

Retrospective Thoughts of an Ethnohistorian

Alfred G. Bailey

Volume 12, numéro 1, 1977

Fredericton 1977

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030818ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/030818ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Résumé de l'article

L'auteur décrit les principaux jalons du cheminement intellectuel de sa carrière d'ethnohistorien en insistant tout particulièrement sur ses efforts d'application de concepts d'anthropologie dans ses études historiques. Il décrit brièvement quelques controverses dans lesquelles il s'est vu impliqué et les principales influences qui ont inspiré ses orientations et ses travaux.

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)

1712-9109 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Bailey, A. G. (1977). Retrospective Thoughts of an Ethnohistorian. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, 12(1), 14–29.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/030818ar>

A.G. BAILEY

Précis

L'auteur décrit les principaux jalons du cheminement intellectuel de sa carrière d'ethnohistorien en insistant tout particulièrement sur ses efforts d'application de concepts d'anthropologie dans ses études historiques. Il décrit brièvement quelques controverses dans lesquelles il s'est vu impliqué et les principales influences qui ont inspiré ses orientations et ses travaux.

ALFRED G. BAILEY
UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK

*Retrospective Thoughts
of an Ethnohistorian*

I think that anyone asked to give a paper on himself must necessarily feel both diffident and appreciative. I want to begin by thanking your programme committee, acting on your behalf, for asking me to do this, and especially, at this time of your first meeting at a university with which I have been associated for many years. I must say here also that I owe a debt to my friend Victor O'Connell who, in the course of preparing an essay on my academic life, compelled me to order my thoughts on the subject in such a way as to be, without too ostensible a hazard, within the limits of my capabilities.¹

In this particular year that marks the two-hundredth anniversary of the surrender of "Gentleman" Johnny Burgoyne's British army at Saratoga, it seems fitting to note that that defeat was one of the occurrences that not long afterwards eventuated in the establishment of an Academy of Liberal Arts and Sciences out of which this University ultimately grew. Before the evacuation of New York at the end of the War, certain Loyalist persons petitioned the authorities to provide for the setting up of a college in Nova Scotia, and when that province was divided two colleges seemed called for. In consequence another petition was presented, this time to the government of the newly constituted province of New Brunswick, which was at once acted upon. The date of what is believed to have been the first legislation in what is now Canada, relating to higher education, was December 13th, 1785.² So strong was imperial sentiment from the very beginning, and so persistent, that we are not surprised to learn of a graduate of 1868 becoming the chief publicist for imperial federation during the latter decades of the nineteenth century. When George R. Parkin later spoke in the Oxford Union — for it was he to whom I refer — a future viceroy of India acknowledged his words as having had the greatest influence on the course of his life. When Parkin lectured at Harrow there was a boy there — it was Winston Churchill — who said that he never forgot what he heard Parkin say on that day. We note also that the first Rhodes Scholar, not only from Canada, but from the western hemisphere, was a graduate of the University of New Brunswick, and I have two reasons for mentioning the name of Chester Martin: first, because he was once president of this Association, and in the second place, because I had been for two years a graduate student at the University of Toronto when in 1929 he became head of the department there. I think that at that time he had become widely known throughout the English-speaking world because of his book, *Empire and Com-*

monwealth, which had been published not long before. Those who read it were soon aware of his abiding conviction that the evolution of what then appeared to be the most powerful empire on earth into a family of free and equal nations represented the special gift of the British peoples to the theory and practice of government among men.

I found that Chester Martin and his colleagues were agreeable to the programme of studies I wished to pursue for a doctorate when I reregistered in the Toronto graduate school in 1930, a programme embracing a study of some of the more important aspects of the social history of the French regime in Canada, particularly relating to the *coureurs de bois* and the Indian tribes involved in the fur trade. I had earlier, when studying for the Master's degree, persuaded Professor Ralph Flenley to give me a course in the history of New France, my interest in this field having sprung from my early memories of Quebec and the village of Tadoussac on the lower St. Lawrence. Champlain's monument on the Dufferin Terrace was a few hundred yards from the house in which I had been born. As a boy I had often climbed the cliff that Wolfe had climbed, and our school's playing field was on the Cove Fields between the Citadel and the abandoned earthworks that had been thrown up for defence against the besiegers, Richard Montgomery and Benedict Arnold, in 1775. I was aware not only of the great men and deeds of the French regime, but also of that period when Quebec, half English in population, was the largest builder of wooden ships in British North America, an industry in which earlier generations of my mother's family had been involved. Our country house in Tadoussac stood opposite the Pointe des Alouettes, the long partly wooded point of sand and gravel on which Champlain had in 1603 made a pact with the Montagnais to aid them in their war with the Iroquois, an event which has been recognized as a turning point in the history of our country.

My interest in the social and institutional aspects of Canadian history stemmed from courses in psychology, philosophy, and sociology taken with Wilfred Currier Kierstead at the University of New Brunswick, which I entered as an undergraduate in 1923. The University at that time still existed in the state of penury that had been its lot since its foundation. Although when I reached my final year I persuaded the Professor of English to reactivate the one elective in modern history offered by the University, but which had for years lain dormant in the calendar, it was these other courses already mentioned that gave a permanent cast to my mind, particularly sociology which at one stage involved the making of a critical comparison of Hobhouse's *Morals in Evolution* and Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*. Both works were historical, or what anthropologists today term diachronic and, as such, given to the formulation of schemes of social evolution. It was clear, however, that there were exceptions to Hobhouse's account of man as having passed from primitive communism to the individualistic property relations of advanced societies; whereas Westermarck, on the other hand, in the work cited, as well as in his history of marriage, rejected promiscuity and communal ownership as charac-

RETROSPECTIVE THOUGHTS . . .

terizing the institutions of early man, or indeed, of the simpler peoples living beyond the range of the advanced societies of his own day.

Since there were no courses offered by Toronto's History Department in what appeared to Chester Martin to be something that might be termed "historical sociology" he put me in touch with T.F. McIlwraith of the Royal Ontario Museum, the only man in Canada giving degree-credit courses in anthropology. Harold Innis also became a volunteer, and I ended up with a kind of interdisciplinary tripos, unique then or since, comprising history, anthropology, and economics, and a doctoral dissertation which, when completed in 1934, bore the title of *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, 1504-1700, A Study in Canadian Civilization*. One of the first things I learned as I pursued these studies was that the ideas of social evolution I had acquired as an undergraduate from such scholars as Westermarck and Hobhouse had to be discarded, along with Comte's law of the three stages and Lewis Morgan's representation of man as having passed from savagery, through barbarism, to civilization. It appeared that these systems, together with those of Sir Edward Tylor and Sir James Frazer, had been under attack for at least a quarter of a century, not only in America, but notably by the "diffusionist" schools of Britain and Germany. Far from believing that societies had, or could, pass with or without outside influence, through the same series of stages of evolutionary advance, the men of these schools, notably Sir Grafton Elliot Smith, and Professor Perry of the University of London, contended that there was no known case of independent invention, but that the conditions that produced inventions were unique, could not have occurred twice, and were thus, wherever found, the result of diffusion from a single point of origin. The creative act, they held, that had raised man above the low-grade culture, had given birth to the Egyptian civilization which had then spread over the earth's surface, even to middle America where pyramids and mummifications were cited in evidence. Even the technique of carving elephants, creatures which had not existed in America since the Pleistocene age, was said to have been acquired by men in transit through south-east Asia, and reproduced at Copan in Honduras.³ I was saved from this madness by my professor who sent me to R.B. Dixon's book *The Building of Culture* in which it was clearly demonstrated that these pyramids were temples, not tombs, and that they were structurally at variance with those of Egypt. The mummies were prepared by quite different methods, and the so-called elephants were more likely to have been modelled after macaws with elongated beaks, or tapers with their snouts extended into scrolls for aesthetic purposes.

Just as the diffusionists had superceded the older evolutionary school, there arose, in addition to the followers of Franz Boas in America, two movements which came to dominate British anthropology throughout the second quarter of the present century, namely the functionalism of Malinowski, and what has been called the structuralist-functionalist school led by Alfred Reginald Radcliffe-Brown something of whose lecture at the Royal Canadian Institute I still remember after all these years, although it must have been around 1931 that he gave it.⁴ While no student of either history or sociology can progress very far

into his subject without coming to recognize sociocultural data as being articulated into configurations which constantly undergo modification at varying rates as man seeks to adapt himself to changing conditions of life, it is impossible to agree to the way in which men focussed their attention so fixedly on synchronic structural studies to the exclusion of the past development of the very societies in which their interests lay. Because of this neglect of the historical dimension by the dominant schools in Great Britain, as well as by Boas and his followers in the United States, such a study as I had made would have been, and I think was, looked upon with disfavour. Although I knew some of the Indian groups at first hand, and had made a thorough study of the anthropological accounts of their contemporary condition, my work was based largely on historical sources, official correspondence, the records of missionaries, the narratives of travellers, and the like. Working with Innis, whose recently published history of the fur trade was destined, in some ways, to revolutionize the study of Canadian history, I recognized that industry, together with missionary enterprise, were the great catalysts of the sociocultural revolution eventuating from the contact of Eastern Algonkians with the incoming Europeans. I was concerned with depopulation through disease and intoxicants, the revolution in technics, social forms, religious beliefs and practices, art forms and mythological motifs and content. Age-old property concepts were rapidly discarded. Those adept at dealing with the French tended to replace in social esteem the most proficient hunters. The new sense of sin, inculcated by the members of the religious orders, led to the segregation of women and girls, shattered band solidarity by isolating converts from their erstwhile pagan brethren, and sometimes culminated in extravagant behaviour marked by such practices as flagellation and other forms of penance. As Pitt-Rivers' work on the contact of races in the Pacific was of a somewhat different type, and as William Christie MacLeod's *American Indian Frontier* did not, I think it is fair to say, involve anthropological insights, I had no clearly defined model to follow, and for reasons into which I will go, it was many years before this kind of study began to win recognition or the approval of scholars working in either anthropology or history.⁵

In the course of the study I had to take account of the ethnic upheaval in the St. Lawrence valley in the interval between the Cartier-Roberval voyages and the renewal of French enterprise in the time of Champlain. It had been suggested that the Indians to whom I referred as Laurentian Iroquois had been driven away by Algonkian-speaking hunters armed with ironware obtained from French fishermen who had already begun to frequent the waters of the Gulf before that time. I found corroboration in a statement made in 1697 by the old furtrader Charles Aubert de la Chesnaye, when he wrote ". . . the true Algonquins possessed the land from Tadoussac as far as Québec, and I have always thought that they came from the Saguenay; it was a tradition that they had driven the Iroquois from the site of Québec and the neighbourhood which was their former home; they used to show us their towns and villages covered with wood newly sprung up." From evidence existing in 1933, that is at the time that my paper, entitled *The Significance of the Identity and Disappearance of the Laurentian Iroquois*, was presented to the Royal Society of Canada, I concluded

that the Stadaconans were of the tribe that in the next century was identified as Mohawk, and that the people of Hochelaga were most probably Onondaga.⁶ At that time also I accepted A.C. Parker's theory that they constituted a vanguard of Iroquoian peoples recently migrated into the northeastern parts of North America. When, over thirty years later, in the course of preparing for the publication of a second edition, thanks to Frances Halpenny, I was asked by the University of Toronto Press to reappraise my conclusions in the light of the intervening research, I found that questions relating to the Laurentian Iroquoians were far more complex than had hitherto appeared to be the case. A revised time-perspective was clearly required. In the early thirties it was generally believed that the north-eastern seaboard, including the Maritime Provinces, had not been occupied before the beginning of the Christian era. Subsequently an "Archaic" culture, dating perhaps from 3500 B.C. had turned up at Tadoussac and other points on the coast; and before many years had passed there occurred the astonishing discovery at Quaco Head, New Brunswick, and Debert, Nova Scotia, of Clovis-type points, similar to those found in New Mexico, dating from a time not far removed from the end of the Pleistocene Age. Likewise, the view of the Laurentian Iroquoians as recent arrivals had to be scrapped in the light of Dr. R.S. MacNeish's derivation of Iroquoian culture through intermediate stages from what he designated as Point Peninsula, dating from 400 B.C. to 600 A.D. in Northern New York and Southern Ontario.⁷ Supported in the main by two other archaeologists of note, W.A. Ritchie and J.F. Pendergast, he concluded that the Iroquoians had already extended to Montreal, and even further eastward, by 1100 A.D., and were still occupying the area in the sixteenth century. Those in the Montreal area were identified as having affiliation with the Onondaga or possibly the closely related Oneida.⁸ Archaeological evidence and the historical record appeared to have some measure of agreement, for had not Nicolas Perrot stated that "the country of the Iroquois was formerly the district of Montreal and Three Rivers"?⁹

Actually the matter was by no means as simple as that statement would seem to imply, especially as insuperable difficulties had emerged with respect to the identity and to some extent to the question of the disappearance of Stadacona and the other towns and villages further down the river. With regard to Stadacona, and the other towns in and about the site of the present city of Quebec, archaeological evidence has always been altogether lacking. It is noteworthy therefore that, in Professor Bruce Trigger's opinion, Cartier's vocabulary of Stadaconan words reveals an affiliation with Huron, but is even more likely to be evidence of a distinct branch of the Iroquoian linguistic stock.¹⁰ In any case they cannot now be seen to have been Mohawk, as I had suggested in 1933, for the testimony on the basis of language directly contradicts the assertion of Aubert de la Chesnaye which would have identified these people with Mohawk or Onondaga-Oneida, members of the League of the Iroquois, the great enemy of the French, Hurons, and Algonkians, in the following century.

To the idea that Cartier's Indians were driven away from the St. Lawrence by the Algonkians, Professor Fenton has added that of the likelihood of depopu-

lation through diseases of European provenience, and, in truth, evidence of venereal disease at Stadacona is not lacking.¹¹ He also suggested the difficulty of maintaining maize culture in such a northerly climate. Professor Trigger has also considered that other peoples further to the westward may have decimated the Laurentian Iroquoians as they tried to break through to the eastward to make contact with the incoming French.¹² Whatever may have been the case, I have tried to see the effect of this population removal, together with that of the Hurons and their kindred in the seventeenth century, on the course of Canadian history as a whole. Far outnumbering the French population at the time of the Conquest, had they survived the ravages of war, disease, and other factors making for social disintegration in the period from 1534 to 1650, modern Canada might well be a largely Indian state as is Mexico. In my essay entitled "Vanished Iroquoians" published in my book, *Culture and Nationality*, I have tried to state more fully than I have done here, why I believe this to have been so.¹³

I have now to come to another topic altogether, one that stirred widespread controversy in the thirty-two-year interval between the publication of my first edition in 1937 and that brought out by the University of Toronto Press in 1969. At the time that I first began to work on my doctoral dissertation in the early thirties, and for many years afterwards, Frank G. Speck, professor of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, and a former student of Franz Boas, was the acknowledged authority on the northeastern Algonkian-speaking tribes. His fieldwork among them led him to conclude that their family hunting territories, individually owned, and transmitted in the male line, represented the condition that had existed in pre-Columbian times. It was therefore a surprise to me to find, in seventeenth-century records, some evidence of the fact that these peoples, on the contrary, practiced communal or collective ownership, and that the individual ownership and system of inheritance observed by Professor Speck was a consequence of contact with the individualistic mores and practices of the incoming Europeans.¹⁴ I found that Diamond Jenness, Chief of the Anthropological Division of the National Museum of Canada, had also come to that conclusion in the course of preparing his volume on the Indians of Canada.¹⁵ It was clear that this view of the matter, which I shared with Jenness, ran counter to the generally accepted view of the leading anthropologists in America who were striving to record the institutions of the aboriginal peoples, many of which were fast disappearing under the impact of the White Man's civilization. Only their anxiety to succeed in doing so seems sufficient to explain their almost total disregard of the available historical records. Although my 1937 edition received favourable reviews, by Robert Redfield in the *Canadian Historical Review*, and C.W.M. Hart in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, it was a serious setback to have it ignored by the leading anthropological journal of the day, the *American Anthropologist*.¹⁶ When T.F. McIlwraith observed that "contact studies are anathema in the United States" he was referring to the only body of scientific opinion existing on this continent. No such opinion could have existed in Canada at that time since there was as yet only one department in any Canadian university, McIlwraith himself having just become the head of the

newly constituted department at Toronto, after years as Keeper of Ethnological Collections in the Royal Ontario Museum, and part-time assistant professor in the University. The degree-credit course which I gave in 1941 at the University of New Brunswick was, I believe, the first in Canada outside of Toronto.

Speck was quoted by Robert H. Lowie in his widely-known work "Primitive Society" in support of his contention that a state of primitive communism had never existed as an institution among any known people.¹⁷ Readers of this work would not be long in discovering that one of the purposes of its author was to draw attention to the errors of Lewis H. Morgan. In fact the entire scheme of human history, as embodied in that author's *Ancient Society* published in 1877, was rejected by Lowie who was one of a numerous band of anthropologists singled out by V.F. Calverton in his essay entitled "Modern Anthropology and the Theory of Cultural Compulsives", as having subscribed to ideas embodied in the works of Edward Westermarck, especially the latter's *History of Human Marriage* and *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* which I had studied as an undergraduate in this University.¹⁸ Calverton there alleged that Westermarck had been widely cited by apologists for the capitalist system in refutation of Morgan's scheme of social evolution. It is true that very little attention had been paid to Morgan's work, outside the restricted fraternity of scholars, until the moment it had been appropriated by the Marxists as clear evidence that communism was not repugnant to human nature since, according to Morgan, it had existed widely in savagery, the first of the two states through which he believed man to have passed on his road to what he regarded as the highest level of civilization, namely the Victorian summit with its strong prejudice in favour of private property and monogamous marriage. One wonders what Morgan, the staid, well-to-do, and conservative American professional man would have thought of the use to which his work was to be put, and how he would have reacted to the prognostication that there would some day be a street in Moscow named after him.

And this brings me to the fact that, although I never became a Marxist, I was well aware that Frederick Engels' *Origin of the Family* reflected the scheme of Morgan — indeed that it embodied the Morgan thesis. I began the appropriate chapter in my doctoral dissertation with a reference to this very influence of Morgan on the Marxists. It may be because I was surrounded by Marxist influences at that time. Perhaps those student days in Toronto in the pit of the Great Depression of the Thirties reflected the first pronounced evidence of Marxism in Canadian intellectual life. Hundreds of unemployed were living on the city dumps. Communist demonstrations were almost a weekly occurrence in Queen's Park adjacent to the campus. At one of these I happened to be present when Professor Meek, a world-renowned scholar in the field of Oriental languages, was man-handled by the police, although he was merely standing on university property at the time, and was unable afterwards to secure any redress when he identified the constable who had allegedly mistreated him. It is not surprising that Marxism was a subject of heated discussion among students in and out of the rooming houses and restaurants that crowded the old streets on the western

border of the campus of those days. Through a friend who was a member of a left-wing political party I met a number of well-known radicals of the period; and later in London, when I was on a post-doctoral fellowship there, I was asked to speak on Algonkian hunting territories and primitive communism to a Trotskyite enclave of the Independent Labour Party at a meeting somewhere in the slums near King's Cross. Earle Birney and I were often together in those days, both in Toronto and London, and I was reminded of this long afterwards when I read his allusion to anthropologists in his autobiographical novel, "Down the Long Table". Nevertheless, I never became a Marxist, nor did I put forward my belief in the pre-European system of collective ownership of the eastern tribes for ideological reasons, as I have stated in my chapter entitled "Reappraisals" that appeared in the forefront of the second edition of my book, *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures*; nor can I state that my book had been neglected by the anthropological establishment of the United States of America because of its possible use as an instrument of aid and comfort to the enemy. Such an idea seems to me to be absurd. Nevertheless Speck and Loren C. Eiseley in their paper on the "Significance of Hunting Territory Systems of the Algonkian in Social Theory" made no mention of my work although they took issue with Jenness's position.¹⁹ It was remarkable how imperfect was their acquaintance with colonial history, as when they stated that European institutions could not have been an influence on the Indians because the fur trade, they wrote, did not become important until late in the seventeenth century; or because the Penobscot had had no contact with the Hudson's Bay Company, an altogether irrelevant fact. Not until 1952 when Eleanor Leacock's doctoral dissertation was published by University Microfilms was a strong counter-attack made on the bastions of the establishment.²⁰ This was followed in 1963 by Edward S. Rogers' paper on the Mistassimi in which he ranges "Stewart, Leacock, Jenness, and Bailey" on one side of the argument and "Cooper, Speck, and Eiseley" on the other, with the odds in favour of the former.²¹

It may seem strange that I was not aware of the later phases of this controversy, but the truth is that I had perforce become absorbed in other matters. A demanding regimen at the New Brunswick Museum from 1935 to 1938 was followed by a heavy teaching schedule at the University, since I was for the first seven years the only incumbent of the department. Courses in British, European, American, Latin American and Canadian fields had to be covered, and to these I added, after three years here, the course in anthropology, as well as a course in a subject I had read much on while in school, namely Chinese History. Added to these was an honours course in what I came to call the "Theory of History and Ethnology" and which has a particular bearing on the theme which I am trying to outline in this paper. But I must add that I had, in addition to my teaching duties, been asked to assume three concurrent administrative positions, one of which was, under the ambiguous and misleading title of Honorary Librarian, that of chief executive officer of the University Library which was at the time, I am confident, the poorest academic library in Canada, containing, as it did, not more than fifteen thousand largely uncatalogued books, only a proportion of which had been well-chosen for the purposes they were supposed to serve. My at-

tempt to develop a programme of graduate studies under grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, having been frustrated by this condition, which I have just described, I was willing to undertake to administer and to develop the Library at the request of the president, Dr. Milton Gregg, and which I succeeded in doing, over a fifteen-year period with the backing of Lord Beaverbrook and with the authority and cooperation of President Gregg's successors, Presidents Trueman and Mackay.

In the years of which I am speaking the limited edition of my Algonkian book became virtually exhausted. The time came when the Museum was unable to accede to requests for copies that came from such unexpected places as Yugoslavia and Poland. It was this situation that led to the publication of a second edition which did not have to wait thirty years, as had the first, for a review in the *American Anthropologist*, and it began to become evident to me that a marked change had taken place in the intellectual climate in the intervening period. Although the reviewer in that periodical was not altogether uncritical he conceded that I had a good eye for details indicating continuity and change, and he paid me a sort of left-handed compliment when he wrote that "as Algonkian ethnohistory is still so much a vale of ignorance that vision of any sort is a rare thing, one-eyed men are counted kings, and books like this must rank as classics."²² The emergence of the field of ethnohistory in the United States was signalled by the founding in 1954 of a periodical of that name, in the pages of which Donald Smith published an encouraging review.²³ In Canada too a marked change had taken place in the establishment throughout the country of departments of anthropology, of which, as I have said, none had existed at the time that the dissertation had been written. The book now came under the eye of Canada's leading anthropologist devoted to the study of ethnohistory. In the *Canadian Historical Review*, Bruce Trigger of McGill gave it as favourable an appraisal as I had any right to expect.²⁴ A few years later, in reviewing my book of essays, *Culture and Nationality*, in the *American Anthropologist*, in September, 1975, he expressed the opinion that my earlier work had prefigured Spicer's *Cycles of Conquest* and the development of American Indian ethnohistory. Had it been heeded, continues Professor Trigger, the evidence it contains concerning Montagnais hunting territories "might have cut short the prolonged debate about the origin of these territories."²⁵

Many years before what I take to be this vindication of my position on that subject, I had begun to apply anthropological concepts to historical interpretation having nothing directly to do with the Amerindian. When in 1934 I enrolled in the London School of Economics on a post doctoral fellowship, with the sociologist, Morris Ginsberg, instead of Malinowski, which had been my original intention, I had planned to generalize my study of culture-contact by endeavouring to determine the role of this phenomenon as a factor in world history.²⁶ Through Ginsberg's good offices I was able to discuss this question with Arnold Toynbee whose early volumes had just been published and whose plan for the continuation of his "Study of History" included a section on the contacts of civilizations in space.²⁷ Although a few years later I gave a course on

Toynbee at the University of New Brunswick, which I believe was the first such course ever given anywhere, there were aspects of his work which I found difficult to accept.²⁸ On the other hand, as I have stated in my article on "The Impact of Toynbee", the arguments of some of his critics, notably Peter Geyl, I thought unconvincing.²⁹ What I found especially valuable in Toynbee was the way in which he addressed himself to the questions of the influence of race and environment on the genesis and growth of civilizations, and their recurrent failures to sustain the high levels of integration and achievement once reached. With respect to these matters the factor of contact and spread of sociocultural influence seemed to me to be fundamental to the study of the whole subject, as I think could be illustrated endlessly. One perhaps need only think of the efflorescence of Persian poetry in the 10th century resulting from the stimulus of Arabic literary culture; or the implication of Grahame Castor's statement concerning the fusion of the ethical systems of Christianity, Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism in the early Renaissance.³⁰ While such a convergence would seem clearly to imply a sharpening of the intellectual faculties, it must be recognized as selective in terms of the value-systems prevailing in any community, and thus determining the character of that community's receptivity to all influences both internal and external. The human spirit will seek to attain to perfection in the forms that seem mete to its purposes and aspirations. Those who try hardest and come closest to the attainment of the ideal, as entertained in a particular time and place, will be acclaimed and emulated. Thus one thinks of Carleton Parker who wrote "In Florence around 1300, Giotto painted a picture . . . the day it was hung in St. Marks the town closed down for a holiday, and the people with garlands of flowers and songs escorted the picture from the artist's studio to the church."³¹ It was clearly because of the emphasis given to distinction in this and kindred arts that men strove to excel in them, until a climax was reached in the work of Leonardo, Michael Angelo and Raphael. As Gustav Spiller put the matter, Raphael "lived in an age when the art of painting had . . . reached the stage when the ideal of the painters, which had been more and more closely approached for some three centuries, was on the verge of being fully realized."³² That the validity of the claim that geniuses cluster at such points, whatever their field of endeavour may be, cannot well be contested, is the inescapable implication to be drawn from the work of such scholars as Spiller and Kroeber.³³ One is therefore compelled, I believe, to reject the views of Whistler and Alfred Weber that great expressions of the imagination are unpredictable, sporadic, and without known cause.³⁴ The comparative study of growth, as well as the decline of creativity through the emergence of coercive instruments, which, in an address at McGill in 1975 I characterized as "ecumenical ethnohistory", must take account of these phenomena as functions of sociocultural structures serving peoples in their attempts to satisfy needs of all kinds, and to fulfill expectations entertained by them, whatever they might be.³⁵

Early in the nineteen-forties I undertook a cultural history of Canada, never completed, in the belief that a study conducted with such a method might throw light, not only on the phases of great world cultures, but equally the sparse and attenuated processes characteristic of such peripheral societies as those of the

British provinces in North America in the nineteenth century. In the case of Nova Scotia a measure of prosperity, a growing diversity of occupation, an enlargement of public intelligence through appropriate institutions, all subsumed, as I tried to demonstrate, the literary achievements of Haliburton.³⁶ Likewise, in the immediate aftermath of Confederation, Ontario experienced a not dissimilar development marked by, among other things, a refinement of technological skills, a specialization of the professions, the application of steam-power to the printing presses, new university foundations, and many other symptoms of social differentiation.³⁷ That these peripheral societies might now more nearly emulate the achievements of the overseas metropolis can be seen, for example, in the mind of the Brantford girl, Sara Jeanette Duncan, reared in an area where American and British influences comingled.³⁸ The sources of the stimuli that she experienced, as can be gleaned from her novel, *The Imperialist*, compel one to look upon the frontier thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner as inadequate to the exigencies of the phenomena here being considered, since what was conducive to a rude democracy could not be regarded as a means to a creative expression in the arts or a proliferation of works of the speculative intellect. Without going further into these matters, which time does not allow, I should say in conclusion, that I have tried to show some of the ways in which I found the study of anthropology helpful in the tasks that I undertook to accomplish. Historians will rightly differ as to the means they may choose to attain their ends. Whatever these may be, I believe it would be generally conceded that the ultimate purpose of all humane studies, including history, must be the evocation of the true image of what man is, what he once was, and what he may yet become.

NOTES

¹ An unpublished paper written in 1976 on *Alfred Goldsworthy Bailey and Canadian Anthropology* by Victor E. O'Connell, B. Litt., D. Phil. (Oxon). *Anthropology* by Victor E. O'Connell, B. Litt., D. Phil. (Oxon).

² Order-in-Council of the New Brunswick Government, writs for an assembly not having yet been issued, under date of December 13th, 1785, was as follows.

“Present the Governor, Mr. G. Ludlow, Mr. Hazen, and Mr. Odell.

Took into consideration the memorial of Dr. William Paine and others praying a charter of incorporation to be granted for the institution of a Provincial Academy of Arts and Sciences: also a memorial of the principal officers of the disbanded corps and other inhabitants of the County of York praying that part of the reserved lands round Fredericton may be appropriated to the use of the proposed Academy.

Ordered that the attorney and solicitor general be directed with all convenient speed to prepare the draft of a Charter for the establishment of the said institution.”

³ Sir Grafton Elliot Smith, *Elephants and Ethnologists* (London and New York, 1924).

⁴ Varying accounts of functionalism are to be found in *Images of Man, a History of Anthropological Thought*, by Anne Marie de Waal Malefijt (New York, 1974), pp. 181-214; and Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture* (New York, 1968), pp. 514-567. For statements at first hand, see Bronislaw Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays* (Chapel Hill, 1944), Chapter

HISTORICAL PAPERS 1977 COMMUNICATIONS HISTORIQUES

VII, *The Functional Analysis of Culture*, pp. 67-74; and A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (London, 1952) pp. 178-204.

⁵ George Henry Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, *The Clash of Culture and Contact of Races in the Pacific* (1927), and; William Christie MacLeod, *The American Indian Frontier* (London, 1928).

⁶ Alfred G. Bailey, "The Significance of the Identity and Disappearance of the Laurentian Iroquois", *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, sect. 2, XXVII (1933), pp. 97-108.

⁷ R.S. MacNeish, *Iroquois Pottery Types: A Technique for the Study of Iroquoian History*, National Museum of Canada Bulletin 124, Anthropological Series, (Ottawa, 1952). William A. Ritchie, *Traces of Early Man in the Northeast*, New York State Museum and Science Service Bulletin 358 (University of the State of New York, June, 1957).

⁸ James F. Pendergast, *Three Prehistoric Iroquois Components in Eastern Ontario: The Salem, Grays Creek, and Beckstead Sites*, National Museum of Canada, Bulletin 208, (Ottawa, 1969).

⁹ Emma Helen Blair, *The Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley and Region of the Great Lakes*, vol. I (Cleveland, 1911), p. 42.

¹⁰ Bruce G. Trigger, "Who Were the Laurentian Iroquois?" *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, III (November, 1966), p. 211. Other statements by Professor Trigger that should be consulted are "Archaeology and Other Evidence: A Fresh Look at the Laurentian Iroquois", *American Antiquity*, vol. 33, no. 4 (October), 1968, p. 437; "Trade and Tribal Warfare on the St. Lawrence in the Sixteenth Century", *Ethnohistory*, vol. IX, no. 3 (Summer), 1962; and the volume which he produced in collaboration with J.F. Pendergast, entitled *Cartier's Hochelaga and the Dawson Site*, (Montreal, 1972). The most searching examination of the problem of Hochelaga, and in a larger sense, of the St. Lawrence Iroquoians, is made in this work of collaboration between Professor Trigger and Lt. Col. Pendergast. In the light of their findings, if I understand them aright, there is no uncertainty that the "Dawson Site", is in fact, Hochelaga as traditionally regarded. It seems more likely to have been a satellite town. Although the archaeological findings on that site indicate a culture closely similar to Onondaga, it might be nearer the truth to regard the people encountered by Cartier as a distinct group of Iroquoian-speaking people, having a language, that is to say, closely related to but not the same as Huron. I believe it is not thought that there is much difference between the languages spoken at Hochelaga and Stadacona. It now seems possible that these peoples, weakened by disease, were decimated, driven away, or partly absorbed by the Hurons or the Lower Iroquois (Mohawk-Onondaga) in their endeavour to push eastward and make contact with the incoming Europeans in the latter part of the Sixteenth Century. Having done so, if they were Mohawks, they then had to force their way into Algonkian territory as they were trying to do in 1603 when Champlain encountered the latter. -A.G.B.

¹¹ W.N. Fenton, "Problems Arising from the Historic Northeastern Position of the Iroquois," in *Essays in Historical Anthropology of North America*, Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, vol. 100 (Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 1940), p. 175; J.J. Heagerty, *Four Centuries of Medical History in Canada* (Toronto, 1928), Vol. 1, p. 270. See also Alfred G. Bailey, "The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, etc.", Chapter 7, *passim*.

¹² For further corroboration of this point see Note 10 above.

¹³ Alfred G. Bailey, *Culture and Nationality*, Carleton Library Series, No. 58, pp. 23-28; see also Alfred G. Bailey, "Overture to Nationhood," *The Literary History of Canada*, ed. C.F. Klinck, (Toronto, 1965), pp. 55-67.

On the adaptation of Indian Studies for literary purposes, see my poems "Hochelaga" in my selected poems, *Thanks for a Drowned Island* (Toronto, 1973), p.

RETROSPECTIVE THOUGHTS . . .

30-31, and "Colonial Set" in *Ninety Seasons, Modern Poems from the Maritimes*, eds. Robert Cockburn and Robert Gibbs, (Toronto, 1974), p. 26.

Something of the subject's literary fortunes not treated in this address may be gleaned from the following: (1) Desmond Pacey, "A.G. Bailey", *Canadian Literature*, ed. George Woodcock, (Spring-Summer), 1976, pp. 49-61; (2) M. Travis Lane, "The Muskrat in His Brook", *The Fiddlehead*, No. 100, (Winter), 1974, pp. 95-101; Northrop Frye, *The Bush Garden* (Toronto, 1971), pp. 17-18; A.J.M. Smith, Review of *Thanks for a Drowned Island*, *Dalhousie Review*, 53 (1974), pp. 752-755; A.J.M. Smith, Review of *Literary History of Canada*, *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 35 (1965), pp. 108-109.

¹⁴ A.G. Bailey, *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures*, Monograph No. 2, New Brunswick Museum, (Saint John, N.B.), 1937, pp. 84-95.

¹⁵ Diamond Jenness, *The Indians of Canada*, (Ottawa, 1932), p. 124.

¹⁶ *Canadian Historical Review*, vol. 19, 1938, pp. 82-83. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, vol. 4, 1938, pp. 600-601.

¹⁷ Robert H. Lowie, *Primitive Society* (New York, 1920) pp. 158, 160, 211f.

¹⁸ *The Making of Man*, ed. V.F. Calverton (New York, 1931), pp. 1-37.

¹⁹ Frank G. Speck and Loren C. Eiseley, "Significance of Hunting Territory Systems of the Algonkian in Social Theory" *American Anthropologist*, n.s., XLI (1939), p. 269, p. 280. For my rejoinder to Messrs. Speck and Eiseley, see the chapter of Reappraisals in the forefront of the 1969 edition of my "Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures," p. XX.

²⁰ Eleanor Leacock, "The Montagnais 'Hunting Territory' and the Fur Trade," Columbia University doctoral dissertation, 1952, (University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

²¹ Edward S. Rogers, *The Hunting Group — Hunting Territory Complex among the Mistassini Indians*, National Museum of Canada, Bulletin 195, Anthropological Series 63 (Ottawa, 1963) p. 55.

²² Willard Walker, Review of the *Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, 1504-1700* (2nd ed.), *American Anthropologist*, 72 (1970), pp. 1493-1495.

²³ Donald Smith, Review of *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, 1504-1700* (2nd ed.), *Ethnohistory*, 19 (Winter), 1972, pp. 88-89.

²⁴ Bruce G. Trigger, Review of *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, 1504-1700*, *Canadian Historical Review*, 52 (1971), pp. 183-187.

²⁵ Bruce G. Trigger, Review of *Culture and Nationality*, in the *American Anthropologist*, vol. 77, (September), 1975, pp. 636-637. My rejection of the late Professor Speck's view of this matter is shared by Marvin Harris. See his *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, etc. (New York, 1968), pp. 362, 666. Although he makes no reference to my work in which this rejection was first set forth, he says of Julian Stewart that he cut through the issue of family and individual ownership of land which Speck "had succeeded in bringing to a point of almost complete confusion by his failure to separate acculturation effects from aboriginal patterns." Again without referring to my earlier dissent from Speck's interpretation, Professor Harris, in commenting on a quotation from Lowie, states "To 'stumble' upon an ethnographic fact is one thing; to deliberately set out to look for it is another. Leacock and Knight did not stumble upon the reinterpretation of Algonkian land tenure. They were able to correct Speck because there existed an established body of scientific theory which Speck's description seemed to falsify, thereby demanding that every aspect of his evidence be gone over with the greatest possible skepticism." I think that if my work had been given currency, Professor Harris would have heard of it, and would have written about it in his book.

²⁶ My professor of anthropology in Toronto, T.F. McIlwraith, advised me not to enroll in Malinowski's seminar because, as far as I remember, he thought Malinowski

would look with disfavour on a "contact" study falling within the field of what is now called "ethnohistory", such as I had made at the University of Toronto. Whatever lip-service Malinowski may have paid, from time to time, to historical studies, he confined himself throughout the greater part of his life to synchronic studies under the rubric of functionalism which in practice excluded historical considerations.

²⁷ Toynbee many years later wrote approvingly of my interpretation of his intentions. See the *Study of History*, vol. 12, 1961, pp. 27n., 140, 535n.

²⁸ While giving my course on Toynbee over the years I found it increasingly desirable to seek to make comparisons between his views and those of other theoreticians concerning the course of world history, including those who held a cyclic view as well as the promulgators of linear and progressive interpretations. It may be that the patterns as seen by Sorokin and Brooks Adams would better be compared to a sailing ship tacking into the wind, than to a cycloid. Certainly in the one there is an alternation between sensate and ideational cultures, with an intermediate idealistic phase, and in the other a change-about between societies having at the one time a supernatural sanction, and at the other, an economic *raison d'être*. In time the course became almost an intellectual history of the West with special reference to Greek and Medieval theories, including that of Joachim, as well as Bodin, Vico, Hegel, Marx, Comte, Morgan, the Diffusionists in their attempt to demolish evolutionary schemes, Spengler, Toynbee, and Kroeber, the anthropologist to whom I feel I owe most, for whatever ideas I may have come to entertain concerning the nature and course of cultures, both advanced and "primitive". As far as Toynbee himself is concerned I often saw distinctions where he saw similarities. Nevertheless he showed a remarkable willingness to modify his models in the light of evidence put forward by his critics.

²⁹ Alfred G. Bailey, "The Impact of Toynbee", *Queens Quarterly*, vol. 62, (1955), pp. 100-110. Geyl had criticized Toynbee for using England from 1588 to 1870 as an example of "withdrawal", although Trevelyan had characterized her institutions in this epoch as having passed from the cosmopolitan and corporate to the insular and oceanic. With respect to another case of which Geyl makes much, I wrote in the above-mentioned article (p. 109) that "if Professor Toynbee distorts and simplifies the case in attributing New England dominance in America to the stimulus of hard ground, Professor Geyl contradicts himself in attempting to refute the argument. While rightly stressing the importance of the politics of Europe as a factor in the situation, with one breath he discounts New England influence on the conquest of New Amsterdam in 1664, and in the next informs us that the New Englanders had, through their penetration of that colony, undermined its powers of resistance. It would appear that the case is not yet closed, nor are many like it." See also Peter Geyl, *Debates with Historians*, (New York, 1958), pp. 72-73; and A.J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, vol. 2, 1934, p. 67.

³⁰ Alfred G. Bailey, F.R.S.C., "Toynbee and the Problem of Climaxes in the Development of the Fine Arts", *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, Section II, vol. XLIX, 1955, pp. 17-18. Also Graham Castor, *Pléiade Poetics, A Study in Sixteenth-Century Thought and Terminology*, (Cambridge, 1964), p. 135.

³¹ Carleton H. Parker, *The Casual Labourer, and Other Essays*, p. 58-59, quoted by J. Crosby Chapman and George S. Counts, *Principles of Education*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1924), p. 317.

³² Gustav Spiller, *The Origin and Nature of Man*, (London, 1935), pp. 343-353.

³³ Alfred L. Kroeber, in his comprehensive text, *Anthropology* (New York, 1948), has made an illuminating approach to the study of the growth, apogee, and decline of "whole culture-patterns and of individual style-patterns of which they are composed, using the latter term to describe continua of all kinds, technical, institutional, expressionist and ideological. In another work, *Configurations of Cultural Growth* (Los Angeles, 1944) he has provided us with a pioneer work, which, however, hardly goes beyond the descrip-

RETROSPECTIVE THOUGHTS . . .

tive. But in the work first mentioned he finds that such patterns grow through successions of creative acts until a high point of perfectability is reached. The pattern thus attains to the most complete fulfilment of its potentialities, and unless some stimulus from without evokes a new creative response it will become progressively repetitious and sterile. A yet more abstract definition of the kind of phenomenon illustrated by Spiller with reference to the achievements of Raphael and other painters is to be found in Morris Ginsberg's book, *Studies in Sociology* (London, 1932), in which he describes (pp. 79-80) "evolution as a process in which the potentialities of a continent are realized predominantly by way of immanent causality and to a relatively minor extent by way of transeunt causality." The implication is that a strong force could transform and even virtually destroy what Kroeber calls a style pattern before it has fulfilled its potentialities. It is doubtful whether the problem of the relationship of, say, creativity in the arts with degrees of political freedom, or relative repressiveness, has yet been examined with the thoroughness that the importance of the subject deserves. While Toynbee treats the breakdowns of societies in terms of moral failure, he has made only tentative inroads into the question of the possible coordination of such areas as religion, literature, and the plastic arts, with a measure of political stability and material prosperity or, at the other end of the scale, the failure to achieve and maintain these conditions. Latterly Don Martindale has written suggestively concerning the affect of coercive political systems on creative expressions. See his *Social Life & Cultural Change*, (Princeton, 1962). I am grateful to Professor Noel Iversen of the Sociology Department of the University of New Brunswick for calling my attention to this work.-A.G.B.

³⁴ Alfred G. Bailey, *Culture and Nationality*, p. 60. Also Morris Ginsberg, *Sociology*, (London, 1934), pp. 46-47.

³⁵ For the varieties of the use of the term "ethnohistory" see Margaret T. Hogen, *Anthropology, History, and Cultural Change*. Viking Fund Publication in Anthropology, no. 52, published for the Wenner-Gren Foundations, etc. (Tucson, 1972), pp. 19-23. The word "ecumenical", as here used is, of course, derived from the word used by A.L. Kroeber in the title of his essay, "The Ancient Oikoumenê as a Historic Culture Aggregate." See his *The Nature of Culture*, (Chicago, 1952), pp. 379-395.

³⁶ Alfred G. Bailey, "Creative Moments in the Culture of the Maritime Provinces", *Dalhousie Review*, vol. 29, (October, 1947), pp. 231-244; republished in *Culture and Nationality*, etc. pp. 44-57, and elsewhere. For comment on this article see Letters to A.G. Bailey from President Sidney Smith and Professor John Bartlett Brebner, Bailey Papers, Department of Special Collections and Archives, Harriet Irving Library, University of New Brunswick. See also A.G. Bailey, *The Historical Setting of Haliburton's Reply: introduction to Haliburton's Reply to the Earl of Durham, London, 1839*. ed. Michael Gnarowski, (Ottawa, 1976).

³⁷ Alfred G. Bailey, *Culture and Nationality*, pp. 64-66.

³⁸ Alfred G. Bailey, "The Historical Setting of Sara Duncan's The Imperialist", *Journal of Canadian Fiction*, vol. II, no. 3, Special Issue, (Summer), 1973, pp. 205-210. See also Alfred G. Bailey, "Evidences of Culture Considered as Colonial", in *Culture and Nationality*, pp. 178-199, for a treatment of the cultural relationship of metropolis and colony.