and befriending the Indians, the Mounted Police brought peace and order to the wild frontier. The Canadian frontier had problems, of course; the disappearance of the buffalo; an illicit trade in alcohol; and the spread of disease. Apparently, however, the reality was not sufficiently romantic for the North American public who chose instead to believe the myth of progress.

The glorious story of the Mounted Police required Indians who were marginal, their history to be not so much ignored as completely denied. Indians belonged to the wilderness – wild, savage, brutal, unpredictable, ahistorical – and like other impediments to progress, they had to be cleared away like so many trees, or broken like the hard prairie soil (Francis 1992:81).

According to the myths of the Canadian frontier, the Mounted Police Force was completely responsible for the pacification of the Indians. The Mounted Police conquered the wildness of the frontier and replaced it with law and social order. They are the heroes of the treasured national stories which confirm and validate important Canadian cultural values, and “Euro-Canadian society has been showing its gratitude to the force ever since” (Francis 1992:81).

The North American Indian was also significantly tamed by the Wild West shows that toured both North American countries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Buffalo Bill Cody’s Wild West Show had a profound impact on the imaginary Indian. Cody’s genius lay in the fact that he managed to convince people that they were getting a first-hand look at the Indian. He fixed the image of the Plains Indian as truly representative of all Indians; he also depicted a blood-thirsty, aggressive attacker of wagon-trains and innocent pioneers. The show reflected cultural anxiety. During its tour of Toronto in 1885, for example, the Northwest Rebellion had only just been extinguished. Louis Riel awaited hanging and Canadians were under the impression that a full-scale Indian war had been narrowly averted. No doubt nervous about the events transpiring in the West, Canadians were

anxious to be reassured. The performing Indian was tame. "...As the threat of violence decreased toward the end of the century, so did the interest in the Wild West Show" (Francis 1992:96). In the shows of Buffalo Bill Cody, the forces of law and order were metaphorically at work. The painted, Wild-West show Indian was preferable because he could be subdued; a tame representation of a by-gone past, no longer frightening or threatening. By inference, the Euro-Canadian was celebrating the triumph of progress, the victory of Western Civilization (Francis 1992:102).

On the other hand, the Canadian government and the Department of Indian Affairs preferred Indians attired in suits and dresses. The preference intended to reflect the assimilation programmes of social policy. At the same time that Buffalo Bill was touring the continent, the government officials were busily promoting their own allegory of progress. The Indians, whether they liked it or not, were being dragged into the modern world for their own good, by "giving up whatever it was that made them Indians" (Francis 1992:103). But either as Plains Indians who were vanishing, or as assimilated moderns in suits, dresses, and shiny leather shoes, the performing Indian was still only playing a role in someone else's show.

As the government adopted policies and mechanisms of assimilation in order to completely annihilate the indigenous cultures in the name of progress, it was also constructing museums within which to house the shards of the broken-down cultures; "cabinets of curiosities" displayed the remains of the day "so that future generations would be able to see what once had existed" (Francis 1992:104).

Hollywood films have taken up where museums began and where Wild West shows ended. Purportedly educational, historical films showing ahistorical Indians are purely entertainment (Berkhofer 1979; Francis 1992; Stedman 1982). The stereotypes are familiar: painted faces; tomahawks in hand; feather headresses and hunters of buffalo, the Indian of the Plains became the "original television test pattern" (Francis 1992:107). Not always negative, the stereotypes were usually played by white ethnic actors in greasepaint (Ricardo Montalban and Anthony Quinn) or braids (Loretta Young and Dolores del Rio). When aboriginal actors were used, they themselves were not always exempt from greasepaint:

In *Geronimo* (1939) for example a Cherokee actor named Chief Thunder Cloud played the leading role, but he had to be heavily made up because he didn't look enough like an Indian (Francis 1992:106).

Films worthy of critical acclaim, *Little Big Man* (1971) and *Dances With Wolves* (1990), are also set in the past and tend to romanticize the Indian who usually appears on the fringe of modernity. The Hollywood films follow in the tradition of other Indian images. The images have been about Western concerns, Western fear, Western insecurity, Western anxiety about "our place in North America, and a deep need to legitimate our presence here" (Francis 1992:108).

Even in the much-lauded *Black Robe* (1990), there is an inherent comparison between Western and non-Western, on Western terms and in symbolism entrenched in Western knowledge. In an early scene, for example, where the film juxtaposes the preparations of the explorer Champlain and a Huron Chief, we are made to understand the Aboriginal with implicit reference to the Western. In a montage, we see Champlain's vest and then the Chief's hand-painted face and chest; the ornamental epaulettes on Champlain's coat and then the Chief's decorative animal-teeth necklaces; the Western cloth cape and then the non-Western animal fur. Once the composition ends, we are deliberately left with the impression of similarity despite difference. During another scene, through the same montage technique, we are shown a vaulted cathedral ceiling and town plaza in juxtaposition to a forest ceiling of tree branches and an empty beach. In all cases, the first shots are invariably Western and they draw us into the comparison with the non-Western. *Black Robe* presents a balanced treatment of early contact; notwithstanding, it still relies on a Western framework in order to communicate its message.

Serious history in Canadian texts really fares no better. Canadian school children have been and continue to be subjected to books that, in the words of Stephen Leacock, pit the struggle of Civilization against Savagery. Once the Indians stopped being useful as allies, they were really only useful as victims. In the pages of Euro-Canadian text-books (see James Walker's 1971 textbook study [revised in 1981]) the Indians prowl on the pages of a history that only began with the arrival of the Europeans. The Iroquois, in particular, are frequently depicted as vicious and war-like, "ripping" at the very throat of New France (Francis

1992:163). The text book Indian was always in conflict. All other activities were considered insignificant.

The fierce Indian was commonly found in Quebec. Historian Benjamin Sulte spoke confidently for all Quebecers when he wrote that 'each of us had an ancestor kidnapped, burned and eaten by the Iroquois' (Francis 1992:164).

Black Robe is a good example: the fierce, war-like Iroquois are negatively compared to the gentle and peaceful Huron. The image of the warring Indian, usually the Iroquois, continues to this day! The Oka Crisis was a ripe ground for the picking and transmitting of images of the Warrior. Many were described as Vietnam Veterans, or trouble-makers from the United States with Mafia connections, who had been stock-piling weapons for years.

In the recently published English translation of *Lasagne: The Man Behind the Mask*, Quebecois lawyer and journalist H el ene S evigny discusses her increased alienation from her former colleagues in journalism, the legal community, and even her own social circle. Following the publication of *Lasagne: L'Homme derriere le Masque*, she was accused of siding with the Mohawk, of "justifying their violence" and lacking "sympathy for White Quebecers" (Cross & S evigny 1994:170). One Quebec journalist covering her book launching in Trois Rivieres asked her if she was aware that Quebecers saw her as "a traitor to her own race" (Cross & S evigny 1994:170).

The publication of *Lasagne* touched upon a terribly complex web of sovereignty and separation, nationalism and racism.

How, for example, would an independent Quebec deal with hundreds of unresolved Native land claims issues, particularly given the behaviour of the provincial government during the Oka crisis?... Would an independent Quebec ruthlessly suppress all cultural differences in its new sovereign state, in the manner in which they suppressed English as one of Canada's two official languages with its provincial language laws? Was it these larger issues ... that appeared to stand behind and fuel the virulent irrational and uninformed reactions to *Lasagne* in the strident populist reaction to the book in my own community and my own country? (Cross & S evigny 1994:170).

The current sovereignty movement in Quebec is dogmatic and self-righteous enough to completely disregard the voices of its First Nations (Cross & S evigny 1994:171). Fallen from the democratic path forged by Rene Levesque, the Quebecois nationalist now operates within

a cultural imperative that defines only the White French Quebecer as “righteous and perfect” (Cross & Sévigny 1994:171). And while a serious analysis of relations between the First Nations and the Quebec state is beyond the scope of this thesis, we must continue to seriously consider the observations of intelligent, rational people, like Ovide Mercredi and Helene Sévigny, who contend that Quebec, for reasons unto itself, is a special case.

Useful as an ally, the fierce Indian enjoyed a full life in both French and English Canada until the War of 1812; thereafter, history appears as an activity engaged in solely by Euro-Canadians. The ambivalence of the Indian image, fierce in history and noble in wilderness adventure and lore, continues to exist today. “The imaginary Indian became one of the icons of consumer society” (Francis 1992:175): the Atlanta Braves, the Washington Redskins, the Edmonton Eskimos, the Cleveland Indians, the Kansas City Chiefs, the Chicago Blackhawks, Red Indian Motor Oil, Mohawk Oil Company, Iroquois Beer, Pocahontas Perfume, Squaw Brand Canned goods, the Ford Thunderbird and GM’s Pontiac division, which created this advertising jingle:

Heap Big Injun,
 Pontiac a warrior brave was he,
 One day he met Miss Sleeping Fawn
 and fell in love you see,
 Now Sleeping Fawn was up to date,
 no birch canoe would do,
 You get a car and take me for a riding when you woo
 Pontiac, Pontiac, Heap Big Injun Brave (1927)
 (Francis 1992:176).

But despite the positive qualities of Indian-ness that the advertisements sought to conjure and exploit to sell products, the message was also that the only good Indian was historical – long dead and non-threatening. Like Lithman, who argues for a dual cultural logic, and Eco, who hypothetically constructed a bifurcated social code, we may at this point also recognize the paradoxical ability or tendency of people to maintain and perpetuate an ambivalent image of the Other.

Daniel Francis (1992:200) argues that the federal government set up its own imaginary Indian, the official Indian of law and regulation (as outlined in the Indian Act) and made it the

object of assimilation policies. Following the War of 1812, when the Noble Savage as ally was no longer needed, a new Indian began to emerge:

... the aboriginals lost their value to the white intruders – and were now perceived to be a social and economic problem rather than an diplomatic one (Francis 1992:200).

Since extermination had never really been an option, and “the last thing” the federal government wanted was a full-scale conflict (Francis 1992:201), the only way to eliminate the Indian was to eliminate the Indian way of life. The government policies, the Wild West Shows, the ethnographies, and the museums all worked under the very real assumption that the Indian was quickly disappearing and had to be collected and archived for future reference.

Indian became a legislated concept as well as a racist one, institutionally perpetuated by all levels of government. The Indian Act was a paternalistic tool designed to deny the rights and privileges of citizenship until the Indian had earned them. Enfranchisement was a reward for good behaviour and despite governmental expectations that “in time most Indians would opt for it”, in truth, “the vast majority of native people chose not be rewarded in this way” (Francis 1992:201). Between 1857 and 1920, only 250 people chose enfranchisement. The long-term policy of assimilation has not entirely disappeared either. The policy still reflects, as it did upon creation, the stress between Civilization and the non-Western world. The central tenets of Western Civilization, a respect for private property vs. tribal communalism, an agricultural as opposed to hunting lifestyle, democratic government, and of course Christianity, conflicted with those of the people encountered by the travelling Europeans. Progress was synonymous with Civilization and the non-Western world was inevitably and irrevocably moving towards Civilization. The Indian was doomed. Everyone said so as they quickly salvaged what they could of the dying cultures.

The Indian was and continues to be an amalgamation of normative and descriptive dimensions fused with ideology and reflecting societal and scientific purposes. According to Berkhofer (1979), the image of the anthropological Indian has been as much based on the observation and report of aboriginal societies as it has been on the needs (both polemic and creative) of North Americans. Despite the propensity to assess the images of the Indian from the vantage point of historical passing and the critique of historiography, the images created

and perpetuated today will be assessed by future scholars and critics in much the same way (Berkhofer 1979:71). In the following quotation, Francis echoes a central message found in Jerry Mander, *In the Absence of the Sacred* (1991).

In another sense, though, the vanishing Indian still persists: the stereotype did not disappear so much as change context... Feeling an absence of the sacred in modern life, many non-natives look to Indian culture for values they find lacking in their own... This is the new vanishing American, the Indian as spiritual and environmental guru, threatened by the forces of consumer society (Francis 1992:58).

3.4 SUMMARY

The doctrines and ideologies of democracy provide significant implications for the comprehension of the interaction between Indigenous societies and the expansive, exploitative Western societies.

The frontier acquired greater symbolic importance as the place offering upward social mobility through the acquisition of property and the exploitation of resources at low cost (Berkhofer 1979:154-5).

In Canada, the True North has become a symbol for purity as opposed to the general degeneracy of Western Civilization. It is one of the primary symbols of Canadian sovereignty, a symbol for the struggle against nature and its ultimate conquest. The Canadian emphasis on collective individualism has helped to place liberal ideas and constitutions in direct contrast to Indian tribalism.

The tribalism is never quite good enough and the Indian is seen as deficient and a social problem (La Roque 1973), ironically in the same environment within which, according to the same tenets, he was once quite efficient, living in a state of grace and in harmony with nature. The Indians have also been affected by the Western notions, having created for themselves a political reality of nationalism which may not be congruous with the reality of pre- and post- contact times but which matches the original and alien Western image of the Indian as a “separate but single collectivity” (Berkhofer 1979:195).

For parts of British North America, land was acquired through either purchase or warfare (Berkhofer 1979:130). Religious and secular ends were fused as settlers attempted

to bring the Indians under the umbrella of Euro-Canadian jurisdiction and economic exploitation. The Indian had to be replaced by the American either through the assimilation of the Indian and his lands or by the substitution of the Indian for the American and the expropriation of his lands. Land was manifest destiny; the appropriate use of land was farming. Here again, we encounter the deficient Indian. Not all Indians were nomadic hunters, but those who were nomadic hunters were not using the land properly.

The ascendancy of the federal government depended on treaties. Expansion could be honourable if the Crown offered British Civilization to the Indian in exchange for land. The same held true for the United States. If the Indians were to accept the benefit of civilization, they too could share in the fruits of manifest destiny.

American democracy designated a belief in the goodness of majority rule, a minimal government supposedly beneficial to all alike, and free enterprise (Berkofer 1979:154).

But suppose, in conclusion, that the ideas of American democracy could be deconstructed. The idea of minimal government may have had a base in Western liberalism, but it also had a base in the sociocultural reality of the League of Nations (Grinde & Johansen 1991).

We are witnessing and experiencing a reinterpretation of modern world histories. We are only now beginning to understand the very complex dynamics of a cultural encounter that began centuries ago. With the new tools of deconstruction, we may move ahead to the task of a multidimensional writing and analysis of all, including the first, North American Nations.

If the political and philosophical gifts of the Iroquois can be brought to a popular level of awareness in the American mind, perhaps the bitterness, indifference and paternalism towards the American Indians would subside (Grinde & Johansen 1991:xxiv).

Through the deconstructive practices currently afoot in the social sciences, the perspective of the Other is slowly being taken into account. The goal is not to substitute, whole-hog, one world view for another, but to combine the two and reflect upon the similarities and differences, until a multi-dimensional analysis and history of contact may be re-written and re-told.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MOHAWK: AN ACCOUNT OF HISTORY AND ETHNOHISTORY

In the late nineteenth century, conventional wisdom divided the study of society into two parts. Societies of European origin were naturally considered progressive and dynamic whereas Indigenous societies were at best static and at worst bound for extinction. The disciplines of anthropology and history divided their attentions: history was the vehicle for the documentation of Western or European people while anthropology enfolded the non-Western or aboriginal people. "Anthropology was created in the nineteenth century as a separate discipline charged with studying peoples who lacked their own history" (Trigger 1985:5).

The marginal place of the Aboriginal belies an ideology which still continues to distort the proper analysis and writing of Canadian history. The chasm between history and anthropology also reflects the persistent refusal of official history to accept the First Nations as adequate subjects for historical treatment. The First Nations are not generally and universally accorded the same status as the French and British or even the Ukrainians and Germans. Both historians and anthropologists share the blame. We must all challenge the myths of conventional history. To overcome the deficiency, it is necessary to expose the fallacious historical or popular beliefs about aboriginal people (as has been done in some detail in the previous chapter) and to re-evaluate these beliefs in more accurate, honest portrayals of aboriginal and Euro-Canadian history.

The movement of deconstruction in the social sciences facilitates a re-consideration of history. A deconstructionist treatment of history offers a serious alternative to official history – one which operates "according to the limits of our own mentality, our physical and mental powers, and our environment" (Woodcroft 1992:1-2). While most historians working today do acknowledge the thousands of years of history before the European arrival, the

study of this history is still not entirely history (a good current exception is Daniel Richter's *The Ordeal of the Longhouse*). Rather, it is the domain of a pre-historic archaeology with its own peculiar methods and data, marginal to the mainstream of Canadian history.

The folly of such marginalization is clearly evident in the early annals of conventional Canadian history, where the scant number of Europeans was equal in size to a small Iroquoian tribe and certainly far less knowledgeable or skilled in the ways of the land. But it was a competition over scarce resources that may have exacerbated the tendency of early historians to denigrate the Indian as a blood-thirsty savage incapable of accepting the fruits of Western Civilization. American anthropology and history developed in a society whose central reality featured, for several centuries, a competition between the Euro-american settlers and the indigenous inhabitants for control of both land and resources (Richter 1991; Trigger 1985:14).

As the aboriginal societies were politically and economically subjugated, Darwinian thought swept the intelligentsia and anthropology followed the doctrine of cultural evolution in its representation of aboriginal peoples and societies. Of the four sub-disciplines, it was ethnology that gave rise to ethnohistory and thus the serious collection of data regarding aboriginal societies.

Ethnohistory has been diversely defined as a repository for data analysis; a convenient source of information for other disciplines; a branch of anthropology and history; and a separate discipline (Trigger 1985:166). According to its foremost Canadian proponent Bruce Trigger (1985), ethnohistory studies the changes that have occurred in aboriginal societies since European contact by using historical documents, archaeological findings, and oral traditions. It has added an historical dimension to American anthropology by covering the other side of historical activity in the New World.

Ethnohistory began as an activity within ethnology; now it may be recognized as either a separate branch of anthropology or even a separate discipline. But, either way, the cautious analysis of historical documents allows the ethnohistorian to carefully retrieve the relevant information. Ethnohistory remains, notwithstanding the problems of the supplementary oral tradition, an excellent avenue for a study of history and change in aboriginal societies.

4.1 PRE-CONTACT

4.1.1 The Iroquois

Early speculations about the origin of the North American Indian were quite varied and often approached the fantastic. For example, “between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, scholars speculated that the Indians might be descendants from Carthaginians, Israelites, Canaanites, or Tartars” (Trigger 1985:56). Some incredible explanations even supposed the Indigenous populations of the Western Hemisphere to be survivors from the lost continent of Atlantis. The establishment of many museums for the collection of material artefacts pulled anthropological attention away from studies of culture change. Archaeology was largely museum-oriented and concentrated on the retrieval and archival of artefacts in museum collections.

Gradually, a handful of archaeologists working in New York state discovered that the pre-historic sites were quite different from Iroquois historical sites. Grand speculation about the Iroquois erupted. The remarkable similarity between the Iroquois and Cherokee languages sparked a migratory explanation for Iroquois origin. The interpretation proffered was that the Iroquois had moved up, from the south, and had only been in the north a short time before the arrival of the European (Richter 1991; Trigger 1985; Wright 1993). More work was done in the early twentieth century, during the thirties and forties. Some scholars continued to believe that Iroquois culture had been brought up to the lower Great Lakes region from the south, but slowly diffusion took precedence as a basis for understanding origins (Trigger 1985:67).

Further developments occurred during the fifties. In 1952, Richard MacNeish proposed the *in situ* theory of Iroquois origin. His theory completely rejected the migration explanation and argued instead that Iroquois culture developed among people who had already been living around the lower Great Lakes (Trigger 1985:68). During this time, American archaeology moved right away from diffusion and migration in its search to understand culture change. Instead, environmental changes were studied to document the process of internal transformation. In 1971, James Wright took a major step forward with the

total excavation of a fourteenth century Iroquoian site (the Nodwell Site) near Southampton, Ontario. Currently, there is no all-inclusive theory and many questions remain unanswered.

The archaeological record shows that the earliest material evidence of human occupation in upper state New York and southern Ontario dated at approximately 4000 B.C. It was circa 500 A.D. that a steady reliance on horticulture produced a number of cultural changes to support the subsistence pattern associated with the historical Iroquois (Trigger 1985:83). The corn, bean, and squash trinity, the three sister-providers, of American agriculture had slowly moved north and east from Mexico (Wright 1993:114). Around 1000 A.D., they were planted in the area of the Great Lakes (Blanchard 1980; Trigger 1985). Building on the relatively recent horticultural patterns, the former hunter-gatherers turned to the new prosperity of agriculture (Wright 1993:114). The Iroquois evolved from a predominantly nomadic society to a more sedentary one during this Early Iroquois period (Trigger 1985:83).

The Middle Iroquois period featured significant changes such as increased warfare and cannibalism. A shift to a cooler and drier climate, possibly due to increased dependency on corn, may have caused soil depletion and migration, followed by increased competition over strategic, localized resources. Warfare may also have become the principal means by which young men were able to attain individual prestige.

During the Early Iroquois period, before the move to a sedentary, agricultural lifestyle, the ability of a hunter to bring his family through the rigours of winter must have constituted the supreme test of his skill (Trigger 1985:99). Once hunting and fishing became collective tasks, however, they no longer provided the dramatic opportunity for individual prestige. In the race for individual prestige, the increased warfare escalated to such a degree that neighbouring communities were forced to band together in self-defense. The formation of larger communities produced an even greater dependency on the land, a geographical dispersal of human settlement, and a modified social organization (Trigger 1985:101).

Traceable in the archaeological record, evidence remains that clans emerged and tribal councils were formed. Unfortunately, the record is less clear on the dates of clan, council, and confederation formation. To further complicate the vague evidence in the archaeological

record regarding confederation formation is the dogmatic anthropological assumption that the confederacy of the Iroquois evolved in response to the conditions manifested by contact with the European (Trigger 1985:104).

This claim is motivated by a creditable opposition to viewing Indians as bloodthirsty savages. Yet it errs too far in the direction of a naive 'noble savage' interpretation of their behaviour. It also continues to imply that Indian history, in the sense of substantial change, was a consequence of the arrival of the Europeans (Trigger 1985:105).

The plausible truth may lie somewhere in the middle, and despite the often vague nature of the archaeological record, ethnography should be grounded in an adequate historical context because, following Trigger, it is safely written that "reliable archaeological data are clearly preferable to unverified ethnographic speculations" (Trigger 1985:118).

4.1.2 The Iroquois Confederacy and the Mohawk

The archaeological record indicates that some of the people indigenous to the North American continent were living in mound cities. The mound cities flourished for approximately twenty-five hundred years, with its apogée roughly coinciding with the European Dark Ages and continuing until the time of contact with the Europeans. There is speculation that the Iroquois left the mound cities to migrate north and east for, "according to the traditions of the six nations, there was a time when Iroquoian people did not occupy the lands they now hold" (Blanchard 1980:40).

The Iroquois traveled up the Ohio River to the Great Lakes area where they began to disperse and settle. The main Iroquois group ancestral to the Mohawk continued its journey down the St. Lawrence River. The People of Flint finally came to settle on the northern-most part of the St. Lawrence River and along the Mohawk River. The Iroquois who had traveled both east and north were not yet allied in a confederacy of nations (Blanchard 1980:54).

Before the arrival of the European in North America, there was war and conflict among the tribes. But then came the "Peacemaker" Deganawida. He lived among the Iroquois and enlisted the help of Hiawatha. Together they began to spread the message of peace. There

were five nations that came to be united in peace: the Mohawk, or People of the Flint; the Oneida, or People of the Standing Stone; the Onondaga, or People of the Hills; the Cayuga, or People of the Swamp; and the Seneca, or People of the Plains. Much later, the Five Nations would become six as they were joined by the Tuscarora, or the People of the Shirt, in the eighteenth century.

The dates given for the formation of the Iroquois Confederacy vary between the fifteenth and the seventeenth centuries, between 1400 and 1600 A.D. Even by conservative estimates, it is now accepted that the Confederacy was formed well before the arrival of the European and not simply as a consequence of contact. The *Great Law of Peace*, or the *Gayaneshakgowa*, was first set down around 1539, but the Council Fire had been lit much earlier.

The council of the Iroquois Confederacy was formed when the five nations finally embraced the word of the Peacemaker. The *Great Law of Peace* came to serve as the constitution of the Confederacy of the Iroquois. The *Gayaneshakgowa* is a remarkable document that facilitates the creation and maintenance of peace. Because vertical hierarchy generates conflict, the complex society of the Iroquois was careful to prevent the rise of hierarchy and preserve equality (MacLaine & Baxendale 1990:90).

To prevent hierarchy and preserve equality, the councillors of the Iroquois Confederacy examined their history for traditional sources of conflict. One serious source of conflict was territorial hunting grounds; the solution, then, was to do away with territorial hunting grounds. Everyone was to be welcome and the hunting territories were replaced by universal laws regarding the treatment of game (MacLaine & Baxendale 1990:99). Thus was constructed the *Great Law of Peace*. The *Gayaneshakgowa* was also responsible for the establishment of a code of conduct devoted not only to the concept of peace but to the foundation of a government.

Every individual belonged to a clan, or was protected by a clan. These clans were organized within each of the settlements of the nation. Each settlement was the responsibility of a particular nation, and each of these nations belonged to the confederacy (Blanchard 1980:83).

According to the *Great Law of Peace*, Deganawida appointed the Mohawk “Keepers of the Eastern Door” and the foundation of the *Great Law of Peace*.

The Iroquois Confederacy is a complex social and political alliance that reflects a world view. The central tenet is peace “dedicated to cooperative social action, mutual assistance, and the elimination of strife and struggle” (Blanchard 1980:2). The Confederacy possibly possesses the oldest constitution in the world, and has been pronounced by John Collier (found in Blanchard 1980:2) as “the greatest political society ever devised by man... [unexceeded] in either wisdom or intelligence”.

4.1.3 World View

In order to understand the Mohawk history, we need to understand the Mohawk world view. To escape the conflicts generated in history between people and nations, it is necessary to understand the hopes and values of a people. To eradicate the ill effects of conventional history of historiography, we need to know that the earth is both feminine and alive, that creation is a continuous process, and that human beings are a part of nature. A belief in the universal interdependence of all things stands in sharp contrast to the racial superiority and ethnocentrism of the Euroamerican world.

Despite centuries of colonization, the world view of indigenous societies remains intact. It is through the study of this world view, the persistence of aboriginal values, that the place of the Aboriginal in world history may be exposed (Sioui 1992:x). Traditional history, principally through its reliance on the Darwinian-based notions of cultural evolution, hinders a balanced history of natives and newcomers. By exploring cultural values, both past and present, history may be undertaken from a variety of perspectives.

History isn't worth doing if it isn't tied to current realities. You can't divorce the creation – the writing – of history from contemporary hopes, fears, problems (Kroup, cited by Sioui 1992:22).

4.2 CONTACT: THE SPECIAL CASE OF ETHNOHISTORY

The full light of history only began to illuminate Canada, according to most conservative accounts, in the seventeenth century. The Jesuit Relations and the writers Sagard and Lescarbot, began to provide the early historical landscape for the building of Canadian historiography. The indigenous tribes were only included insofar as they supported European activity in North America. Only the sub-discipline of ethnohistory, established in the nineteenth century, would focus exclusively on the indigenous populations.

Ethnohistory came to rely on both the written Western sources of information and the oral non-Western traditions of aboriginal people. The difference in world view helps account for the difference in the historical traditions of Western and non-Western people. Tribal societies generally have not been interested in the conservation of accurate knowledge for their own sake, over long periods of time; and “what pass as [historical explanations] are often mythical charters explaining and validating current social relations” (Trigger 1985:167). Ethnohistory may be the most inclusive inquiry into the study of non-Western people because its attempt to amalgamate the written Western history with the non-written oral tradition of the indigenous peoples provides for a balanced treatment.

4.2.1 An Ethnohistorical Examination of Contact

4.2.1.1 Early Contact

A close relationship existed between Western European fishermen and the coastal tribes during the sixteenth century. Iberian fishing fleets dominated the Atlantic and kept the expansion of other Europeans in North America at bay. However, once “Iberian power waned”, toward the end of the century, “northern European settlement along the coast proceeded rapidly, and along with it came the unfolding of the fur trade” (Wolf 1982:158). The re-discovery of an old process for felting beaver fur increased the popularity of the beaver pelt (Trigger 1985:33) and became the main focus of the North American fur trade complex (Wolf 1982:159).

The popularity of the beaver hat in Europe expanded the fur trade in North America. Following the demise of Iberian power, the French, Dutch, and British began to settle on the

continent and manoeuvre for power. Each of the settlements erected by the northern Europeans was located on or near a "major route to the inland riches of the fur country" (Wolf 1982:161). The Company of New France, for example, was established at Quebec, and controlled the St. Lawrence River as well as its routes to the Great Lakes. The Dutch at New Amsterdam, founded by the Dutch West Indies Company, were able to control the Hudson River and the route westward on Lake Ontario. "Thus, the northern route was long controlled by French interests, while the southern access was held first by the Dutch and [later] by the English" (Wolf 1982:161). However, as one beaver population after another became depleted, the fur hunters pushed farther west and one tribe after another was enveloped in the fur trade. The fur trade had serious ramifications for all those involved. It not only affected the social organization of the First Nations, but created profound changes in food production, geographic habitat, and warfare (Wolf 1982:161). Following the events of Cartier's manoeuvres in what is now eastern Canada, the most significant occurrence was the disappearance of the St. Lawrence Iroquois. The disappearance of the St. Lawrence Iroquois has been used as a contemporary basis for arguing against Mohawk occupation of the St. Lawrence Valley since time immemorial.

Although the details remain unknown, it is more likely that quarrels over access to trading spots along the St. Lawrence played an important part in the disappearance of the Laurentien Iroquois and perhaps may have strengthened... the Five Nations Confederacy of the Iroquois (Trigger 1985:35).

Some archaeologists explained the disappearance of the St. Lawrence Iroquois as a consequence of attack by the Huron; some ethnohistorians explained the disappearance as the result of the aggression of other Iroquois. Really, the combination of both explanations may be a more accurate reflection of reality. For example, there is an early historical reference to an attack by other Iroquois (around 1600 A.D.) on the St. Lawrence Iroquois and Denis Jamet, a Recollet priest writing in 1615, claimed to know an elderly Huron who remembered the St. Lawrence Iroquois villages before their destruction even closer, he claimed, to the Cartier visit than the 1600 A.D. date (Trigger 1982). In fact, Cartier's account of the St. Lawrence Valley, made in 1603, revealed the area as a no-man's land due to the warfare

between the Algonkin and Montagnais to the north and the Mohawk and other Iroquois to the south. This point is made in the oral tradition of the Iroquois: before the *Gayaneshakgowa*, there was war. The indigenous people of the northern hemisphere did have a history prior to the arrival of the Europeans. Their activities, behaviour, and interaction with each other affected and influenced the activities, behaviour, and interaction of the French, Dutch and British.

Both the oral history of the Iroquois and the archaeological record indicate that the Mohawk occupied well over 9 million acres of territory between the creation of confederation and the arrival of the European. The two principle settlements were at Hochelaga (Montreal) and Stadacona (Quebec City); Hochelaga was the largest with a population of 3500 and an aggregate of fifty longhouses (Blanchard 1980:86).

The St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes had prehistorically been central to the trade and defense of those living in and around the area. The security of the Iroquois Confederacy depended upon the control of those waterways and, unfortunately, both the Algonquin and the Huron rejected the *Great Law of Peace* so that a state of war developed between them and the Confederacy. Following war with the Algonquin, a peace was eventually concluded. The Mohawk controlled the Hudson River (near current-day Albany, New York), Lake Champlain, and the St. Lawrence River route to the Great Lakes while the other nations of the confederacy controlled the Great Lakes and their surrounding shores. Thus, "the Great Law of Peace was the rule of the land, until it was disturbed by the arrival of European colonists..." (Blanchard 1980:98).

The proper history of Iroquoian-European contact began with the second voyage of Jacques Cartier. Cartier and his men spent the winter of 1535 to 1536 in the company of the Mohawk, who they assisted the French and even offered them a cure for scurvy. But it was during the early teen years of the seventeenth century that the French successfully expanded their trade network.

A bifurcated trade network was developed around 1610: the Huron, Algonquin, and Montagnais traded with the French while the Iroquois traded with the Dutch and then the British (Trigger 1985:182). From the beginning of contact, then, the French and Iroquois were

antagonistic. It has already been argued that the Dutch (followed by the British) and the French simply fell into “previously existing chains of mutually hostile alliance” (Trigger 1985:182) and that the European introduction of firearms in 1609 changed the nature of warfare while exacerbating the frequency and violence of the attacks. Furthermore, “it is clear that where competition existed, native traders were pleased to play rival groups of Europeans against one another” (Trigger 1985:189). But, “why did the Indian cooperate with the fisherman, the fur trader, the explorer and the black robe?” (Miller 1989:35). There are a number of answers. The early contact between the Indian and the European was beneficial to both parties (Miller 1989; Trigger 1985) and there were very good reasons for mutual cooperation. At this time, “European motives and Indian interests were largely compatible” (Miller 1989:40). But for the indigenous populations, the sustained contact became increasingly ambivalent and eventually destructive.

4.2.1.2 The Missionaries and the Fur Trade

In the early period of contact, sometime before 1632, the fur trade was the sole focus of all interaction between the First Nations and the French. Notwithstanding the very early period of contact during which time the goods disbursed by the European were thought to have supernatural powers, the Aboriginal neither feared the European nor regarded him as superior. In fact, the slowness with which the European learned languages and hunting or survival skills was often ridiculed. Further, the Iroquois considered the French extremely greedy and cruel (Trigger 1985).

The French need for evangelization and the indigenous desire not to upset trading networks created a period of Canadian historiography that has been called that of “the Jesuit mission to Huron country” (Trigger 1985:227) between the years 1634 and 1650. The relationship between the missionaries and the Indians has been studied in a number of ways. One of the most important points garnered from earlier work (Hunt 1940; Innis 1956) is that the Jesuits were of a different breed. If it has been said that the Recollets were clerks of the company, then the Jesuits were extremely anti-establishment. Amongst themselves, they agreed that the French traders were vile creatures who served only to corrupt the Indians.

They “regarded the moral values evident in traditional Iroquois culture as being more in line with Christianity than the materialist values of the French in Montreal” (Blanchard 1980:7). The Jesuits were experienced missionaries and members of a powerful order. Their work in India and China had taught them to alter the local customs as little as possible. Traditional Canadian history amply documented the missionary effort in New France. Few historians, however, have explored the missions from the Aboriginal side. “...To ascertain what the Jesuits and their teachings meant to native people or what impact they had on native ways of life” (Trigger 1985:226).

Ethnohistorical methods and analyses have allowed for a partial revision of historical documents. They have also raised an awareness about the development of New France and the account of the indigenous people. The conversion activities of the French and the internal conflicts between converted and non-converted Huron and Iroquois were all taking place against an alarming backdrop of war and pestilence (Trigger 1965:45).

As the Jesuits returned to Huron country in the early 1630s, disease broke out in that part of North America. Brought by the European, a series of epidemics plagued the Huron and their immediate neighbours for seven years. Between 1634 and 1640, an unknown disease ravaged Huronia. It could have been measles or smallpox, but its end effect was the same. From 1638-1640, a smallpox epidemic was also killing or permanently disfiguring many people. By 1640, half of the population at Huronia had died. It has been reported that the Iroquois were not hit as badly by the epidemics, possibly due to less contact with the French. However, there are reports of a smallpox epidemic among both the Seneca and the Mohawk while post-epidemic population figure estimates, whether conservative or liberal, show a definite decline.

Despite the ill effects of the epidemics, the Iroquois were still quite anxious to capture the fur trade, or at least to control a good portion of it. Unlike the Huron, the Iroquois were not entirely dependent on the French; furthermore, the Huron dependence on the French had increased because of the terrible population loss suffered during the epidemics. Also, in Huronia the fur trade and the missions were inextricably bound, thus increasing Huron dependence and weakening traditional social structure.

In many historical accounts and documents, the Iroquois are blamed for the massive de-population of the eastern aboriginal world. To justify the exploitation of the fur trade and the theft of land, the Iroquois have been turned into grossly savage Indians who cared little for themselves and even less for each other (Sioui 1992). The antagonism between the Iroquois and the Europeans is historically evident, no doubt, but often the accounts have concealed more than they have revealed.

Many wars have been instigated both between Amerindians and between Amerindians and Euroamericans, and these conflicts have been largely used to conceal the demographic catastrophe created by the epidemics (Sioui 1992:5).

During the French and Indian wars, the Mohawk were eager to establish trade and military alliances with both the British and the French. The Mohawk, including those at Kahnawake, used their ambivalent position in order to guarantee for themselves good prices for fur and high quality trade goods (Blanchard 1980:7). The Mohawk were extremely successful militarily as they attempted to monopolize trade with the Europeans (Campbell & Pal 1991:290). A growing demand for European goods among the Iroquois, and a decline in beaver supply in some territories, generated a situation ripe for conflict. "If the Iroquois could not realign traditional trading patterns, they could perhaps achieve their goals by waging war" (Trigger 1985:261). All in all, the manoeuvres were facilitated by the Iroquois acquisition of guns from the British. Eventually, the French also began to offer or sell guns to their trading partners, but due to Jesuit insistence, only to those who had been baptized (Trigger 1985:262).

Mohawk blockades of the St. Lawrence River for the theft of Huron furs were routine during the middle of the seventeenth century. The Huron were still serious competitors in the fur trade despite a decade of smallpox and a population reduced to 10,000 people. But as the Huron were struggling for survival, so were the Iroquois. While the smallpox had left the Iroquois relatively untouched, the burgeoning population of Europeans had reached a quarter of a million by 1700, and more than 5 million by 1800 (Wright 1993:123). Thus, the Iroquois revived their ancient practice of replacing people by adopting prisoners of war, and set about incorporating the Huron.

In spite of the tension between the Huron and the Iroquois, those Huron who remained adamantly opposed to the Jesuit mission in Huronia were quite amenable to the diplomatic overtures of the Iroquois. “The traditionalists probably resented the Jesuits as much as this radical faction did, but they feared and mistrusted the Iroquois even more” (Trigger 1985:265). The Iroquois diplomacy failed, however; and while the pro-Iroquois radical faction eventually sided with the traditionalists, they all began to doubt that the Jesuits were capable of defending them. The confidence of the Huron in the Jesuits was shattered when an Iroquois war party attacked and destroyed two Huron settlements and three Jesuit priests were killed. While the Jesuits did not even seem capable of defending themselves, they nonetheless continued their programme of conversion as growing numbers of Huron were baptized (Trigger 1985:266-7). On 16 March 1649, however, the Jesuit mission in Huronia was suddenly aborted following a devastating attack by the Iroquois. The missionaries Brebeuf and Lalement were taken prisoner and tortured to death. Ironically, the Huron captured by the Iroquois were instrumental in the death and torture of the two priests, particularly Brebeuf, whom the Huron taunted and abused (Mealing 1967; Trigger 1985).

The Iroquois capture and torture of Jean de Brebeuf is quite likely the most horrifying lesson taught in Canadian history. The use of allegory and metaphor helped turn Brebeuf into a New World Christ (see in particular the Jesuit account of the martyrdom in the *Jesuit Relations*). The entire episode is so steeped in myth that an objective account is almost impossible to find. Conversely, the Jesuit role in the fur trade has often been misunderstood. Darker motives are occasionally ascribed to the Jesuits from a twentieth century perspective.

Such interpretations are the product of a secular society. Indeed, it is curious that scholars who are trained to take great pains to understand the thoughts and motives of non-Western peoples are often the least willing to understand people of their own culture who happen to hold views different from their own (Trigger 1985:50).

There can be no doubt that the primary aim and function of the Jesuits in North America was conversion. They were unwitting agents of colonization and the fur trade.

The Iroquois managed to disperse their neighbours and incorporate their enemies. “By the 1660s many of Iroquoia’s citizens were Hurons and Algonquins who ‘had become

Iroquois in temper and inclination” (Wright 1993:124). In this way, the Iroquois Confederacy managed to survive and shatter the trading network upon which New France depended for economic prosperity (Trigger 1985:273). Ultimately, the Iroquois paid a price for their success. The dispersal of their neighbours had resulted in the capture of too many prisoners, while the years of war had created serious internal division. “Bacqueville de La Potherie... later observed that when it came to foreign affairs, Iroquoian people generally developed two opposing factions” (Trigger 1985:274). By no means did the factionalism weaken the Iroquois society or position. Rather, it enabled the Iroquois to carry on negotiations during times of peace and war while maintaining face.

Despite the devastation of the Jesuit Mission at Huronia, the order remained eager to convert the Iroquois. At this time the French Crown was aggressively promoting colonization and evangelization. Both the Jesuits and the Sulpicians set up missions among the Mohawk, one at Kahnawake and the other at Kanasatake.

The complexity of the three-nation war between Britain, France, and Iroquoia was exacerbated by the Iroquois policy of aggressive neutrality. The unique advantage of the Iroquois to negotiate in times of war proved to be an advantage. Until the War of Independence, in which the Iroquois Confederacy held a balance of power for the last time (Wright 1993:125), Iroquois independence served as a buffer against the colonial expansion of either side. Neither the British nor the French could be entirely sure of the Iroquois position. Following the fall of New France, the Iroquois remained independent, but their tactics were just as aggressive and self-reliant as ever. During the American Revolution, for example, the Mohawk defended and upheld their neutrality while the Iroquois, under the direction of Joseph Brant – who “broke the back of the Longhouse and hastened the fall of Iroquoia” (Wright 1993:137) – dragged the Confederacy into the Revolutionary War.

These differential foreign involvements, however, took their toll on Iroquois unity. The American War of Independence set cluster against cluster. Factions within each cluster also opposed kinsmen to one another. This left the confederacy weak and divided: it continued on a ceremonial basis, but with the American victory it lost its major military and political functions. (Wolf 1982:170).

The bilingual and bicultural Brant had convinced four of the nations to fight for the Crown, but in 1782, the British abruptly gave up, without a thought for their allies:

They urged the Iroquois to go home and withheld supplies to finish the job... Brant was in despair; perhaps he was also disillusioned. 'We the Indians wish to have the blow returned on the enemy as soon as possible... We are... as it were between two hells' (Wright 1993:140).

4.2.2 The Specific Case of the Mohawk at Oka

The mission at Lac de Deux Montagnes (Kanesatake) continued ministering to the Mohawk. The Sulpician order had been granted the land there with full seigneurial rights by the French Crown. Following the French defeat in North America, the British chose to observe those rights. In 1784, the Order of Paris transferred land title at Oka to the Seminary of St. Sulpice in Montreal. For the Jesuit Mission at Kahnawake, however, the British administration had other plans. "The terms of the Jesuit seigneuries did not grant the full, traditional rights of 'temporal lords' to the missions" (Campbell & Pal 1991:290) and thus in 1775, the Jesuit Mission was dissolved and administration fell to the Crown.

The Mohawk maintained their position and policy of aggressive neutrality. They could not acceptably submit to British command without compromising their own sovereignty. During the War of 1812, Mohawk territory was invaded by Americans. The Kahnawake Mohawk leapt into action and fought in the battles of Chateauguay at Beaver Dam, within their own regiments. "One observer noted [that] the Cognawaga Indians fought the battle... and Fitzgibbon got the credit" (Blanchard 1980:11).

The end of the eighteenth century was a generally difficult period for the Iroquois.. They had almost entirely depleted the fur-bearing animals within their own territory and needed to expand. Furthermore, white settlers were encroaching on their traditional hunting grounds. In 1822, the Mohawk in the Oka area launched an unsuccessful claim to prevent white settlement. Meanwhile, the Mohawk at the Sulpician mission were also concerned about their land and the disputes which followed all stemmed from the legal doubt about the transfer of title to the Seminary of St. Sulpice from the Order of Paris (Campbell & Pal 1991:290).

The Mohawk effort to regain both ownership and control of their land had been continually thwarted despite often violent responses to white encroachment. The dispute over land between the Sulpicians and the Mohawk continued even as other land titles and reserves were transferred to the Commission of Indian Lands for Lower Canada in 1850 following an 1841 passage of a statute of the legislature confirming the title. The Seminary of St. Sulpice continued receiving confirmation of the original land grant of 1718 at Oka through a series of disputes and court rulings. In 1910, a decision of the Superior court upheld the 1841 statute of the legislature and concluded that the Mohawk could not prove occupation since time immemorial. Ironically, as the Mohawk launched court cases and petitioned Ottawa, the Sulpicians continued slowly to sell their land (Campbell & Pal 1991:291; Hughes 1991:8).

Only in 1945 did Ottawa take any action. Without consulting the Mohawk, the Department of Indian Affairs bought the remaining Sulpician land (to the area of 730 hectares) as well as a neighbouring wood lot (Campbell & Pal 1991:291). The government agreed to assume the obligation of religious duties, but no reserve was set aside for the Mohawk and a parcel of land was granted by the Quebec legislature to the town of Oka to build a nine hole golf course. And in 1975, a comprehensive claim filed by the Mohawk of Kanasatake, Kahnawake, and Akwesasne was still denied (Hughes 1991:8). A specific land claim was also launched and denied in 1977. Still the dispute ensued, while the government continued to state that it was willing to negotiate a claim (Campbell & Pal 1991:291).

In 1989, the town of Oka announced its plans to expand the nine hole golf course and the government appointed a mediator to reach a settlement. The talks were halted by the newly elected band council in March 1990; on 11 March 1990 the Mohawk at Kanesatake erected a blockade on the road that led to the development site (Campbell & Pal 1991:291).

4.2.3 The Indian in Canadian History

The secondary role of the Indian in Canadian history should come as no surprise. The master narrative of Western Civilization usually positioned the Indian as a noble help-mate or an uncivilized heathen. The focus was not on the Indian; instead, the protagonist was the

conquering European, principally British, who hailed from across the ocean and bore on his shoulders the weight of Western Civilization.

The collapse of the master or meta-narratives has been engineered by probing, critical questions or critical treatments of history that facilitate even more critical, probing questions and treatments of history. Only now, with the inclusion of works by non-Western or traditional scholars and historians, have the channels opened for a new kind of discursive writing and telling of history – critically informed and more inclusive.

After 1812, the Indian almost entirely disappears from the history of Canada. “That Canada still has an Indian population, or that they are presently involved in a movement to reassert their identity, is almost entirely neglected” (Walker 1971:30-31).

It is tempting to portray native North Americans in sombre tone as the victims of unremitting European self-interest... a necessary antidote for the long-standing tendency of historians to minimize the moral responsibility of European settlers... Such a view fails to acknowledge the tenacity with which [they] continued to defend their lands, customs, and personal dignity (Trigger 1985:297).

Unfortunately, even historians who are sensitive and interested in extending Canadian historiography are usually limited to an interaction which focuses on the impact Europeans had on indigenous societies. Few are willing to leap beyond and into a more complex treatment of indigenous actions as partly responsible for the outcome of history (Trigger 1985:299).

From the marriage of ethnography and history emerged a discipline capable of extending the borders of conventional history by including oral traditions and the archaeological record in its reckoning of the historical present. In fact, eminent ethnohistorian Bruce Trigger (1986) proposes that a genuine understanding of native history is possible; but first we must acknowledge the distorted stereotypes created by Euro-Canadians that are entirely responsible for the on-going distortion of indigenous societies and their histories.

The objective is to uncover the rightful place of the Aboriginal in history. Traditional history is unable to present either an aboriginal history or an inclusive history of Canada. Instead, traditional history serves only to reinforce the barriers of our current social reality and perpetuate them into the future. Traditional history is unable to present a balanced

treatment of history because it is still being written as a teleology of Western Civilization based on the cultural values of the doctrine of cultural evolution.

Strangely enough, the anthropological paradigm of cultural relativism is not the obvious antidote to cultural evolutionism that it may have appeared to be to the Boasian school and its followers or practitioners. Critical historians, Georges Sioui (1992) in particular, are now acknowledging the moral dimension of history and arguing against the relative evaluation of culture. By underscoring culture as a system of values, we may explore the development of values over time. Such an approach is partly consistent with the central tenet of this thesis: where contact between people occurs, ideas combine in time and space. And the process cannot be one-sided. It is impossible to say that one society has affected another without acknowledging that the reverse is also true. In this way, the history of Canada may become a chronicle which acknowledges the effort and contribution of all people and not just the pursuits and adventures of a given few (Trigger 1985:343).

Official history, or historiography, is fraught with faith-affirming statements woven into myth. The stories are those stories told by and believed in by those who hold power. Wolf tackles the problem of power and its anthropological implications in "Facing Power: Old Insights, New Questions" (1990). Instead of constructing a monolithic image of power (like Hobbes's *Leviathan* and de Jouvenal's *Minotaur*), Wolf proposes, instead, a categorization of power incumbent upon different kinds of social relationships. 1) Power as a personal attribute, understood as potency or capability. 2) Power as the ability of *ego* to impose its will on an *alter*, either in social action or in inter-personal relations. 3) Power as tactical or organizational, moving beyond inter-personal relations and into *settings*. 4) Power that not only operates within *settings*, but which actually organizes or arranges the *settings* and specifies the energy flow of tactical or organizational power (Wolf 1990:218). The fourth categorization of power is, perhaps, what Foucault refers to as "the ability to structure the possible field of action of others", or what Wolf calls structural power or the power that structures political economy (Wolf 1990: 219).

We may use Wolf's fourth categorization of power to challenge, as Keesing asked us to do, the liberal stereotypes of the 'traditional sector'. The social field of action at Oka was

shaped by people who have long been identified and defined according to those same constraining stereotypes. To paraphrase Elijah Harper on *The People of the Pines* dust-jacket, anyone wanting to understand the situation of aboriginal people in Canada should look closely at the Oka crisis.

In her article, "A New Paradigm in Canadian Indian Policy for the 1990s", the late Sally Weaver argues that the opposition of Elijah Harper to the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord and the crisis at Oka are examples of "the current turmoil in the field of Canadian Indian Affairs... [and] a newly emerging policy paradigm ... [which] severely challenges current policy thinking in regard to the relationship of the Canadian state to Indian First Nations" (Weaver 1990:8). Her words are especially prophetic in the post-Mulroney years as Jean Chretien's Minister of Indian Affairs, Ron Irwin, struggles with Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs Grand Chief Phil Fontaine for a prototype of Aboriginal self-government in Manitoba:

I would argue that Indian policy is experiencing a *paradigm shift* from the old to a new way of conceptualizing First Nations issues, and that during the transition period to the new paradigm we should expect to see erratic policy experiments, unfocused initiatives and false starts until the new mode of thinking settles into acceptance (Weaver 1990:10).

Structural power shapes the social field of action, permitting behaviour that is possible and prohibiting other less possible and impossible behaviour. The new paradigm of Indian policy, which is changing the relations between the First Nations and the Canadian nation-state, may be part of a larger movement toward process.

It is precisely in the notion of structural power that anthropologists may delineate the forces of the world and how they impinge upon people, without resorting to the naive (and much criticized) anthropological 'tropical island syndrome' (Wolf 1990:219). In order to address the relations between tactical or organizational power and structural power, Wolf proposes a focus on process – away from the building blocks of social organization like gender, clan, or lineage (which were constructed at a time when anthropology was concerned with product) and toward an understanding of social organization as process, fluid in time and space (Wolf 1990:223-4).

The essential idea in the new paradigm thinking comes from the symbolism of the Iroquois Two-Row Wampum as found in the 1983 Penner Report on Indian Self-Government. "The relationship between the First Nations and [the Canadian nation-state] is a *permanent organic relationship* that will prevail into the distant future" (Weaver 1990:11).

The deep flaws in the federal land claims policy were a key reason for the outpouring of support across Canada for the Mohawk warriors in the summer of 1990 (York & Pindera 1991:278).

The finality of land claims is being challenged – "once-and-for-all settlement is misguided" (Weaver 1990:11) – and the concept of termination as found in the 1969 White Paper is no longer a part of the new paradigm. Despite the insistence of the federal government that it would not negotiate land claims at gun-point, the Mohawk managed to control the social field of action:

Even before the crisis was over, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney was promising a dramatic increase in federal money for land claims.

"There were Cabinet ministers who had never dreamt they would be talking about native issues and they had to deal with it," Georges Erasmus said. "Everyone started to talk about Canada's relationship with aboriginal people, treaty rights, land rights... The Mulroney agenda is being pushed by this issue. Whether they want to or not, they have to deal with it" (York & Pindera 1991:286-7).

Regarding treaty rights and land rights, "the second new paradigm notion is that the relationship between the state and the First Nations will exist at many levels, but one of these will be the very important level of *sanctioned rights*" (Weaver 1990:11).

Oka sparked a serious display of First Nations unity across Canada:

They felt the same burning anger.

"If you are pushed around for a hundred years... and you run out of patience... and there's nowhere to move, then it's a legitimate reason to take up arms," said Gary Potts, Chief of the Bear Island Indians of Lake Temagami in northern Ontario.

Potts was applauded by a roomful of aboriginal people when he made those comments on a TV program at the end of the Oka crisis. He was voicing the frustrations of a new generation of natives who are more willing and able to fight for their rights than their forebears (York & Pindera 1991:273).

Other important aspects of the new paradigm thinking include a *re-conceptualization of culture* to include 'pizza-eating' AK-47-carrying Mohawk Warriors as "real Mohawk" despite their deviation from those old liberal stereotypes; the idea of *jointly formulated policies*, the importance of *aboriginal knowledge*, and of real *empowerment* through self-government (Weaver 1990).

The new paradigm thinking has begun to challenge old ideas, but the process is slow. The federal government responded to Oka as a crisis of 'law and order' while the Mohawk and other First Nations rallied behind the warriors. If we follow Wolf's conceptualization of structural power in an analysis of First Nations and the Oka Crisis (using Weaver), we learn that the factions or 'building blocks' are less important than the processes. The Longhouse Mohawk, the Chief and Council Mohawk, the Catholic Mohawk, the Anglican Mohawk, the pro-and anti-gambling and cigarette-smuggling Mohawk – all were engaged in the same struggles, the same processes of empowerment, of land rights, of a permanent relationship with Canada.

Within the social sciences the movement of deconstruction has opened up a reinterpretation of modern world histories. We are only now beginning to understand the very complex dynamics of a cultural encounter that began centuries ago. With the new tools, methodologies and insights afforded us by the movement of deconstruction, including a focus on process, we may move ahead to the task of writing a more inclusive and multi-dimensional history of all North American nations.

Someday, when the dominant society becomes more concerned about reciprocity and less concerned about superiority and domination, we may be able to join hands and celebrate the diverse roots of the American democratic tradition without the blinders of indifference and cultural arrogance (Grinde & Johansen 1991:xxiv).

In the book *Exemplar of Liberty*, Donald Grinde and Bruce Johansen (1991) explore the unconventional, critical side of American history. The two scholars offer an historical analysis of the evolution of American political ideas and democracy which departs from the meeting of cultures; notwithstanding their exclusive focus on American history, this thesis has only to gain from the incorporation of their hypothesis.

The cultural encounter between Europeans and non-Europeans manifested itself in many ways. As explored in the previous chapter, those critiques of European societies which highlighted the Noble Savage as ideal revealed more about European society than about North American indigenous societies. Locke, Rousseau, and scores of travel writers used the Noble Savage to comment upon the foibles of Western Civilization. Thus lived the Noble Savage, as much a sardonic descriptor for the Aboriginal of the Western Hemisphere as it was a satirical, ironic label for the European noble, quite fallen in the corrupt wiles of Western Civilization.

The Noble Savage may have been an apparition created by the European imagination but its influence on the European philosophy and ideology of the Enlightenment was very real. The dastardly effects of the Noble Savage have been documented most extensively in the now familiar Berkhofer Jr. book, *The White Man's Indian* (1979); however, the more positive effects which sprang from the contact between cultures, no matter how fanciful the manifestations, have usually been ignored or overlooked. "...Did the mixture of fact and fancy even matter, since the Europeans who made the New World into a metaphor for liberty absolutely believed what they thought they saw" (Grinde & Johansen 1991:72).

A political idea, even one as inaccurate and whimsical as the liberty of the Noble Savage, Grinde and Johansen remind us, does not require a completely factual base in order to affect or "have a profound influence on the course of intellectual history" (Grinde & Johansen 1991:72). Countless allusions and references have been made to the influence that the Iroquois Confederacy had on the constitutions and nations of the North American continent. Grinde and Johansen present a most persuasive case as they argue that the Fathers of Confederation were well aware of the sophistication and complexity of the Iroquois Confederacy. Some of the social philosophers, historians, and statesmen were informed by the ancient American Confederation (said to be the oldest in the world). The Iroquois themselves were also aware of the opportunity to influence.

'Our wise forefathers established union and Amity between the Five Nations. This has made us formidable, this has given us great weight and authority with our neighbouring nations. We are a powerful confederacy; and by your

observing the same methods our wise forefathers have taken, you will acquire strength and power (Canasatego, cited in Grinde & Johansen 1991:94).

Canasatego's famous speech was made during a treaty conference held at Lancaster in 1744. The treaty was held as war broke out between Britain and France. The representatives from Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania were anxious to procure Iroquois assistance in what became commonly known as King George's War.

At a meeting with the Six Nations in August 1775 at Albany, the Commissioners of Indian Affairs made reference to the speech of Canasatego.

Brethern,

Our business with you, besides rekindling the ancient council-fire... is... to inform you of the advice that was given about thirty years ago, by your wise forefathers...

Our forefathers rejoiced to hear Cannasatego speak these words... They said to one another, 'The Six Nations are a wise people. Let us harken to them, and take their counsel... Our old men have done so... We thank the Great God that we are all united; that we have a strong Confederacy... (Commissioners for the 12 United Colonies, cited in Tooker 1988:310).

Few Americans, regardless of their historical awareness or sophistication, are unaware that the tea-dumping patriots were dressed as Mohawks. The Boston Tea Party was not a spontaneous prank pulled by a street gang. The Boston Sons of Liberty were a serious group of men using a very symbolic form of protest: "and they had chosen their symbols with utmost care" (Grinde & Johansen 1991:112).

The tea symbolized British tyranny; the Mohawk symbolized American freedom – an antithesis to the British and an emerging national consciousness. The image of the Noble Savage informed the idea of American democracy and the *Gayaneshakgowa* provided a blueprint or a prototype for the creation of a nation composed of an amalgamation of fairly independent states. It is not terribly difficult to see the parallels between the United States and the Iroquois Confederacy.

The bicentennial of the American constitution provided a ripe atmosphere for serious acknowledgement of the role that the Iroquois Confederacy played in the formation of the United States of America. Articles were published, speeches were made, and cries to include the knowledge in the public school curricula were made (Tooker 1988:306). Across the

centuries, many statesmen, philosophers, and academics have made the argument that the Iroquois Confederacy provided a model for the creation and constitution of the United States. The argument is very old and somewhat contentious. Contrary to the work of Grinde and Johansen is that of the ethnohistorian Elisabeth Tooker, who claims that there is no support for this thesis in either the historical or ethnographic literature (Tooker 1988:305).

The work of those who claim that the Iroquois Confederacy influenced the American democratic system and constitution are divided by Tooker (1986:306) into two camps. One is the populist idea that only the Indian knew true democracy and that Western Europeans learned democracy from the Indians. The other idea specifically holds that the Iroquois Confederacy influenced the American Confederation and constitution.

There are many followers in the second camp. Many Americans have written about the influence of Iroquois political and philosophical traditions on the formation of the United States of America (The Commissioners of Indian Affairs 1775; William E. Griffiths 1891; Herbert M. Lloyd 1901; Ely S. Parker 1916; William B. Newell 1928; J.N.B. Hewitt 1936; Matthew W. Stirling 1937; Clark Wissler 1940; Paul A.W. Wallace 1946; Frank Underhill 1953; Irving J. Hallowell 1957; Reaman 1967; Marriott & Rachlin 1968; Farb 1968; Eckert 1969; and most currently Grinde & Johansen 1991). Ironically, Elisabeth Tooker documents all of these men in an article which refuses to acknowledge the “‘direct chain of evidence linking the basic document of the American Government’ to Canasatego and his speech at the 1744 Lancaster Treaty Conference... [and] ‘an Iroquois origin for the American system of government’” (Smithsonian Press Release 26 March 1936, cited in Tooker 1988:325).

The most quoted and explicit passage, however, concerning the influence of the Iroquois Confederacy on the United States of America is found in a letter written by one of the Fathers of Confederation himself, Benjamin Franklin:

...it would be a very strange thing, if six nations of ignorant savages should be capable of framing a scheme for such a union, and be able to execute it in such a manner, as that it has subsisted [for] Ages, and appears indissoluble; and yet a like Union should be impracticable for ten or a dozen colonies, to whom it is more necessary, and must be more advantageous; and who cannot be supposed to want an equal understanding of their interest (Franklin, cited in Tooker 1988:308-9).

Tooker steadfastly denies the influence the Confederacy may have had on the founding fathers by doubting that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, July 1787, would have proposed a system whereby only their relatives could become members of congress (Tooker 1988:312). Leaving aside the irony of Tooker's last statement (the founding fathers did not have to overtly propose this system because by virtue of its nascent social organization, a complex industrial society has a controlling elite which implicitly orders a system of governance whereby relatives of a few select families by and large rule), her literal interpretation of the argument is otherwise flawed because she is looking into history for an empiricism which does not exist (see Hayden White's *Tropics of Discourse* 1978).

The evidence for the influence of Western European institutions and ideologies upon indigenous societies and cultures has not been manifested entirely in tangible ways; yet no one would deny that there has been influence on traditional ways. It would be equally ridiculous and dangerous to think that following centuries of contact, the indigenous societies and cultures would not have influenced, at all, the transplanted European cultures in North America.

If one segment of the population now believes that the Iroquois Confederacy directly shaped the American Confederation and Constitution, the interesting analysis is one which reflects upon the historical circumstance during which time such an assertion was made and not one which negates the directness or indirectness of the influence (or indeed if it existed at all).

The story of how European immigrants to America shared ideas with native peoples goes much deeper. While the example of America's native societies was cited in the creation of the constitution, we must also examine the ideas behind this seminal document to understand how the examples provided by native political organizations helped shape the thinking of Europeans as they became Americans (Johansen 1990:279).

The indigenous threads of American democracy and ideology cannot be denied (Deloria 1988); they were woven into the American tapestry "at a time when 3 million people of European descent lived in small islands of settlement among more widespread American Indian nations" (Johansen 1990:281). Lewis Henry Morgan himself, father of American

anthropology, wrote that the Iroquois Confederacy contained 'the germ of modern Parliament congress, and literature' (1965 [1881]:32).

Thus, while the founders of the United States certainly did not copy the Iroquois' matrilineal, clan-based system of governance any more than they copied the unwritten constitution of the British... it is possible to argue that the concept of our system of federalism, of state within a state, owes a substantial debt to that of the Haudenosaunee (Johansen 1990:284).

When we look beyond the official historical record and re-write or re-think it so that it accurately records our past, we come closer to an understanding of how people interact and communicate through deed, word, or symbol. We attain a better understanding of power and process. Furthermore, neither Grinde nor Johansen argue that the Iroquois Confederacy provided *the* model for American Confederation: "the Iroquois ... provided *a* model – one among many – that gave our founders raw material for their own unique, ideological constructs" (Johansen 1990:280). The conclusion that Grinde and Johansen reach is that the Iroquoian model will become another part of the pantheon of political ideas that created the American democratic system and psyche. In short, "Europe and the West... are being asked to take the Other seriously... The subaltern and the constitutively different suddenly achieved disruptive articulation exactly wherein European culture silence and compliance could previously be depended on to quiet them down" (Said 1989:223). Despite a scholarly penchant for historical accuracy, such as the work of Elisabeth Tooker (1988), we do no people any service, historically rightly or wrongly, by denying them a past. The First Nations of the North American continent did affect the transplanted European nations, just as they themselves were affected; they contributed to the massive North American sociocultural complex. Perhaps, as Sioui (1992:65) argues, the First Nations quenched the bloodthirst of the feudal European societies and changed them into more humane ones. Either way, it is the responsibility of the contemporary scholar to use the tools of current theoretical and practical analysis in order to make history a more inclusive, honest process and product.

CHAPTER FIVE

OKA: A POST-MODERN CRISIS?

5.1 BEGINNINGS

On the pages of *The Globe and Mail* and across the video screens programmed and produced by the CBC, the Canadian national news agencies erected an image of the crisis. Clad in camouflage and carrying an AK-47, the Mohawk Warrior became the central symbol of the Oka crisis, 1990. But what kind of world do we live in where Mohawk Warriors carry semi-automatic weapons and wear the green, brown, and olive of the international soldier? What can the image tell us about cultural contact and conflict; relationships between people and nations; or symbols and images; in the contemporary world? On the surface, the image contradicts traditional western knowledge: "Indians" do not carry sub-machine guns and they certainly do not wear camouflage. However, as the myths of Western Civilization erode, so do the precepts of traditional Western knowledge.

To decode the image amidst the rubble of twentieth century truth, the anthropological analyst must step gingerly through the interdependent cultural terrain of colonizer and colonized, Western and non-Western, in which both co-exist and battle for over-lapping experience.

...Because of empire, all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogenous, extraordinarily differential and unmonolithic (Said 1993:xxv).

The tried and true beliefs of our world are crumbling daily (Schultz and Lavenda 1990:xvii). The callous and global machinations of both international and national political or economic interests, along with the apparent human tendencies to conquer, exploit and oppress, have combined with the threat of nuclear holocaust, world hunger, and stock market collapse to create the age of disaster. The age of disaster, also known as the post-modern age, has increased human vulnerability to both natural and human-made disasters (Torry 1979). We live in, the Quechua speakers tell us, *manchay tiempo*: a time of fear.

Postmodernism is a state of things. It is primarily determined by an extremely rapid and freewheeling exchange to which most responses are faltering, impulsive, and contradictory. What is at stake is the constitution of being – the way we perceive ourselves and others...Postmodernism is the only possible contemporary answer to a century worn out by the rise and fall of modern ideologies, the pervasion of capitalism, and an unprecedented sense of personal responsibility and individual impotence (Olalquiaga 1992:xi).

The utopian character of modernity has been ruptured. The old authority cannot be replaced by a new authority (Said 1992:xxiv). No one believes anymore in the progressive goals of the modern age: there is no newer, better world. The effects of the two world wars have taken their toll. Without a future to look forward to and with only a ridiculed and criticized naive past, the modern age has collapsed upon itself, leaving behind a collection of forms with little function. The threat of world annihilation has aborted an innocent age of progress and order.

The fragmentation, intertextuality, and massive commodification of everyday life that began with modernity once had a function that has now been totally lost...

In the midst of this obsolescence... new ways of life emerge, more skeptical of these visions as moving in only one direction. I believe this moment of new life emerging from the ruins of decaying dreams has been properly called postmodern (Olalquiaga 1992:xx).

On the North American continent, the skepticism of visions which move in only one direction has been expounded by both aboriginal and critical western scholars. Euro-American scholars who refuse to believe that Western supremacy is anything but an artificially constructed product of the modern age have not been listening. Assumptions, beliefs, and ideologies are being questioned; if the future is no longer morally progressive, then neither was the past.

5.2 THE POST-MODERN PROJECT

5.2.1 Introduction

Following World War II and the collapse of the European colonial empires, the citizens of former colonies began to vocally reject the myths of Western Civilization. The experience of decolonization created a new political and ideological reality that questioned

the very epistemological status of the master-narratives, or the tenets of Western knowledge. Christened by Lévi-Strauss as the hand-maiden of colonialism, anthropology was also touched.

...A very widespread, empowering distinction has been eroded: the division of the globe into literate and non-literate peoples. This distinction is no longer widely accurate, as non-Western “tribal” peoples become increasingly literate. But furthermore, once one begins to doubt the ethnographer’s monopoly on the power to inscribe, one begins to see the “writing” activities that have always been pursued by native collaborators (Clifford 1986:117).

Since the seventeenth and well into the twentieth century, the Western intellectual elite has maintained a faith in the superiority of Western Civilization, and retained for itself a position as the reference point of the *telos* of history (Bauman 1993:128). The position was used to judge both neighbouring and distant categories of humanity alike. From the vantage point called modernity, “all other known or guessed forms appeared as past stages, side-shoots, or cul de sac” (Bauman 1993:129). The march toward the light of history, the struggle of reason against animal instinct, science against magic, and truth against prejudice, defined the project of the modern age.

On the other hand, the post-modern age may be characterized by the abandonment of the march toward the light – the abandonment of the search for reason.

Instead, it tries to reconcile itself to a life under conditions of permanent and incurable uncertainty; a life in the presence of an unlimited quantity of competing forms of life, unable to prove their claims to be grounded in anything more solid and binding than their own historically shaped connections (Bauman 1993:135).

5.2.2 The Modern and the Post-Modern

Post-modernism may be conceptualized as an aesthetic trend, a period concept to explain the culture of late capitalism, or a loose body of theory (Helvacioğlu 1992:8). Aesthetically, post-modernism is a reaction against the assumptions of modernism. Opposed to the rigid structure of modernity, and supported by a collapsed and chaotic sense of time and space, post-modernism is the pathological symptom of a society that has lost its capacity to deal with the spatial, temporal, and historical dimensions (Helvacioğlu 1992:10). As the

culture of late capitalism, so described by Frederic Jameson and a few other neo-Marxists, post-modernity is defined by the universalization of the capitalist mode of production and characterized as a post-modern sensibility of “diversity, schizophrenia, decentralization, deconstruction, and distraction” (Helvacioğlu 1992:13). Unlike modernity, post-modernity has no unified tradition, even among the neo-Marxists. Unlike the post-modern historical materialists, like Jameson, the post-structuralists, like Jean-François Lyotard, reject historical materialism both methodologically and theoretically. Their point of departure is not the social world; rather, it is a critique of modern philosophy and epistemology. Preoccupied with the present, these thinkers argue that the Enlightenment project of Emancipation falls into error (Helvacioğlu 1992:16). The critique of modernity called post-modernity contains the divergent intellectual traditions of post-Marxism and post-structuralism.

In the post-structuralism camp, according to Lyotard, the post-modern condition refers to the state of knowledge or epistemology in the most highly developed, industrial societies where knowledge is placed within the context of the crisis of narratives. For Lyotard, the modern stands in opposition to the post-modern as a condition or state of things wherein any science (the term here is used generally) legitimates itself by evoking or appealing to a higher discourse, a “meta-narrative of legitimation”(1993), like the Enlightenment or Marxism, “the emancipation of the rational or working subject, or the creation of wealth” (Lyotard 1993 [1979]:xxiii). The term post-modern, extremely simplified, generally refers to a skepticism of these grand or master-narratives. The master-narrative, or meta-narrative, has lost its “great hero, its great dangers, its great voyages, its great goal” (Lyotard 1993[1979]:xxiv). There is a crack in the binding that holds together the narrative elements and they are no longer cohesively homogenous. Instead, a heterogeneity of elements is still manipulated by power-brokers who argue that the elements are indeed commensurable and composing an as-yet-unseen whole.

Our working hypothesis is that the status of knowledge is altered as societies enter what is known as the post-industrial age and cultures enter what is known as the post-modern age (Lyotard 1993[1979]:3)

The modern is to the post-modern as purpose is to play, hierarchy is to anarchy, distance is to participation, synthesis is to antithesis, presence is to absence, genre is to text,

boundary is to inter-text, semantics is to rhetoric, signified is to signifier, master-code is to idiolect, narrative is to anti-narrative, type is to mutant, and God the Father is to the Holy Ghost (Hassan 1993:152). Drawn from diverse fields and many disciplines, the concepts on any given side of the above binary pairs may not be entirely discrete, but their respective rubrics point to or reflect general tendencies of either condition. The post-modern is generally understood as a breakdown in the status of knowledge in architecture, aesthetics, society or culture: a call to abandon the Enlightenment cultural and historical project called modernity. Represented as the progress of reason toward a social end, the project of modernity is now entirely questionable (Docherty 1993:95-7). The post-modern project may reveal epistemological skepticism, or heightened reflexivity, or the conventionality of history. But whatever it does, whichever characteristics of the post-modern condition it chooses to adopt, it can be unequivocally said that post-modernist theory rests upon the assumption that there is no external vantage point, no Archimedean point of view.

We are confronted with, more accurately, incorporated into, a totalizing hermeneutic – a sort of epistemological antinomianism – that rejects totalization, questions the authority of any hermeneutic, and refuses any transcendental position (Crapanzano 1992:91).

The post-modern is very similar to the post-colonial in rejecting the “authority of any hermeneutic” and dismissing a unified world vision or master-narrative. The surface is stressed over depth, and the uncritical acceptance of modern technology (from the pocket calculator to the sub-machine gun) is combined with the absence of historical awareness.

...Like something out of Salman Rushdie, having more to do with the New York art scene, the Milan world of fashion, or the Paris Bar in Berlin than with the pathetic conditions of a Bangkok slum where a man may wear a women’s lib t-shirt, enslave his wife, spend his evenings in a brothel listening to Michael Jackson on a cassette recorder made in Japan, and hope his daughter will win a Miss Thailand contest so that he can open a little restaurant for workers in the center of the city and have his teeth capped in gold (Crapanzano 1992:90).

There is a common thread between post-modernism and post-colonialism, between over-generalizations and loose associations, in a world that seems not to have an all-encompassing, referent narrative anymore. Still, we need to be careful in our own over-generalizations or

loose associations. Roberto DaMatta, in "Some Biased Remarks on Interpretivism: A View from Brazil", regrets that interpretive American anthropology is currently mired in a "rhetorical and programmatic exaggeration" that is still based upon the same cultural and academic imperative it seeks to repudiate (DaMatta 1994:120). And without mincing words, DaMatta comes right to the most "irritating feature" of the new interpretive, post-modern anthropology. Shrinking away from the study of American culture as 'the devil shrinks away from the cross', contemporary interpretive American anthropology remains alienated from the very society, culture and value system that produced it. "What is supposed to be a 'dialogical' and polysemic dialogue becomes once again an authoritarian monologue" (DaMatta 1994:120). To paraphrase DaMatta, what would Stephen Tyler's interpretive, post-modern anthropology look like if he had conducted fieldwork in America instead of India?

5.2.3 The End of the Meta-Narrative

It is no secret that anthropology arose from colonialism (Stocking 1989). One part of the anthropological enterprise was to capture the whole of cultures on their way to extinction in the face of immutable and progressive Western Civilization. But now anthropology is no longer an exclusive Western discipline and the critics of Orientalism have exposed the myths of Western scholarship and knowledge, thus disabling the often crooked, homogenous representations of the Other.

The figure of the primitive or the alien other is no longer as compelling as it was in similar experimental periods... Global homogenization is more credible than ever before, and though the challenge to discover and represent cultural diversity is strong, doing so in terms of spatio-temporal cultural preserves of otherness seems outmoded (Marcus 1986:268).

Veena Das (1994:136), an anthropologist and an Indian, laments that the knowledge categories of non-Western cultures are simply unanchored beliefs, while the knowledge categories of Western cultures are scientific and objective truths. "Other cultures acquire legitimacy only as objects of thought, never as instruments for thought" (Das 1994:136). The production of knowledge about Indian society, indeed the production of knowledge about any society, cannot occur without the input of its indigenous citizens. Knowledge is now

produced by a plurality of voices and people, and a legitimate re-positioning for anthropology and the social sciences is needed (Das 1994:143).

Epistemological skepticism is a hallmark of post-modernity (Crapanzano 1992:88). The epistemology of any intellectual field is no longer constant or infallible (if indeed it ever was). The general critique of colonialism in the post-war period, which encompassed the discipline of anthropology, challenged and undermined both the ability and the authority of the West to represent other societies. The general critique touched off an important process of theorizing about the very limits of representation itself (Clifford & Marcus 1986:10). One significant consequence of the epistemological skepticism of the theoretical and practical discourse of post-modernity has been the erosion of a stable narrative. The ground from which persons and groups securely represented others has been dislodged and altered (Clifford & Marcus 1986:10). There is no single vantage point from which we may observe humanity. There is no culture or society from which the anthropologist emerges to compare with other societies or cultures. The lesson is simple: "human ways of life increasingly influence, dominate, parody, translate, and subvert one another" (Clifford & Marcus 1986:22).

Crapanzano argues that it has been history, more than any other process or product, that has been most profoundly affected by the radical changes in Western discourse initiated by post-modern theory and practice. History is a "positioned narrative that affirms, among other things, its position" (Crapanzano 1986:97). The artifice or mythology of history is denied while it serves as an authoritative reference point. However, once there is a failure in hegemony, once the authoritative reference point is eroded, history is no longer able to speak for everyone. Each has his or her own legitimate position and history. Thus, "the artifice of historical assumption – the incorporation of multiple positions into a single, consuming narrative – is revealed" (Crapanzano 1986:98). In the words of Marshall Sahlins, "the local people articulate with the dominant cultural order" on their own terms, "jiving to the world beat while making their own music" (Sahlins 1994:389).

Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) is supported by two central tenets: one, that there has historically always been a world-wide pattern of imperial culture; and two,

that there has always been an historical experience of resistance against imperial culture or empire (Said 1993:xii). The Western power to narrate or to block narration has been of great significance in the maintenance and perpetuation of both culture and imperialism. However, the imperial, grand narratives of Emancipation and Enlightenment were at one point displaced and replaced by the narratives of Equality and Human Community.. Ironically, the stories which the colonizers told about the colonized also became the tools used by the colonized to assert their identity in the face of the colonizer (Said 1993:xxv).

All cultures are involved in the construction of contemporary reality. The global communication made possible by the modern world empires (Said 1993:6) has also eradicated or blurred the margins between empires. As scholars, our principle aim is not to separate human sociocultural experience into fragmented pockets of existence, post-modern conditions notwithstanding, but rather to connect the nuances of human experience (Said 1993:14), while understanding that the past is constructed according to current sensibilities.

A more interesting type of secular interpretation can emerge altogether more rewarding than the denunciations of the past, the expressions of regret for its having eroded, or... the hostility between Western and non-Western cultures that leads to crises. The world is too small and interdependent to let these passively happen (Said 1993:18-19).

Part of the programme is to acknowledge the complex and convoluted histories of human experience, to do away with or eschew exclusionary theories or histories. "Exclusions that stipulate, for instance, that only women can understand feminine experience, only Jews can understand Jewish suffering, only formerly colonial subjects can understand colonial experience" (Said 1993:31).

No one today is purely one thing. Labels like Indian, or woman... are not more than starting points, which if followed into actual experience... are quickly left behind... Just as human beings make their own history, they also make their cultures and ethnic identities. No one can deny the persisting continuities... but there seems no reason except fear and prejudice to keep insisting on their separation and distinctiveness... It is more rewarding – and more difficult – to think concretely and sympathetically, contrapuntally, about others than only about "us". But this also means not trying to rule others, not trying to classify them or put them in hierarchies... For the intellectual there is quite enough of value to do without that (Said 1993:336).

History is not a singular line. It is a network of forces, a number of directions or historical lineages which flow simultaneously. Opposed to the Enlightenment narrative of linear progress, toward Emancipation or some other *telos*, the post-modern condition defies a homogenous imperial trajectory (Docherty 1993:18). As Marcus and Fischer tell us, we need to see that most local cultures are not able to stand alone, and that broad processes of influence are as much inside as outside of local context (Keesing 1994:302). Unfortunately, the social world does not present itself in easy categories of inside and outside, or we and they. Social and cultural boundaries are less and less coincidental and the polyglot and polychrome spectrum of any contemporary urban landscape points to a growing universal reality of mingled social systems (Geertz 1994:460).

The job of ethnography, or one of them anyway, is indeed to provide, like the arts and history, narratives and scenarios to refocus our attention; not, however, ones that render us acceptable to ourselves by representing others as gathered into worlds we don't want and can't arrive at, but ones which make us visible to ourselves by representing us and everyone else cast into the midst of a world full of irremovable strangeness we can't keep clear of (Geertz 1994:463).

Moral issues that used to only arise between cultures now arise within cultures. From Robert Cross, we learn that the Longhouse remains divided in a cultural impasse that cannot be rendered intelligible in easy terms of we and they, traditional or modern:

We have two Longhouses of traditional people in Kahnawake when there's supposed to be one... Back during the French and Indian wars, and during the American Revolution, they started arguing amongst each other in the Longhouse, and certain traditional people said we should fight for the British... and certain other traditional people said 'We should remain neutral in these disputes'. And what they did was they made their own Longhouses... In the end, the British betrayed their allies from the Six Nations Confederacy, so the two Longhouses, they don't forgive each other, they don't agree with each other, so they won't sit under one roof – even until today (Cross & Sévigny 1994:50).

5.2.4 The Referential Emptiness Produced by High Technology

Perhaps native peoples occupy a space in our own imagination... Perhaps they are our nostalgia for the world we have lost and the image of hope for the world we are stuck in.. And perhaps we'd like to keep them preserved like

Autumn vegetables, grateful that someone somewhere, in the true north strong and free, is worrying about keeping the rivers clean and the land as pristine as we like to think of it (Schechter 1992:74).

The discourse of post-modernity questions the hegemony of Western representation and epistemology by attacking the tropes, or figurative expressions, that legitimate thought and action (Tyler 1992:1), express what we collectively hold dear, and that sustain the master-narratives of Western Civilization. The example that Tyler gives as the trope for modernity is “loss and liberation” of the “past surpassed”.

It is the modernist fable of technology triumphant, of the creativity-in-destruction of the technology of the alphabet, of the rise of civilization from savagery, and the surpassing of the life-world of common sense and oral mnemonics by science and technology (Tyler 1992:1).

Here, the rational plane of Western Civilization is a lonely kingdom where others lurk in shadows cast from a romanticized, noble past, summoned only to legitimize or justify the imposed alienation by their outlandish otherness (Tyler 1992:1). But the counter-trope of post-modernity, of “resistance and recovery”, of the “past recuperated” smashes the myth of modernity and forever extinguishes all hope of an utopian future. Modernity is eroded by the irony of representation and writing is erected as the means of representing reality. In this way, writing is opposed to the oral tradition and given priority, encompassing and preceding orality.

Anthropologists invoke native speech out of nostalgia, a guilty longing for a past before writing and the corruption of civilization that writing creates and symbolizes (Tyler 1992:5).

Tyler further argues that orality and literacy are the poles which make up the contemporary binary pair of the ancient opposition between the ear and the eye. Once the Greeks learned to write, the dominance of the eye swept the West. The old argument comes to the fore again because the instrument of domination, the eye, has now dominated itself and is being challenged by new and ever-changing technologies of representation. The whole idea of computer literacy is one good example of the challenge to writing. “For us, ‘orality’ is the name of the resistance to... this sound-less shuffling of meaningless signs” (Tyler 1986:7).

5.2.5 The Interchangeability of Signs: Parody

The appropriation and transformation of elements or signs is an old process which has reached a high degree of complexity within the post-industrial, post-modern age. With the collapse of the meta-narratives and the referential emptiness produced by high technology, there has been an unprecedented degree of reciprocal appropriation and mutual cultural exchange and change (Olalquiaga 1992:76).

Writing about Latin America, Olalquiaga poignantly describes the multi-cultural realities of non-Western people.

Their own version of international culture tends toward a hyperrealism of uniquely parodic attributes. This 'magical hyperrealism' often inverts the image of a colonized people humbly subservient to metropolitan discoveries into one of a cynical audience rolling over with laughter at what it perceives as the sterile nuances of cultures with very little sense of their own self-aggrandizement (Olalquiaga 1992:75).

By turning issues or objects figuratively or literally upside down, they show off an acquired ability to deal with the unexpected changes of policies and relations, in their own way. Parody and role inversion are two excellent examples of popular resistance.

Parody may very well be, according to Linda Hutcheon (1986), a perfect post-modern form in its simultaneous incorporation and challenge of that which it parodies. Both parody and its less caustic cousin stylization can be challenges to the established order; but while stylization is corroborative and signals submission, parody is antithetical and requires critical, ironic distance and hierarchy. *Parodia*, from the Greek meaning song or counter-song, needs a higher semantic authority (Crapanzano 1992:93). When parody does not have a clear semantic authority, it may be called meta-parody.

In parody, words are double-voiced and interpreted as the expression of two speakers. In other words, "the words of one speaker are appropriated by a second speaker as the words of the first speaker but used for the second speaker's own purposes" (Crapanzano 1992:93). By tapping into a higher semantic order, parody creates a new semantic order or orientation for a word, phrase, or action by inverting or re-contextualizing it while allowing it to retain its old meaning. Parody, in this case, straddles two worlds.

In our post-modern age, parody is a highly creative process, “one whose essential relativism forces us to recognize and reconsider the moral basis of our [own] cognitive outlook that is so often masked by taken-for-granted communicative conventions” (Marcus 1992:94). Parody is an interaction that is designed to be heard and interpreted by a third person whose own process of active reception is anticipated and directed during the parodic episode (Crapanzano 1992:93).

The parodic sensibility of the Mohawk during the Oka crisis clearly shows a creative and not entirely humour-less approach to contemporary politics and experience. “In this way, threatening situations and intricate issues become familiar to a mass audience that would otherwise remain marginalized from such sophisticated reflections... on life” (Olalquiaga 1992:85-6). There are two basic elements in the creation of parody. One is the ability to simultaneously control multiple codes.

Accustomed to dealing with the arbitrary imposition of foreign products and practices, (the) culture has learned the tactics of selection and transformation to suit the foreign to its own idiosyncrasy, thus developing popular integrative mechanisms that are deliberately eclectic and flexible (Olalquiaga 1992:84).

The other is the inherent self-referentiality of contemporary discourse. Considering the Oka crisis, what could be more conscious, or self-conscious, than a masked warrior ‘playing’ golf and allowing himself to be photographed? Not only was he simultaneously controlling codes and inverting images while appealing to a higher semantic order, but he was relying on a third person to actively receive the message. During the Oka crisis, the Mohawk displayed an uncanny ability to adapt, to select what was useful and to discard what was not. People now use the structures, both colonial and pre- or post- colonial, in order to lend weight or currency to their disputes (Sahlins 1994:385). “The first... impulse of the people is not to become just like us but more like themselves”, turning foreign goods, values or structures to the service of their own values, ideas and relations (Sahlins 1994:388). A very good example of the latter occurred in the film *Okanada*. Having successfully slipped through both army and Mohawk lines, the film-maker, Albert Nerenberg, proceeded to capture the warriors on film.

Nerenberg asked one warrior, a MicMac from Nova Scotia, if he had ever been scared enough to cry. The Warrior hesitated momentarily before angrily and profanely questioning

his question. Then he abruptly walked away. There were innumerable replies that he could have made. Instead, he chose to parody the film-maker by asking him to repeat the question and then profanely assessing the question as “stupid”. He discarded the useless semantic domain of the international soldier, which was being invoked by the film-maker and his question, inverted the domain of the reporter by asking him a question, well aware of the present and possible future audience of the video-tape, and then invoked a new semantic order in his assessment of the question. Unable to leap from the higher semantic order of the Western military to the newly constructed one, the film-maker probably never understood why the warrior found his question to be stupid. Presumably only a warrior, with access to the semantic domain of the Warrior Society, could know why the question was stupid. By exposing the multiple codes that non-Western people need to know, the incident parodically reflected some of the tension between the media and the Mohawk, particularly those belonging to the Warrior Society.

Through the use of multiple codes and a self-conscious theatricality, the imposition of added layers of meaning is clearly delineated throughout the crisis in the image and figure of the Mohawk warrior. The contemporary Mohawk warrior is partly an appropriation of the image of the international soldier as well as an amalgamation of traditional Mohawk elements. The Mohawk are drawing from two reserves of meaning. Clad in camouflage and brandishing AK-47s, the Mohawk warriors, some of whom were Vietnam veterans, appropriated the image of the international soldier. Ironically, this subversion was directed at one of the very powers (the Canadian state) that contributes to the composition and perpetuation of that image.

“Our enemies are not imaginary but real”, says the Mexican super-hero, *Superbarrio* (Olalquiaga 1992:87). The Mohawk are not fighting a cold war, nor are they ideologically or militarily trouncing a Middle Eastern target. Like the enemies of *Superbarrio*, the enemies of the Mohawk are real. The Mohawk have replaced the idea of the glory of war with the reality of a struggle for existence. Like *Superbarrio*, the Mohawk wear their masks “on the grounds that it allows collective identity”; also like *Superbarrio*, they have replaced the democratic

struggle of the international soldier with a democratic struggle for their own basic rights (Olalquiaga 1992:57).

In the tradition of resistance, the American Indian Movement (AIM) of the late 1960s and early 1970s used parody to deliver its message. The Red Power slogan was taken from the more established and militant Black Power movement, and during the occupation of Alcatraz the activists announced that they were “‘reclaiming’ the island ‘by right of discovery’ – in a deliberate imitation of the early European explorers” (York & Pindera 1991:170). The Mohawk have continued with this tradition of resistance, and in their strategy of psychological warfare during the Oka crisis, used parody in order to intimidate the army.

...The Mohawks used a variety of home-made devices to imitate the high-powered weapons the army thought they had. A circular cutting tool used in ironworking became an imitation M72 rocket launcher. An ordinary black plumbing tube was placed in the back of a pick-up truck and camouflaged so that it resembled an anti-tank missile launcher (York & Pindera 1991:244-5).

The strategy worked; it worked so well, in fact, that the army called the Warriors liars when they adamantly (and truthfully) insisted that they had no such weapons.

Parody is a common tactic. Artist Louis Hall, the founder of the Warrior Society and unwitting designer of the Warrior Society flag (he had designed a flag in the late 1970s to be used as a symbol of North American Indian identity which was subsequently adopted by the Warrior Society), has consistently used parody in his artwork. On his wall is one poster that reads, “I want you for the Warrior Society (and) shows a Mohawk war chief pointing his finger at the viewer like Uncle Sam in the old American military recruitment posters” (York & Pindera 1991:253). Another poster reads:

There will come a day when the red man shall put the white man in a boat and send him back to Europe where he belongs and keep him... A wall shall be built around Europe, not to keep people out but to keep the white man in. It's not good for the world to have the white man running around loose (York & Pindera 1991:253).

The creation of such artwork reflects an awareness of self and other, as well as mutual interaction between the poles. Throughout the entire crisis, the Mohawk retained a sophisticated awareness, a self-conscious perception of their own place, stereotypically or otherwise constructed in time and space. One Mohawk, commenting generally on the crisis,

said: “if the Mohawks hadn’t taken a stand... they would have been just ‘wooden cigar-store Indians’” (York & Pindera 1991:420).

Trained by a long history of intertwining codes and spectacular roles, post-colonial cultures show in this reversal how the world can also be a scenario for their own directorial and spectatorial delight (Olalquiaga 1992:91).

But, before entering further into a discussion of the crisis at Oka as post-modern, the sequence of events needs to be established.

5.3 THE CRISIS AT OKA

5.3.1 A Sequence of Events

The complexity of the crisis between the Mohawk and the governments of Quebec and Canada has come to be known simply as Oka. The word Oka has a multiplicity of meaning beyond its geographical or social parametres as a “bucolic little Quebec town about twenty minutes from Montreal... known principally for its pungent cheese and one or two surprisingly good restaurants” (Campbell & Pal 1991:268). Oka contains a legacy of colonialism, a struggle for sovereignty, and a dispute over land. The word is synonymous with razor wire, camouflage, tanks, AK-47s, bullets, stones, golf-carts, feathers, tobacco, and human rights. Between March and September 1990, Oka began as a political demonstration against a golf-course expansion with a barricade erected near Kanesatake on 11 March 1990. It escalated to a raid on 11 July 1990 during which time SQ Corporal Marcel Lemay was killed and the Mohawk Warriors at the larger and more powerful community of Kahnawake blockaded the Merceir Bridge. It ended as an international affair which involved the replacement of provincial SQ officers with the Canadian army and a final disengagement that was in no way a Mohawk surrender.

On 11 March 1990, the Mohawk erected a barricade to halt the expansion of the golf course after the talks with the municipality of Oka had broken down, following the March election of a new Chief and Council. The town of Oka received an injunction on 30 June 1990 in order to continue with the golf course development. A week or so later, the Quebec Minister of Native Affairs, John Ciaccia, urged the Mayor of Oka, Jean Ouellette, to suspend

the development of the golf course pending negotiations which strayed beyond "strict legality".

Exactly four months to the day that the barricades had been erected on the dirt road leading to the golf course, the SQ raided the barricades at Oka. In the ensuing melée, one man was killed. On the morning of the day of the raid, without immediate band approval, the Mohawk Warriors at Kahnawake blocked Highways 132 and 138, which led to the Mercier Bridge, and effectively prevented 60,000 daily commuters from direct access to Montreal. The closure of the Mercier Bridge and the death of Corporal Marcel Lemay turned the protest into a full-blown crisis. The investigation into Lemay's death and the blockade of the Mercier Bridge had serious and profound ramifications. Speaking specifically about the Mercier Bridge, Campbell and Pal assert that "it made sixty thousand people angry enough that some of them vented their rage in racism and violence" (1991:278).

Immediately following the raid and the closure of the Mercier Bridge, on 12 July 1990, John Ciaccia negotiated for four hours with the Mohawk at Oka, stopping at sundown only out of deference to the Mohawk. An important point in the negotiations was Mohawk immunity from prosecution in connection with the death of Corporal Lemay. Following a call, made in conjunction with Ellen Gabriel on 14 July 1990, for federal involvement, John Ciaccia emerged from a late night meeting on 15 July 1990 declaring that an agreement had been reached.

But crowds kept gathering at the Mercier Bridge, and following six consecutive days of Mohawk effigy burning, a larger crowd of approximately 4,000 people stormed the police gates on the Mercier Bridge. Federal Indian Affairs Minister Tom Siddon issued his first public statement, calling the situation "most unfortunate", and promising not to interfere with Ciaccia's negotiations. Meanwhile, American human rights lawyers Stanley Cohen and William Kunstler had arrived in Oka at the invitation of the Mohawk Warriors on that same day, 17 July 1990. The following day, 18 July 1990, Premier Robert Bourassa made his first public statement which alluded to a drawn-out process, and the very next day, 19 July 1990, featured a federal press conference called by Tom Siddon to announce that Ottawa would not negotiate at gunpoint and thus would only step in once the dispute was resolved by Quebec.

Ottawa may not have been involved in the negotiations, but on 23 July 1990, Deputy Minister Harry Swain made several off-the-record remarks about the “armed insurrection” by violent warriors who had intimidated the Mohawk leaders. Tom Siddon, his minister, publically contradicted him as Quebec began to re-negotiate. On 28 July 1990, Ottawa announced its intention to purchase the remaining parcel of land for \$3 million, following an offer made by Quebec (based on Ottawa’s purchase) to buy half of the land in dispute for \$1.4 million. The negotiations resumed, but on 31 July 1990, the municipality of Oka announced its refusal to sell the last parcel of golf course land until the Mohawk barricades were torn down.

On 5 August 1990, Premier Robert Bourassa issued a 48 hour ultimatum and after a meeting of the Quebec Cabinet three days later, called on Ottawa to send in the army. On the same day, both federal and provincial governments and the Mohawk agreed to the appointment of Justice Allan Gold of the Quebec Superior Court as a mediator. The army took position on 11 August 1990, under the command of General Kent Foster, who declared that an armed attack on the barricades was inconceivable. And following a preliminary agreement on 12 August 1990, soldiers and equipment were mobilized and in place by 18 August 1990.

In the midst of military manoeuvres and ongoing talks, the Six Nations Confederacy met in Syracuse, New York, at the Onandaga Reserve. One Chief claimed that the warriors were fakes, solely interested in protecting the gambling and cigarette trade.

On 27 August 1990, the talks broke down once more. Premier Robert Bourassa called upon the army to dismantle the barricades. The next day, as approximately 150 Mohawks left Kahnawake via the Mercier Bridge, an angry mob of about 500 people threw stones and bottles at the procession of cars. Interestingly, later that same day, in the evening, several light planes or helicopters were seen flying low and circling the reserve. The Cessna airlift entered “Quebec mythology” as the media reported that the warriors at Kahnawake had organized an air-bridge (York & Pindera 1991:333). Both the army and the Mohawk benefited from the myth. It was no longer necessary to conduct a house-to-house search for weaponry, as it had

all ostensibly been air-lifted, and the Mohawk enjoyed the illusion that they had an air force as well as the very real assurance that the army would not invade Kahnawake.

Thus, over the course of two days, the barricades were jointly dismantled by the Kahnawake Mohawk and the army; and on 1 September 1990, the army moved to dismantle the barricades at Kanesatake. The remaining warriors at Kanesatake took refuge in the Treatment Centre, as clashes between the SQ and the Mohawk continued. The seventy-third day of the crisis was reached and passed on 21 September 1990, making the Oka crisis the longest stand-off between North American governments and First Nations. On 24 September 1990, the probability of a peaceful conclusion was increased and on 25 September 1990, the Prime Minister announced the commitment of the federal government to deal with the First Nations on land claims, self-government and revisions to the Indian Act. Finally, on 26 September, 1990, the Mohawk at Kanesatake buried their arms and left the Treatment Centre.

5.3.2 Oka as a Post-Modern Crisis

We cannot have in Canada or in Quebec this type of democracy or pseudo-democracy that permits citizens, no matter what the value of their ultimate cause to choose which laws they are going to follow (Premier Robert Bourassa, cited by York & Pindera 1991:316).

The crisis at Oka revealed a deep chasm of serious mis-understanding between indigenous and non-indigenous Canadians. For the First Nations, the crisis represented the real world of their politics; however aggrandized by myth their position might have been, it was grounded in the practice of generations. Furthermore, the Indian Act is not a legal abstraction. "That structure, that presence in every aspect of community and individual life, is inescapable and implacable" (Campbell & Pal 1992:324). For non-indigenous Canadians, the violent images played nightly on their television screens and splashed daily on their newspapers were "surreal and incomprehensible... a bizarre inversion that turned the peaceable kingdom into a Lebanon of the North" (Campbell & Pal 1992:325). For them, the Indian Act remained a meaningless abstraction and the crisis at Oka was not a part of the real world of their politics.

The Mohawk rejected the legitimacy of the Canadian state and law with regard to their land and government. With their nation-to-nation talks, their reluctance to negotiate with Quebec, and their invocation of traditional Mohawk culture, the Mohawk attempted to expand the paradigm of the Canadian polity. The government representatives, both federal and provincial, continued throughout the crisis to affirm and re-affirm their authority over the Warrior Society, the Mohawk, and more generally the First Nations of Canada, within the confines of Canadian law. Both sides were involved in the maintenance and perpetuation, through discourse, of separate and disparate ideological positions. The crisis could in fact be described, in the language of post-modernity, as a struggle between those who still accept the tattered meta-narratives of Canada as a land of peace, order, and good government and those who never did.

5.3.3 Anthropology and the Post-Modern Crisis at Oka

The post-modernist project is both a particular kind of research into cultural activity and a state of things. Cultural anthropology is basically a modernist project. Thus, the discourse of the post-modern has induced a re-evaluation of the central tenets of the discipline which includes: 1) a reconception of the culture concept in terms of power; 2) a different appreciation of cultural meanings as they are constructed in everyday practice; and 3) a study of cultural practices in context as they relate to historical events within a “multinational global economy” (Coombe 1991:188-9).

It has previously been argued (see Chapter 2 on Nations and Nationalism) that modernity arose from the Enlightenment, upon the ashes of the old religious and feudal orders, by processes of rationalization, secularization, urbanization, and industrialization. Indeed, the modern age probably began with the Reformation and the Renaissance wherein the individual as social being ascended as an individual before God, quite apart from the collective or social whole. The separation of the individual from the social whole gave way to the separation of economics, politics, religion, art, and culture from the day-to-day struggle of ordinary existence. This is what Rosemary Coombe (1991:190) calls the project of hermeneutics.

In the form of positivist social science, modern rationalism presented individual and social life as governed by objective laws analogous to those imagined for the natural world (Coombe 1991:189).

Hence culture was a system of meanings and values divorced from but at the same time informing the political and economic spheres. The reification and isolation of culture allowed the bourgeoisie to consolidate and legitimate its social power (Coombe 1991:190). While rejecting the high modern tradition of universality by exalting and venerating the plurality and multivocality of human cultural existence, anthropology did retain the aesthetic of modernism. In this way, cultures share “an egalitarian and democratic ethos as separate and equal” (Coombe 1991:191). Cultures could be compared because of difference in two senses, that is, the internal cultural difference was ignored or overlooked in favour of similarity. Shared patterns of culture were emphasized at the expense of conflict or contradiction; and second, the culture thus defined by a constructed internal homogeneity became further defined in contra-distinction to other cultures, despite zones of similarity across cultures in age, sex, race, gender, class, etc. (Coombe 1991:191).

Anthropology has been touched by the post-modern rubric and the staples of the discipline are being questioned. The former classic ethnographies are no longer classic; no longer are they accepted as holistic, all-encompassing, self-contained descriptors of culture (Coombe 1991:190). Anthropology has slowly come to terms with the differential processes at work within cultures and the zones of experience (age, race, gender, etc.) which transcend them. The contradictions are no longer smoothed over and the boundaries between what were thought to be discrete cultures are no longer visible.

Cultural truths are always partially and historically constructed. Thus, culture needs to be addressed as a creation of conflicting, dialogic processes wherein not everyone has a place at the table. Ironically, as the differences within cultures become difficult to ignore and increasingly visible, the differences between cultures seem more difficult to locate and increasingly invisible. Wolf's *Europe and the People Without History* (1982) showed clearly,

...the historical inadequacy of cultural anthropology's attempts to draw rigid cultural boundaries around particular populations without taking into account their connections with other populations and with larger currents of world history (Coombe 1991:192).

Cultures are not hermetically sealed. “[T]he last residues of cultural anthropology’s modernist heritage... are dissolving in the complex cultural context of a late capitalist, post-colonial era dominated by a multinational economy” (Coombe 1991:192). The post-modern programme or agenda within cultural anthropology has introduced, in part, an approach which analyzes or studies sociocultural systems without the constraints or limitations of modernist discourse (Coombe 1991:193). As a discipline that was always fully aware of cultural plurality, the novelty of the post-modern as cultural critique lay in its ability to expose the differences within cultures. Cultural anthropology may have always been engaged in the study of margins, but now it must further widen its circle and catch the others within the margins, including “their own challenges to and critical commentaries on the singular cultural systems that constitute anthropology’s own master-narratives” (Coombe 1991:194).

Using Coombe’s bifurcated approach to the post-modern, as both analytical paradigm and as a state of things, the crisis at Oka may be explored in the following ways: one, as a study or analysis which is opposed to modernism, acknowledging the referential emptiness, the absence of master-narratives, and the interchangeability of signs; and two, as a condition of post-modernism proper whereby the factionalism of Mohawk culture and society is finally grasped by conservatives and radicals alike and the internal divisions within cultures are finally acknowledged and documented. The people themselves are allowed to challenge and critique the singular cultural systems. In this sense, Oka is a post-modern crisis because it is no longer seen as a cohesive or self-contained event, just as the Mohawk are no longer cohesive and self-contained as a discrete sociocultural entity. Sociocultural homogeneity must be surpassed in order for anthropology to transcend its somewhat tainted historical past of colonialism and imperialism (Coombe 1991:194).

Following World War II, the development of global modernization in the eradication of disease, the spread of literacy, and new economic and political programmes, has resulted in massive civil war, economic instability and disparity, inter-racial tension and inter-ethnic bloodshed (Tambiah 1994:430). Even the introduction of Western democratic institutions or principles like constitutions, human rights bills, majority rule or peace, liberty and freedom have resulted in a collective, localized world violence and a general malaise among “people

who are not aliens but enemies intimately known”; furthermore, “the internationalization of violence and the simultaneity of its occurrences viewed on our tv screens make us all vicarious spectators and participants responding with our own sympathies and prejudices” (Tambiah 1994:432-4).

There is special import in what Tambiah (1994:434) says for the case of British expansion and domination in Canada. By standardizing and homogenizing diverse societies or structures, they were able to develop and progress, or divide and rule. But following two earlier stages of post World War II decolonization and nationalism, terms such as devolution of powers, traditional homelands, and self-determination crept into indigenous politics. People began to claim and want to be different (Tambiah 1994:435-40). In other words, we must accept “the right of formerly un- or mis-represented human groups to speak for and represent themselves in domains defined, politically and intellectually, as normally excluding them” (Said 1986:215).

The effects of the industrial age may be tremendous, but the incorporation of a society or culture into the global economy does not unalterably propel that society or culture along an unpredictable yet homogenous Western trajectory. Anthropologists need to realize that the “consequences of such developments will be shaped by the local conditions” (Coombe 1991:198). Thus the cultural is inextricably bound to both the political and the economic. Unfortunately, many post-modern anthropologists do not practice what they preach regarding inclusion of previously excluded others. “With their roots in the interpretive/cultural constructionist tradition, [they] often rhetorically invoke radical alterity in the same [old] ways. Either way, anthropology is drawn upon to provide the alterities to which envisioned ones are counterposed” (Keesing 1994:302), hence, leading to a dangerous essentialism which has even passed into everyday discourse. How often is culture reified? Too often, says Keesing, who provides a recipe for an alternate anthropological approach to cultural theory, as well as a concept of the cultural which adequately characterizes complex industrial society and small-scale communities of the past and present. The recipe includes: 1) a study of how symbolic power is linked to power and interest, probing what Keesing calls “the political economy of knowledge”; 2) an acknowledgement of how cultural traditions carry ideological

force; 3) a critical conceptualization of the cultural which includes a recognition that in any community or society “there will be multiple subdominant and partially submerged cultural traditions... as well as a hegemonic force of the dominant tradition”; and 4) a re-conceptualization of culture as the cultural which introduces “superimposition... interpretation and pastiche” (Keesing 1994:309-10).

From a superficial perspective the existence of Coca-cola, Exxon, Barbie Dolls, and Big Macs all over the world looks like a globalization and homogenization of culture. However, it doesn't follow that these things have the same meaning in other cultures that they have in our own... It is surely a form of imperialist hubris to believe that they do (Coombe 1991:198).

The Iroquois Confederacy is inherently divisive. Composed of five (now six) nations, the League was built to accommodate difference and heterogeneity. For the Mohawk, internal division has also been a consistent, continuous historical reality. Having both peace chiefs and war chiefs, for example, allowed the Mohawk to continue negotiations or peace talks in times of war. For a nation so ordered, it is no surprise that the Oka crisis brought to the fore the many factions of Mohawk society. This did not mean, however, that the Mohawk were disorganized, disunited, or lacking direction. They were all in agreement regarding the land issue (York & Pindera 1991:113) despite the historical divisions which were further compounded by the religious and linguistic divisions that dated back to the time of the Sulpicians.

The Mohawks who remained faithful to the priests were Catholic and French-speaking, but the majority spoke English and were protestants. The dispute became even more complicated in the mid 1980s, when Bill C-31 was passed, giving back Indian status to hundreds of Kanesatake Mohawk who had lost their treaty rights (York & Pindera 1991:111).

In Kanesatake, there are three basic factions. One is the Kanesatake Band Council. The Band Council is recognized by the federal government and follows the Indian Act with the exception of democratic elections. Through a 1969 Indian Act provision, of leadership according to custom, the Chief and Council are appointed by clan mothers. Opposed to the appointments are the Kanesatakeron League for Democracy and the Group for Change – known during the crisis as the Mohawk Coalition. Usually composed of people who have lost their clans, and therefore have little power under the current custom, they are eager to restore

democratic elections. And finally, third, is the Longhouse, also occasionally known as the traditionalists. They do not recognize the jurisdiction of the Indian Act, nor do they recognize the authority of the Chief and Council.

In Kahnawake, there are also three basic factions. A larger, more militant and powerful reserve, Kahnawake is also the seat of the Warrior Society. Created in the late 1970s by militant Mohawk under the direction of artist and activist Louis Hall, the Warrior Society played a significant role in the Oka crisis, both at Kanesatake and Kahnawake. The militant Longhouse vision of Louis Hall stands in opposition to the Kahnawake Longhouse. The Kahnawake Longhouse is composed of traditionalists who are very concerned about the use of violence and weaponry. Then there is the Kahnawake Mohawk Council; recognized by neither the Warrior Society, nor the Longhouse, they follow the Indian Act and profess to work for change within the system.

Notwithstanding the divisiveness of Mohawk society, a sense of community was constructed and maintained during the Oka Crisis. Repeatedly, the land was invoked as a symbol of shared unity (York & Pindera 1991; Campbell & Pal 1991), and across the country the imagined community of First Nations was constructed through the imagery of communion: land, tobacco, feathers, sovereignty, oppression, racism, a right to livelihood, and in some cases, a right to live.

Mass media communications technologies also enable people to participate in communities of others with whom they share neither geographical proximity nor a common history but an access to signs, symbols, images, narratives... with which they can convey mutual solidarity (Coombe 1991:196).

The cultural must now be understood politically in a late-capitalist context. In the commodified world of our current reality, we are bombarded with signifiers bereft of meaning (Coombe 1991:196-7). To truly understand the post-modern condition and to understand the events or processes which unfold within it, we need to acknowledge the diversity and multiplicity of symbols. Like all cultural signifiers, even western-based symbols may become culturally multivalent, "capable of taking on new meanings in new contexts" (Coombe 1991:198).

On the evening of 13 July 1990, on the other side of the barricades, the Mohawk warriors began to taunt the mob gathered at the Mercier Bridge in protest of its closure. One warrior burned the Fleur-de-Lis and “they played Mohawk chants on loudspeakers at their own bunkers. A warrior on a motorcycle circled in front of the Mohawk barricade holding aloft a Warrior Society flag” (York & Pindera 1991:227). Earlier that day, the crowd had threatened to boycott an IGA that continued to serve Mohawk customers, despite tremendous public pressure. Finally, the Mohawk welcome sign was removed from the window, followed shortly thereafter by the English welcome sign. Only the French welcome sign remained. “By nightfall, the crowd at the barricade had swelled to two thousand. ‘Le Quebec aux Quebecois!’ one of the men yelled. ‘Give the Mohawk a case of beer and they’ll get out’ a woman said” (York & Pindera 1991:227).

Ironically, English-speaking Canadian journalists became the targets of French Canadian anger as the mobs protested that they were unfairly characterized as violent bigots. Yet as York and Pindera (1991) point out, the cries of “maudits sauvages”, the effigy-burning, and the stone-throwing could scarcely be interpreted in any other way. Still, the Quebecers interviewed by the media insisted that they did not hate the Mohawk because they were Indian, but rather because the Mohawk considered themselves “above the law” (York & Pindera 1991:231). On the other side of the coin, the Mohawk were refusing help from anti-French bigots and adamantly asserting that “they wanted no part of a language war” (York & Pindera 1991:242). Thus, it is a “true conceit to believe that... our own common sense categories therefore suffice for making sense of their lives” (Coombe 1991:199). The master-narrative holding the symbols, the signs, the images in place has been eroded.

In conclusion, we offer the staredown between Private Patrick Cloutier and the warrior Brad Larocque.

As he stood near the razor wire, a masked warrior strode up to him and glared into his eyes... In one of Cloutier’s impassive moments, the tense staredown was captured in a photograph that became famous around the world as a symbol of the Oka crisis (York and Pindera 1991:354).

The most well-known symbol of the crisis was, in fact, a composite of multiple realities. The warrior was Brad Larocque, a young Ojibway university student from Saskatchewan. The

soldier turned out to be a cocaine user who was busted twice in the years following the crisis and arrested for a hit and run accident (*The Globe and Mail* 10 Dec. 1993:A6). So blatant an exposure of the fraudulent master-narrative erodes a standard school-book treatment of the warrior and the soldier, particularly as a symbol for the crisis. The warrior was not even a Mohawk, much less an Iroquois. Brad Larocque would also come to serve as an ironic foil for the supposedly stalwart and disciplined Private Patrick Cloutier who would later be discharged and characterized, following the two drug busts, as a cocaine user and criminal. The revelation becomes increasingly significant as we begin to learn more and more about the contemporary Canadian soldier – particularly poignant when we consider the events in Somalia and the rampant racism reflected in the hazing rituals of the Airborne. And so it becomes increasingly difficult to accept the ravaged master-narratives of Western Civilization as the multiple layers of our contemporary reality are so clearly eroded and revealed.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.1 RECAPITULATION

The Oka Crisis serves as a catalyst for the exploration of a myriad of issues enveloping a complex reality of contact between civilizations. The issues may be explored within four not necessarily discrete categories: 1) nations and nationalism; 2) the Indian; 3) the Mohawk; and 4) Oka as a post-modern crisis.

The thesis follows a central and basic argument, one which attempts to analyze the contact between and within cultures, while recognizing the limitations of a Western sociocultural approach. Contact between cultures inevitably occurs, resulting in a bi-directional give-and-take which alters ideology and everyday interaction between ordinary people. First Nations nationalism has been produced by the contact which occurred between traditional aboriginal societies and modern western ones; but conversely, the North American sociocultural complex has also been moderated by its contact with traditional aboriginal societies.

A comprehensive review of the literature yielded few anthropological works which combined a general study of culture contact at the macro level with a particular analysis of interaction between people at the micro level. Canadian anthropologists working in this area usually focus on the macro level interaction between aboriginal societies and the Canadian nation-state, within an academic paradigm of political economy. However, such a strict focus on the macro level often precludes a more particular study of interaction between people, as well as a more general analysis of ideology, history or symbolism. Thus, the strategy within the thesis, of combining a macro study of contact over time, with a micro analysis of

interaction, symbols and ideas, has provided a more generally inclusive framework. Furthermore, micro and macro levels are not mutually exclusive. Thus, the thesis attempts to achieve a balance between the micro and macro level. The ostensible focus of the thesis is the crisis at Oka; however, the surrounding discussion encompasses a broad scope of issues such as nations and nationalism, the idea of the Indian, the Mohawk, and the Oka crisis as a post-modern event within a post-modern state and discipline.

The bifurcated use of both the micro level and the macro level facilitates a discussion of First Nation nationalism. It allows for an analysis which hones in on process, as well as enveloping a larger interaction between nations and ideologies. Indian-White interaction has not simply been a one-sided, uni-directional story of oppression, subjugation, and exploitation.

The nation is a modern creation, the product of a modern ideology called individualism. Individualism developed in the Western world by an ideational or mental revolution that favoured the individual over the collectivity and thus turned formerly traditional societies into modern ones. In the so-called new, or non-Western, world the processes of modernization were sustained by the contact that occurred between aboriginal societies and the transplanted European ones. The First Nations evolved through interaction between both people and ideas. The process was, indeed continues to be, bi-directional; the cultural exchange not only created a modern nationalism out of traditional tribal structures, but established a unique democratic tradition significantly different from its European origins or contemporary counterparts.

A breakdown of the interaction or contact reveals an ideological framework capable of incorporating and maintaining fundamentally disparate ways of ordering knowledge and behaviour. In other words, there exists a dual cultural logic that allows the First Nations to subsist within the individualistic, modern (now post-modern) milieu and still retain elements of a traditional past. The model of nationalism created by Lithman (1988), featuring a comparison between collectively and individually centred nations, allows a close look at the ability of First Nations to articulate within two worlds. But as we later observe in the work

of Grinde and Johansen, the relationship has also created a special North American political reality.

By the mid-twentieth century, the Western empires had colonized three-quarters of the global surface. The West granted itself an Archimedian point of privilege and measured all societies against its own institutions, structures, and nations. By virtue of its hegemony, Western terms continue to be used as intellectual currency and, despite the bi-directional influence discussed throughout this thesis, we have all come to understand *us* and *them* or *we* and *they*, Western and non-Western in the language (usually English) or Western epistemology. But the movement of deconstruction, initiated and supported by marginalized social critics and academics, has questioned the integrity and authority of Western knowledge. The discipline of anthropology has also been challenged. Alternate channels of authority have guided sociocultural inquiry away from exclusive images of Otherness and toward more inclusive, reflexive presentation and re-presentation.

Largely forged through ethnohistory, anthropology has established a meaningful method for studying the changes that have occurred in aboriginal societies since European contact by combining historical documents, archaeological findings, and oral traditions. Ethnohistory has provided a more inclusive, less exclusive avenue for the study of history and change in aboriginal societies because it unites the written history of the West with the oral tradition of indigenous people.

The narrative or myth of Western Civilization has generally accorded the Indian a secondary role in the official history of Canada. Following the war of 1812, the Indian almost entirely disappears from the pages of Canadian historical text. The collapse of the meta-narrative, of the exclusionary histories of Western Civilization, largely fashioned by critical and non-Western historians and scholars, has created a new, more inclusive shared writing and telling of history. Within anthropology, the theory and practice of ethnohistory extended the borders of conventional history and is helping to uncover the rightful place of the Aboriginal in history, while denouncing fanciful images of noble savagery and the Other.

Grinde and Johansen's *Exemplar of Liberty* (1991) is an excellent argument upon which to base a re-interpretation of official history because it acknowledges the influence that

the First Nations had on the European ones and argues for an understanding of our shared past which accurately reflects our shared present. In North America, there is a healthy skepticism surrounding the assumptions, beliefs and values of the West. People no longer believe in the modern age; its utopian character has been ruptured and new ways of experiencing and interpreting experience have taken hold. The effects of modern warfare, the threat of nuclear annihilation or terrorism, the scourge of world hunger and new plagues, like AIDS, have created an age of individual responsibility and personal impotence.

The collapse of empire around the world has nurtured a rejection of the myths of Western Civilization. The citizens of former colonies questioned the ideology and epistemology of Western knowledge as the experience of decolonization created a new, political and economic reality, a post-modern age, incapable of cohesively binding together the master-narratives of Western Civilization. Whether post-modernity is defined as an aesthetic condition, the culture of late-capitalism, or a body of theory, it rests on the assumption that there is no Archimedian point of view firmly entrenched in a referent narrative. The critique of colonialism questioned Western authority and representation, facilitating radical change in almost all Western disciplines.

In anthropology, post-modernity has initiated a reconception of the culture concept, an appreciation of cultural meanings entrenched in practice, and a study of culture and history in a global universe. Anthropology no longer overlooks the differences within cultures to augment the differences between cultures. Instead, it has acknowledged the overlapping realities, histories and zones of experience such as age, sex, race, gender and class. The task for anthropology, in this post-modern age, is to catch the Others within the margins.

Oka is a post-modern crisis because it not only exposes the absence of Western meta-narratives, but it reveals the complexity and heterogeneity of the Mohawk. The heterogenous reality of Mohawk society was revealed to both conservatives and critics. We must continuously be accepting of usually invisible human groups, allowing them to speak for and represent themselves in milieus (both internal and external) which generally exclude them. Furthermore, and ironically in this case, the Iroquois Confederacy was initially created both to accommodate difference and promote unity. Using the language of post-modernity, the

crisis could ultimately be described as a struggle between those who still accept the tattered meta-narratives of Canada as a land of peace, order, and good government and those who do not.

6.2 COMING FULL CIRCLE

Through contact between civilizations, the traditional societies of the Western Hemisphere became modern, able to distinguish their members from the surrounding collectivity, capable of forming nations in the modern sense, and able to articulate in the Western world. But we have come full circle. Following the argument of George Sioui, Bruce Johansen, Donald Grinde, or any academic who argues that the aboriginal societies of the New World have tempered the often brutal humanity of the transplanted European guests, we may enter into a precarious discussion of the post-modern. The strongest critic of Orientalism, Edward Said, informs us that it is in the cries and through the insight of the colonized, of the Other, that our master-narratives have been denigrated, fraudulently exposed, or constructively contextualized.

The cycle of contact has come full circle. Yes, we have influenced them, but they have also influenced us. The relationship is symbiotic, bi-directional and processual; it is not parasitic, uni-directional or as static as the school texts and propaganda would have us believe.

The master-narratives of Canadian social history are collapsing in on themselves. The institutions of the British are no longer unequivocally accepted as the Canadian established order. We now admit that the First Nations were always here; that the British may have won on the Plains of Abraham but the French in Quebec are still shouting sovereignty and separation; that Chinese men built the railroad; that Ukrainians developed the Prairies; that Italians and Portuguese gave hard labour; that new immigrants from Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America continue to toil in garment and industrial factories and that Aboriginals were here all along, contributing to the industry of the nation state (see Rolf Knight's *Indians at Work*). The new Canadian myth is more inclusive and more accommodating; it is seriously

attacking the old master-narratives of British institutionalism, bi-lingualism and bi-culturalism, and peace, order, and good government.

What can be said when we have witnessed the recent dismantling of the 1st Commando Airborne and the video-taped aftermath of civilian beating and death in Somalia during peace-keeping and participated in a referendum on national unity; and watched, five years ago, as tanks rolled over the pines?

Indeed we have come full circle. We have seen into our own existence. We have come to see that our own exceptional (formerly modern, now post-modern) development is just that – exceptional, not superior. Contextualized, we admit that our own way of life is not apical, nor Archimedian, just different, more or less the same as other ways of life.

REFERENCES

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AND FILMS

Fraser, Graham. "Pent-up Feelings from Summer Explode in House". *The Globe and Mail* 25 September 1990:A6.

Kanesatake: 270 Years of Resistance. Videocassette. Dir. Alanis Obsomsawin. Prod. National Film Board of Canada. Dist. NFB. 1991. 119 min.

McDonald, Neil. "Avoiding a Short Cut to Disaster". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A17.

"Mohawks Refuse to End Blockade". *The Globe and Mail* 9 July 1990:A5.

"Mohawks to Receive Visit from Jesse Jackson". *The Globe and Mail* 24 August 1990:A1.

Moon, Peter. "Mohawks Bear Emotional Wound". *The Globe and Mail* 21 March 1994:A2.

"Most Involved in Mohawk Crisis Given Low Marks – Poll". *Chronicle-Herald* 2 January 1991:A11.

Norris, Alexander. "At Least Seven Main Political Factions Make Up Mohawk Band at Kanesatake". *Montreal Gazette* 16 October 1990:A2.

_____. "Kahnawake Group Challenges Power of Warriors". *Montreal Gazette* 13 July 1991:A5.

_____. "Kanesatake and Kahnawake: One Year Later". *Montreal Gazette* 6 July 1991:A5.

_____. "76-Year-Old Chief Blames Ottawa for Crisis". *Montreal Gazette* 11 July 1991:A1.

"Oka a Misuse of Political Power, Public Purse". *Windspeaker* 28 February - 13 March 1994:5.

Okanada. Videocassette. Dirs. Albert Nerenberg and Catherine Bainbridge. Prod. Ina Fichman. Maximage Productions Snap TV. 1991. 33 mins.

Picard, Andre. "Mood Turning Ugly Among Residents of Oka". *The Globe and Mail* 16 July 1990:A1.

_____. "Police Will Attack Again, Mohawks Say". *The Globe and Mail* 26 July 1990:A1.

_____. "Quebec Ready to Resume Talks with Mohawks, Minister Says". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A4.

- ____. "75-Day Mohawk Siege has Longer Precedents". *The Globe and Mail* 24 September 1990:A5.
- ____. "Standoff at Oka Increases Tension Over Language". *The Globe and Mail* 14 September 1990.
- ____. "UN Considers Probe of Oka Situation". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A1.
- Picard, Andre and Geoffrey York. "Barricade Removal Halted". *The Globe and Mail* 31 August 1990:A1.
- Picard, Andre, Geoffrey York and Rudy Platiel. "Hope Growing that Oka Deal Near". *The Globe and Mail* 25 July 1990:A4.
- Picard, Andre and Patricia Poirier. "Talks Fail to Resolve Standoff in Quebec". *The Globe and Mail* 14 July 1990:A1.
- ____. "Talks Progress in Oka Standoff". *The Globe and Mail* 16 July 1990:A1.
- Platiel, Rudy. "Natives Deny Violence Growing". *The Globe and Mail* 14 July 1990.
- ____. "Native Factions United by Crisis". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A4.
- Poirier, Patricia. "Broadbent Assails Use of Food as Weapon in Oka Dispute". *The Globe and Mail*. 24 July 1990:A4.
- ____. "Chateauguay Mayor Defends Community". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990.
- ____. "Media Asked to Help Identify Rock Throwers". *The Globe and Mail* 31 August 1990:A3.
- Sheppard, Robert. "Gun Butt Diplomacy Not Enough for Natives". *The Globe and Mail* 16 July 1990:A21.
- "Soldier in Oka Photo Discharged". *The Globe and Mail*. 10 December 1993:A6.
- Valpy, Michael. "Chateauguay Resembles Alabama in the 1960s". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A5.
- ____. "Mohawk Struggle in Quebec an Old One". *The Globe and Mail* 26 July 1990:A5.
- Velk, Tom. "Who Really Owns the Land in Oka?" *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A17.
- Wilson, Deborah. "B.C. Indians Step Up Roadblock Tactics". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990.
- ____. "Tension Mounts at B.C. Logging Blockade". *The Globe and Mail* 30 October 1990:A4.
- Wagamese, Richard. "Warriors Ideas Blasted but Barricade Backed". *Calgary Herald* 20 July 1990.

York, Geoffrey. "Federal Minister Calls Warriors Criminals". *The Globe and Mail* 24 July 1990:A1.

_____. "Oka Warriors Closer to Surrender". *The Globe and Mail* 10 August 1990:A1.

York, Geoffrey and Andre Picard. "No Land Deal While Barriers Up in Quebec, Siddon Says". *The Globe and Mail* 20 July 1990:A1.

BOOKS AND JOURNAL ARTICLES

Anderson and Chock, Eds. 1986. "Ethnographic Realities/Authorial Ambiguities". *Anthropological Quarterly*, April 1986, Vol. 59(2):52-87.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1988. "Putting Hierarchy in Its Place". *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 3(1):36-49.

Augé, Marc. 1979. *The Anthropological Circle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1993. "The Fall of the Legislator". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Berkhofer, Robert Jr. 1979. *The White Man's Indian*. New York: Vintage Books, a Division of Random House.

Beteille, Andre. 1986. "Individualism and Equality". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 27(2):127-134.

Blanchard, David S. 1980. *Kahnawake: A Historical Sketch*. Kahnawake: Kanien' Kehaka Raotitiohkwa Press

_____. 1980. *Seven Generations: A History of Kanienkehaka*. Kahnawake: Kahnawake Survival School.

Boldt, Menno. 1993. *Surviving as Indians: The Challenge of Self-Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Boldt, Menno and J. Anthony Long. 1985. *The Quest for Justice: Aboriginal Peoples and Aboriginal Rights*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Boon, James A. 1990. *Other Tribes, Other Scribes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borofsky, Robert, Ed. 1994. *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

_____. 1994. "Assessing the Field". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

- Breton, Raymond. 1984. "The Production and Allocation of Symbolic Resources: An Analysis of the Linguistic and Ethnocultural Fields in Canada". *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* Vol. 21(2):123-143.
- Campbell and Pal. 1991. "Feather and Gun: Confrontation at Oka/Kahnesatake". *The Real World of Canadian Politics*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Carrier, James G. 1992. "Orientalism: The World Turned Upside Down". *American Ethnologist*, May 1992 Vol. 19(2):
- Carrithers, Collins and Lukes, eds. 1985. *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clifford, James. 1986. "Introduction: Partial Truths" *Writing Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- _____. 1986. "On Ethnographic Allegory". *Writing Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Clifford, James and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Cockcroft, James D., Andre Gunder Frank and Dale L. Johnson. 1972. *Development and Underdevelopment*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Colden, Cadwallader. *The History of the Five Nations of Canada*. T. Osborne [1747] Toronto: Reprinted by Coles Publishing Company, 1972.
- Connor, Walker. 1990. "When is a Nation?". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 13(1):92-103
- Crapanzano, Vincent. 1992. "The Postmodern Crisis: Discourse, Parody, Memory". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Cross, Ronald and Hélène Sévigny. 1994. *Lasagna: The Man Behind the Mask*. Vancouver: Talonbooks.
- DaMatta, Roberto. 1994. "Some Biased Remarks on Interpretivism: A View from Brazil". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Das, Veena. 1994. "The Anthropological Discourse on India". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Deloria, Vine. 1970. "Some Criticisms and a Number of Suggestions". *Anthropology and the American Indian*. A Symposium of the American Anthropological Association, 20 November 1970.
- _____. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman & London: University of Oklahoma Press.

- _____. 1973. "Custer Died for Your Sins". *To See Ourselves: Anthropology and Modern Social Issues*. Thomas Weaver, Ed. Scott Foresman and Company.
- Deloria and Lytle. 1984. *The Nations Within*. N.p.: Pantheon Books.
- De Walt, Billie R. and Pertti J. Pelto, Eds. 1985. *Micro and Macro Levels of Analysis in Anthropology*. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Dickinson and Wotherspoon. 1992. *Deconstructing a Nation*. Vic Satzewich, Ed. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Docherty, Thomas. 1993. *Postmodernism: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Drabek, Mileti & Haas. 1975. *Human Systems in Extreme Environments*. Institute of Behavioural Science [Boulder]. University of Colorado.
- Dumont, Louis. 1985. "A Modified View of Our Origins: The Christian Beginnings of Modern Individualism". *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, and History*. Eds. Carrithers, Collins and Lukes. N.p.: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1986. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1977. *From Mandeville to Marx: The Genesis and Triumph of Economic Ideology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1980. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1980. *On Value*. Radcliffe-Brown Lecture in Social Anthropology.
- _____. 1970. "Religion, Politics and Society in the Individualistic Universe". The Henry Myers Lecture 1970. Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.
- Dumont, Louis. 1987. "Discussion and Criticism: On Individualism and Equality". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 28(5):669-677
- Dyck, Noel. 1990. "Cultures, Communities and Claims: Anthropology and Native Studies in Canada". *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXII(3).
- Eco, Umberto. 1992. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Falk Moore, Sally. 1994. "The Ethnography of the Present and the Analysis of the Process". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

- Feit, Harvey. 1985. "Legitimation and Autonomy in James Bay Cree Responses to Hydro-Electric Development". *Indigenous Peoples of the Nation State*. Noel Dyck, Ed. St. John's Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Francis, Daniel. 1992. *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Frideres, J.S. 1974. *Canada's Indians: Contemporary Conflicts*. Prentice-Hall of Canada.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1994. "The Uses of Diversity". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1982. *Nationalism and the Two Forms of Cohesion in Complex Societies*. Radcliffe-Brown Lecture in Social Anthropology.
- _____. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. 1987. "The Social Roots of Egalitarianism". *Culture, Identity and Politics*.
- Ginsburg, Faye. 1992. "Indigenous Media: Faustian Contract or Global Village?". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith, Eds. New York: International Publishers.
- Greenhouse, Carol J. 1992. "Signs of Equality: Individualism and Hierarchy in American Culture". *American Ethnologist* Vol. 19(2).
- Grinde, Donald A. and Bruce E. Johansen. 1991. *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*. American Indian Studies Centre. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Hale, Horatio. 1883. *The Iroquois Book of Rites*. Philadelphia: D.G. Brinton.
- Hall, Tony. 1991. "Indian Summer, Canadian Winter". *Nacla Report on the Americas* Vol. XXV(3).
- Handler, Richard. 1984. "On Social Discontinuity: Nationalism and Cultural Objectification In Quebec". *Current Anthropology* Vol.25(1).
- Harris, Marvin. 1968. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*. New York: Thomas Crowell.
- Hassan, Ihab. 1993. "Toward a Concept of Postmodernism". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Heller, T.C., M. Sosna and D.E. Wellbery. 1986. *Reconstructing Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*. N.p.: Stanford University Press.
- Helvacioğlu, Banu. 1992. "The Thrills and Chills of Postmodernism: the Western Intellectual Vertigo". *Studies in Political Economy* 38, Summer 1992.

- Hinsley, Curtis M. Jr. 1991. *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology 1846-1910*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Hughes, E.C. 1943. *French Canada in Transition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hughes, Ken. M.P. 1991. *The Summer of 1990: Fifth Report on the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs*. Ottawa: House of Commons.
- Hunt, George T. 1967. *The Wars of the Iroquois: A Study in Intertribal Relations*. N.p.: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 1991. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Huysen, Andreas. 1993. "The Search for Tradition: Avant Garde and Postmodernism in the 1970s" *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- The Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues. 1987. *Indigenous Peoples: A Global Quest for Justice*. London and New Jersey: Zed Books Limited.
- Innis, Harold, A. 1970. *The Fur Trade in Canada*. [1936] Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jameson, Frederic. 1992. *Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jennings, Francis. 1976. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Katzer, B. 1988. "The Caughnawaga Mohawks: the Other Side of Ironwork". *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 15, Winter 1988:39-55.
- Kapferer, Bruce. 1988. *Legends of People, Myths of State*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.
- Keesing, Roger M. 1981. *Cultural Anthropology: A Contemporary Perspective*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- _____. 1994. "Theories of Culture Revisited". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Klippenstein, Norman L. 1991. *The Haida Struggle for Autonomy on the Haida Gwaii*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Department of Anthropology, University of Manitoba.
- Knight, Rolf. 1978. *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Indian Labour in British Columbia*. Vancouver: New Star Books.

- La Fontaine, J.S. 1985. "Person and Individual: Some Anthropological Reflections". Carrithers, Collins and Lukes, Eds. *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, S. and N. Lurie. 1971. *The American Indian Today*. New World Book Manufacturing.
- Lithman, Y. Georg. 1987. *A Community Apart*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- _____. 1988. "Cultural Dimensions of Development and Underdevelopment: Issues of Nation and Person In Indian-White Relationships". University of Toronto Conference.
- Little, Bear, Leroy, Menno Boldt, J. Anthony Long. 1990. *Pathways to Self-Determination: Canadian Indians and the Canadian State*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lydekker, John Wolfe. 1938. *The Faithful Mohawks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacLaine, Craig and Baxendale. 1990. *This Land is Our Land: The Mohawk Revolt at Oka*. Montreal: Optimum.
- Mander, Jerry. 1991. *In the Absence of the Sacred: The Failure of Technology and the Survival of Indian Nations*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Marcella, A.J., G.A. DeVos, F.L.K. Hsu. *Culture and Self: Asian and Western Perspectives*. New York and London: Tavistock Books.
- Marcus, George E. 1986. "Afterword: Ethnographic Writing and Anthropological Careers". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- _____. 1986. "Contemporary Problems of Ethnography in the Modern World System". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- _____. 1992. "A Broad(er) Side to the Canon, Being a Partial Account of a Year of Travel Among Textual Communities in the Realm of Humanities Centers and Including a Collection of Artificial Curiosities". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*". George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- _____. 1992. *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Matthiasson, John S. 1992. *Living on the Land: Change Among the Inuit of Baffin Island*. Toronto: Broadview Press.
- _____. 1994. "Lived Experience and the Present: New Directions in Anthropological Writing". *Reviews in Anthropology* Vol. 23:269-280.

- McCall, Christopher. 1990. *Class, Ethnicity, and Social Inequality*. N.p.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- McMaster, Gerald and Lee-Ann Martin, eds. 1992. *Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives*. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- McMillan, Alan D. 1988. *Native Peoples and Cultures of Canada: An Anthropological Overview*. N.p.: Douglas and McIntyre.
- McRoberts, K. 1988. *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*. N.p.: McClelland and Stewart.
- Mealing, S.R. 1967. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*. N.p.: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Miller, J.R. 1989. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Minogue, K.R. 1967. *Nationalism*. University Paperbacks. London: Methuen.
- Morgan, Lewis, Henry. 1954. *League of the Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.
- Morris, Desmond. 1969. *The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal*. Toronto: Bantam.
- Olalquiaga, Celeste. 1992. *Megalopolis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ortiz, Sutti, ed. 1983. *Economic Anthropology: Topics and Theories*. Lanham, New York, and London: University Press of America.
- O'Sullivan See, K. 1986. *First World Nationalisms: Class and Ethnic Politics in Northern Ireland and Quebec*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Paine, Robert. 1990. "Our Authorial Authority". *Culture* IX(2).
- Ponting, J. Rick. ed. 1986. *Arduous Journey*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc.
- _____. 1990. "Internalization: Perspectives on an Emerging Direction in Aboriginal Affairs". *Canadian Ethnic Studies* Vol. XXII(3).
- Portoghesi, Paolo. 1993. "Postmodern". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1986. "Fieldwork in Common Places". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George Marcus. Eds. University of California Press.
- Rabinow, Paul. 1986. "Representations are Social Facts: Modernity and Postmodernity in Anthropology". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.

- Rahman, Aminur. 1987. "Nationalism and Nation Formation: An Anthropological Discussion in Relation to Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflict in the Third World". *Bangladesh Sociological Review* Vol. 2(2):
- Reaman, G. Elmore. 1967. *The Trail of the Iroquois Indians*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Limited.
- Richard, Nelly. 1993. "Periphery and Postmodernism: Postmodernism and Periphery". *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Thomas Docherty, Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ritcher, Daniel K. 1992. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization*. Institute of Early American History and Culture. University of North Carolina Press.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1986. "From the Door of his Tent: The Fieldworker and the Inquisitor". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- Russell, John. 1992. "Race and Reflexivity: The Black Other in Contemporary Japanese Black Culture". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Russell, Peter. 1966. *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company of Canada Limited.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1994. "Goodbye to Tristes Tropes: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- _____. 1977. *Orientalism*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London & Henley.
- _____. 1989. "Presenting the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors". *Critical Inquiry*. Vol.15 (Winter 1989).
- Satzewich, Vic. 1992. *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and Racism in '90s Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Schechter, Stephen. 1992. *Zen and the Art of Postmodern Canada*. Robert Davies Publishing.
- Schneider, R.A. and R.A. Levine. 1985. *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schultz, Emily A. and Robert H. Lavenda. 1990. *Cultural Anthropology: A Perspective on the Human Condition*. West Publishing Company.
- Seton-Watson. 1977. *Nations and States*. London: Methuen.

- Shaffir and Haas. 1978. *Shaping Identity in Canadian Society*. Prentice-Hall of Canada.
- Stedman, Raymond William. 1982. *Shadows of the Indian: Stereotypes in American Culture*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Shively, J. 1992. "Cowboys and Indians: Perceptions of Western Films Among American Indians and Anglos". *American Sociological Review* Vol. 57 December 1992:725-34.
- Sioui, Georges E. 1992. *For an Amerindian Autohistory: An Essay on the Foundations of a Social Ethic*. N.p.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Stewart, Kathleen. 1992. "Nostalgia: A Polemic". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Stewart, Susan. 1989. "Antipodal Expectations: Notes on the Formosan Ethnography of George Psalmanazar". *Romantic Motives: Essays on Anthropological Sensibility*. George W. Stocking Jr., Ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stocking, George W., ed. 1989. *Romantic Motives: Essays on Anthropological Sensibility*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stymeist, David. 1975. *Ethnics and Indians: Social Relations in a Northwestern Ontario Town*. Toronto: Peter Martin and Associates.
- Tambiah, Stanley J. 1985. *Culture, Thought and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1994. "The Politics of Ethnicity". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Tanner, A. 1983. "Introduction: Canadian Indians and the Politics of Dependency". *The Politics of Indianness*. Institute of Social and Economic Research. St. John's: Memorial University.
- Tiger, Lionel. 1969. *Men In Groups*. London: Nelson.
- Tooker, Elisabeth. 1990. "The United States Constitution and the Iroquois League". *Ethnohistory* Vol. 35 Fall 1988:305-36; Discussion: Vol. 37 Summer 1990:279-97.
- Torry, William A. 1979. "Anthropological Studies In Hazardous Environments: Past Trends and New Horizons". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 20(3) September:
- Trigger, Bruce. 1985. *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's Heroic Age Considered*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University.
- Tucker, D.F.B. 1980. *Marxism and Individualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Tyler, Stephen A. 1992. "On Being Out of Words". *Re-Reading Cultural Anthropology*. George E. Marcus, Ed. Duke University Press.
- _____. 1986. "Post-Modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document". *Writing Culture*. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, Eds. University of California Press.
- Wade, M. 1964. *The French Canadian Outlook*. N.p.: McClelland and Stewart.
- _____. 1968. *The French Canadians*. N.p.: Macmillan Company of Canada.
- Walker, James. 1971. "The Indian in Canadian Historical Writing". *Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers*. 1971:21-47.
- Weatherford, Jack. 1988. *Indian Givers*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Weaver, Sally. 1990. "A New Paradigm in Canadian Indian Policy for the 1990s". *Canadian Ethnic Studies* Vol. XXII(3).
- White, Hayden. 1978. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.
- Wilson, Edmund. 1960. *Apologies to the Iroquois*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Cudahy.
- Wolf, Eric. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1994. "Facing Power: Old Insights, New Questions". *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Woodcroft, George. 1992. *The Monk and his Message: Undermining the Myth of History*. Vancouver; Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Wright, Ronald. 1993. *Stolen Continents: The 'New World Indian Eyes*. N.p.: Penguin Books.
- York, Geoffrey and Loreen Pindera. 1991. *People of the Pines: The Warriors and the Legacy of Oka*. N.p.: Little Brown and Company (Canada).
- Yun, Ma Shu. 1990. "Ethnonationalism, Ethnic Nationalism and Mini-Nationalism: A Comparison of Connor, Smith and Snyder". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 13(1):525-541.