

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Contributions to Ojibwe Studies, Essays 1934-1972. By A. Irving Hallowell.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6z47k6ct>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 36(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Dinwoodie, David W.

Publication Date

2012

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

M. Zissu, *Blood Matters: The Five Civilized Tribes and the Search for Unity in the Twentieth Century*, 2001.) The omission is pronounced given that Chang's study addresses the same time period and many of the same events and themes as that work, including an extended analysis of Indians' evolving views of race in Oklahoma.

Erik M. Zissu

Stillman, Friedman & Shechtman, P. C.

Contributions to Ojibwe Studies, Essays 1934–1972. By A. Irving Hallowell. Edited by Jennifer S. H. Brown and Susan Elaine Gray. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press 2010. 664 pages. \$50.00 paper.

For the last forty years or so, many Canadians have been distancing themselves from the artifice of Europe and seeking a more natural coexistence in their North American environment. Globalization critic John Ralston Saul recently captured the spirit of this impulse when he declared, "We are not a civilization of British or French or European inspiration," but rather "we are a people of aboriginal inspiration organized around a concept of peace, fairness and good government" (*Fair Country: Telling Truths About Canada*, 2008, xi–xii). Although capturing the neoromantic spirit of the moment perfectly, Saul's statement is surprising nonetheless due to the fact that, until recently, at least some Canadian elements have studiously if quietly avoided configuring themselves on any single basis and particularly avoided configuring themselves in the terms of American ideology. Let me try to elaborate.

Although the original charter for the Hudson's Bay Company provided for rights to colonize and trade, in 1679 company leadership passed to a group that was "willing to forego colonization ventures and concentrate their efforts on building up a profitable trade." As Brown explains in her justly renowned comparative analysis of the corporate cultures of the Hudson's Bay and Northwest companies, "They and their successors in fact laid the basis of a long persisting company resistance to the planting in its territories of settlements that would, it was argued, be heavy financial burdens and strain the meager subsistence resources of the north" (Jennifer Brown, *Strangers in the Blood: Fur Trade Company Families in Indian Country*, 1980, 9). The company was so intent on engineering the conservation of the Aboriginal residents as trappers and traders (to ensure the profitability of the enterprise) that they "demanded both celibacy and chastity from its employees," forbidding sexual relations with European women and women "who were members of the Indian groups on whose goodwill and cooperation the trade depended" (Brown,

Strangers in the Blood, 12). Additionally, from the 1707 Act of Union forward anyway, the era during which Linda Colley argues that the British nation was being forged, they ensured that those serving the empire in North America could realize the full benefits of British citizenship.

When we consider Benedict Anderson's finding that nationalism first originates in the New World in colonial provinces in which small but significant populations of creoles, who were excluded from advancement in the European society from which they descended on grounds of transatlantic birth, "consciously redefined" populations of Aboriginals "as fellow nationals," and on that basis rejected old and created new societies (*Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, 1983, 50–59), the significance of the actions of the Hudson's Bay Company is clearer. In the south, where the priority was colonization, the result was creolization, and it was this that provided the ideological bases for revolution and nation formation in Mexico and the United States. In the north, where the Hudson's Bay Company focused on trade rather than colonization and where post-Union Britain adopted a policy that attempted to minimize the formation of creoles by avoiding discrimination based on residence, transatlantic birth, or intermarriage, creolization was symbolically denied even in those circumstances when it was relatively common in practice (whereas in the United States and some Latin American societies, it was symbolically asserted even when widely avoided in practice), and Canada failed to participate in the first wave of nation formation.

Following the precedent set by the Hudson's Bay Company, Canada continued to differentiate itself from Mexico and the United States in ways that few could delineate as well as Harvard-educated Welsh Canadian Lewis G. Thomas. Even while shifting to a policy of European settlement rather than conservation of trade-oriented aboriginality, the Dominion of Canada continued the policy of the Hudson's Bay Company in order to steer away from what it perceived as majoritarian policies. Thomas notes carefully the logic of the Dominion, "It was consistent with the national purposes of the new Dominion in the first decades of its life that undue pressure would not be placed on immigrants to conform to any Canadian pattern. The resulting transformation might go too far and issue, not in Canadianism, but in Americanization" (*Rancher's Legacy: Alberta Essays*, 1986, 67).

With a little of the historical background of the Canadian identity predicament, I hope it is now possible to see that, although the "we are a people of aboriginal inspiration" movement to which Saul and others are contributing unites many for the way it acknowledges the enormous contributions of Aboriginal peoples to Canadian society, it simultaneously divides by conflating the Canadian story with the national story of the neighbors to the south.

To the extent to which it renews Canadian national sentiment, it generates fresh acrimony.

Though it may not appear obvious at first, it is helpful to have such questions in mind, I believe, when considering what the new collection of A. Irving Hallowell's writings offer us today. Hallowell was born in Philadelphia in 1892 and was affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania throughout college, graduate school, and his teaching career. Highly regarded by students and colleagues, Hallowell published widely, particularly on the subject of culture and personality, and held many offices in a variety of academic organizations. Hallowell's essays have been collected twice before, first in *Culture and Experience* (1955), which honored his sixtieth birthday, and second in *Contributions to Anthropology: Selected Papers of A. Irving Hallowell*, edited by Raymond D. Fogelson (1976). Melford E. Spiro compiled a *festschrift* in 1965 entitled *Context and Meaning in Cultural Anthropology*.

During the 1930s, Hallowell conducted fieldwork among the Ojibwe of Berens River and other groups in the greater area of Lake Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. The book under review represents an attempt to gather Hallowell's contributions to Ojibwe studies into a single volume. Thus the book is a contribution to North American Indian studies, First Nations studies, the history of anthropology, and, less obviously but not necessarily less significantly, Canadian studies.

Some of the most intriguing of Hallowell's writings center on Ojibwe relations with the land and with other-than-human persons. Direct knowledge of the topography of the country, culturally distinct systems of directional orientation, and relations with supernatural "masters" of the different species of game and fur-bearing animals are among his most compelling subjects. Seeing that terminology for stones was grammatically animate, Hallowell once asked an Ojibwe man whether all the stones seen about were alive. After a time, the man replied, "No, but some are." The same man described for Hallowell how in a Midéwiwin ceremony led by his father, a stone began to move, "following the trail of the old man around the tent, rolling over and over" (540). Ironically, although Hallowell's interest in such material during the 1930s, as opposed to, for example, social structure viewed from the vantage of colonial oversight, was shaped by his Boasian, which is to say, Americanist, orientation within cultural anthropology, it is likely this material will most readily resonate with the neoromantic milieu of Canada today.

Regarding social history, there is a less than systematic treatment of the time period and a less than subtle treatment of "the total community" of this part of Canada. Hallowell acknowledges that he never befriended the personnel of the Hudson's Bay Company posts, nor did he become more than casually acquainted with the missionaries. At one point, he suggests that the

American South might provide a model for illuminating intercultural relations involving the Ojibwe and their Canadian neighbors, and in lieu of a systematic account of rural Canadian life, he recommends Fred Bosworth's 1959 antiracist polemic, *The Strange One*, a well-meaning period piece that thematizes the radical discontinuity between the evolutionary humanism of Julian Huxley and the discriminatory practices of old-fashioned British Canadians toward a young Cree teacher, Kanina Beaverskin, in the James Bay area. Although the book effectively raises the real problem of racial discrimination in Canada, it makes no attempt to describe the dynamics of the rural Canadian society of that moment as a distinctive cultural-historical phenomenon. Of his interests during the 1930s Hallowell observes, "I was completely oriented toward Indians and their culture rather than the total community" (9). Although this orientation leads to a serious appreciation of Chief William Berens's thoughts, in other respects it undermines the contribution of his work.

Nevertheless, it is important not to overlook the historical value of the work. The historical contributions are considerable, even if they are embedded in subtext rather than text. Hallowell was well aware of his limitations, stating that he "always regretted not making a serious study" of the relationship patterns of the total community (9). Hallowell was, moreover, nondoctrinaire, sensitive, and observant. Drawing largely on published sources, he effectively contextualizes his studies in relation to the fur trade and missionization, among other histories, far more richly than might be expected on the basis of his anthropological orientation. Most significantly, he includes a wealth of historical information, personal history, and abundant evidence regarding the "total community" of the Lake Winnipeg area of Canada during the 1930s in the case studies embedded in his culture- and personality-oriented papers. These rich individual- and event-oriented accounts bear directly on First Nations and Canadian history, even though they too are products of an Americanist orientation.

Once recognized, the history embedded in the subtexts of *Contributions to Ojibwe Studies* is likely to resonate with those involved or interested in a movement related to but not congruent with Saul's. In response to the globally driven industrialization of the north and the neoromantic reaction of Saul and others, there arose from several quarters, again some thirty to forty years ago, an effort to historicize Aboriginal life in Canada more richly. Though certainly not the sole agents of this historicist movement (others include Arthur J. Ray of the University of British Columbia, Robin Fisher of Simon Fraser University, John Foster [and students] and Olive Dickason of the University of Alberta, and Bruce Trigger of McGill University), volume editor Jennifer S. H. Brown and series editor Regna Darnell have been two of the prime movers. They have published numerous influential works and

supported many academic and independent scholars of diverse backgrounds and political orientations. *Contributions to Ojibwe Studies*, which is but a small part of the ongoing effort to historicize, provides a welcome opportunity to read or read anew Hallowell's powerful and lovely essays, and in the process to reflect upon the ever-changing—and ever-political—contexts for the study of the Aboriginal people of North America.

David W. Dinwoodie
University of New Mexico

Creek Paths and Federal Roads: Indians, Settlers, and Slaves and the Making of the American South. By Angela Pulley Hudson. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010. 272 pages. \$65.00 cloth; \$24.95 paper.

Angela Pulley Hudson is at the forefront of an emerging historical focus on networks and communication in early America. As Hudson demonstrates, such studies have much to tell us about sovereignty, power, resistance, and cultural exchange. Hudson's lens centers on the construction of roads through the Creek Nation in an effort to explore relations between the Creeks and their neighbors from the late eighteenth century through the 1830s. Addressing several bodies of scholarship, she exposes the central role that roads through Creek country played in debates over states' rights, imperialism, and Indian Removal.

Native people had been travelers for centuries. As Malinda Maynor Lowery argued recently in *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South* (2010), "geographic movement (rather than attachment to one specific place) and expansive attitudes about adoption and cultural exchange . . . more accurately describe Indian groups historically" (xii). As Hudson points out, the Creek Nation had its roots in a diverse range of ethnic groups that came together to form a new nation during the colonial period. Movement is central to Creek history and plays a major role in their creation story. Hudson's greatest strength in this book is her exploration of indigenous notions of geography and borders. Perhaps because of the great success of William Cronon's *Changes in the Land* (1983), we often conceive of Native and Anglo notions of land as fundamentally different, but Hudson upsets that notion, arguing, "Borders were not a foreign concept, nor were they simply imposed on the Creeks by outside forces" (18). Instead, "Creeks and their Indian neighbors defined territory in several distinct ways—including use rights, rights of way, and discrete types of lands, such as hunting lands and communally cultivated fields" (19). Grounded in their own epistemologies and informed by their experiences with