révolutionnaires, en les traitant même de menteurs puisque, se disant nationalistes, ils sont en fait communistes et internationalistes et, se disant indépendantistes, ils sont en fait soumis à Moscou !

Alors, quand Dieu s'est retranché dans l'isoloir, quelle case a-t-il cochée ? Le vote démocratique étant secret pour que sa liberté soit protégée, il est par définition difficile de le savoir. Les évêques, ses représentants officiels, ne nous sont pas d'un grand secours puisqu'ils ont refusé de prendre parti. Une lecture de l'Evangile qui permît de départager le oui et le non n'était pas accessible au premier venu et l'archevêque de Montréal, qui le demandait à ses fidèles, leur posait une véritable colle. Les politisés chrétiens s'y sont risqués, mais ils n'ont pu faire mieux qu'aboutir à un oui tactique inspiré par des préoccupations assez distantes de l'enjeu référendaire. Quant aux Bérêts Blancs, leur identification des séparatistes avec les communistes et de ces derniers avec les suppôts de Lucifer paraîtra aussi peu convaincante qu'extravagante.

Incertain donc le vote de Dieu. On a même l'impression qu'il n'a pas participé au scrutin. Je suis frappé plus que tout en effet par la tiédeur démontrée par le catholicisme québécois à l'égard du nationalisme qui reçoit la même épithète, alors pourtant que l'enjeu essentiel du référendum tournait autour de cette réalité. Quelle différence sous ce rapport avec l'attitude de l'épiscopat canadien-français il y a un siècle, lorsque la constitution confédérative avait été rédigée et adoptée ! Les évêques d'alors s'étaient montrés accomodants sur une question aussi épineuse que le divorce, dans l'intérêt du groupe canadien-français, autrement dit au nom de préoccupations nationalistes.

Mais en 1980, Dieu, dirait-on, a progressé et s'est libéralisé. Il plane plus que jamais au-dessus des questions nationales. C'est ce qui me fait douter qu'il ait vraiment voté au scrutin du 20 mai.

Roger Lapointe

SHINGWAUK
PROJECT
ART: MISS.
cop.#1
(10)

David Nock

The failure of the CMS native church policy in southwestern Ontario and Algoma*

E. F. Wilson was sent out by the Church Missionary Society (CMS) to southwestern Ontario in 1868. He arrived at London, the see city of Huron on July 22, 1868, with the somewhat vague instructions 'simply to go first to . . . Dr. Cronyn . . . and from thence to travel around and select what might seem to be the best spot to make the centre for a new mission.'[1]

Settled eventually near Sarnia, Wilson's mission to the southwestern Ojibway lasted only three years, from 1868 to 1871. He spent another year under the Society's auspices in Sault Ste. Marie. By 1873, however, all support for Wilson's mission was severed, and Wilson began his career which lasted until 1893 as a freelance missionary and teacher.

Under Henry Venn, the long-time honorable secretary of the CMS, exciting experiments in the process of indigenizing the Christian church among the natives were attempted. The times were wrong for such experiments to succeed. In non-settler colonies, success came to his plans only when decolonization was under way. In settler colonies such as Ontario, Henry Venn's ambitious plans were likely to fail since the British settlers, including Bishop Cronyn and eventually E. F. Wilson himself, had grave doubts about the appropriateness or possibility of creating an indigenous church among the Indians.

The desire of the CMS that Wilson institute an indigenous native church among the Indians of southwestern Ontario failed, but the reasons for that failure tell us much about the missionary and imperial forces at work in the nineteenth century, and about the process of colonization itself.

The CMS had as its first aim conversion; its second aim was to set up a native church of indigenous pastors and bishops. The CMS wished to evangelize the world in one or two generations. These goals entailed two likely corollaries: a tolerance of other Christian bodies (the Roman Catholic church was not included under this rubric and was looked upon virtually as the whore of Babylon); and the use of native personnel as catechists, clergy, and even bishops. Although the CMS encouraged its missionaries to bring along some of the accomplishments and accoutrements of civilization, its missionary was to seek the 'euthanasia' of his own position; he was there to save souls, train the local people to take over their own mission, and then to exit to a new field of endeavour.

If Wilson had entered a field mainly inhabited by the heathen, his mission to the Ojibway would no doubt have been justified despite their

* This paper was presented at the Western District Historical Conference, October 14, 1979.

1 E. F. Wilson, *Missionary Work Among the Ojibway Indians* (London: SPCK, 1886), 14.

David Nock is Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

SR 9/3, pp. 269-85 / été/summer 1980 / imprimé au Canada/printed in Canada

meagre numbers (a total of 1,300 souls in five communities). Instead, he entered a field already occupied by the Methodists for over forty years. Some of these early Methodist missionaries included Thomas Hurlburt, William Ryerson, Jonathan Scott, Conrad Vandusen, Shahwundais (John Sunday), William Case, Egerton Ryerson, James Evans, and Kahkewaquonaby (Peter Jones).[2] As early as 1824 a Methodist missionary society had been organized in Upper Canada. Methodist missions had been established at New Credit, Walpole Island, Sarnia, Stony and Kettle Points, Muncey, Oneida, and Saugeen. A publication on the Ontario Indian writes, 'The Methodists had long supported a school and a missionary on the Sarnia Reserve and had a good church attendance.[3] The historian of the Saugeen Indians writes of the Methodists that 'They were by far the most active religious group converting the Indians of Upper Canada in the first half of the nineteenth century.'[4]

In consequence, by the 1860s the greater proportion of the southern Ojibway had already been converted, either to the Methodist connection or to the Roman Catholics. Anglicans had been relatively absent from the field except among the Iroquois confederacy and among the Indians at or near Garden River where a mission had been maintained since 1832. Even in the Algoma region pagans were few by the 1860s. The Rev. James Chance was missionary at Garden River from 1854 to 1871. His widow in the late 1890s wrote a memoir of her husband's life and in it there is a chapter on the conversion of the last heathen in Algoma.[5]

The truth is that, by the time of Wilson's arrival, there was little room or opportunity for any appreciable number of conversions. There remained a small percentage of pagans, but they had ample opportunity to receive the Gospel of Christ. In Wilson's original mission in southwestern Ontario there were perhaps 300 or so Indians who remained heathen by choice.

In one of his earliest letters to the CMS, Wilson did not hide the fact that he had invaded the Methodist field. About Sarnia he wrote, 'the majority Methodist, a few pagans, about 14 families belonging to the Church (i.e., Church of England) and crying out for a missionary.'[6] This letter is of significance since it indicated that Wilson was mostly concerned with the already converted Anglican Indians, and that Wilson was ready to accept this definition of the situation of himself as a pastor, rather than as a missionary to the non-Christian. At Kettle Point, the Indians were 'half Methodists, several pagans, about 7 families anxious for a Church Mission-

2 Biographies of Hurlburt, Ryerson, Scott, Vandusen, and Shahwundais can be found in Marc La Terreur (ed.), *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. 10 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972). See also Peter S. Schmalz, *The History of The Saugeen Indians* (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1977), 23.
3 *Indians of Ontario, An Historical Review* (Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch, 1966), 28.
4 Schmalz, *History of the Saugeen Indians*, 23. See also Elizabeth Graham, *Medicine Man to Missionary* (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1975).
5 Mrs. J. Chance, *Our Work Among the Indians* (London, 1897). Mrs. Chance spoke of 'the unspeakable satisfaction' of coverting the last pagan at Garden River (34).
6 Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa (PAC), Reel A-80, Wilson to the CMS Secretariat, November 2, 1868. The following summary in the text is from the same letter. Substantive missionary efforts begin at the St. Clair Reserve in the 1830s. See Graham, *Medicine Man to Missionary*, 38.

ary': at New Credit there were a 'majority Methodists . . . about 7 families anxious for a Church Mission.' Sable 'used formerly to be a good proportion of Church people, but now from neglect have nearly all become Methodists. About 6 or 7 persons still desire a Church Mission.' Cape Croker was 'chiefly Jesuit and Methodist. A Church catechist is paid by the Diocesan Society and about 20 people attend the services on Sunday.' Despite the gloomy picture above—that there were no wastes of heathen—Wilson only rejected one possible cure because of the preponderance of Methodists—Saugeen which 'appear[ed] to be nearly all Methodists.' In truth, there were only a handful of heathen, and E. F. Wilson was virtually a missionary without pagans.

The CMS had been ignorant of the true situation in the Huron and Algoma regions. If they had been aware of the facts, Wilson would likely not have been dispatched to the region. In December 1869, the CMS committee admitted that they 'had no idea of the preoccupation of the field by other missionary Agencies to the extent which you say and statistics exhibit.'[7] So dismayed was the Committee that it told its agent rather bluntly that had they known of the strength of the Methodist missions in the region, 'Their general principles would have been against their entrance upon such a field.'[8]

As a committed Evangelical, the CMS Secretary Henry Venn was more concerned with conversion than with poaching amongst other Protestant bodies. Jean Usher writes that Venn, 'who urged upon all his missionaries the necessity of maintaining fraternal relations with other Protestant missions, was more concerned with winning souls for Christ than with extending the organization of the Church of England.'[9] Wilson was directly ordered to 'maintain a friendly intercourse with other Protestant societies.'[10] The CMS, having been apprized of the lack of pagan souls, was obviously distinctly embarrassed and themselves talked in terms of having to '*justify* their interference with other Missionary Agencies at work in Huron'[11] (italics mine).

How did Wilson respond? Quite clearly, he looked upon the Methodists as rivals and ignored the CMS guidelines for careful cooperation. Signs of possible conflict had been evidence from the very beginning at Sarnia. Agreement for the establishment of the mission had to be obtained from the band council. Wilson wrote in his autobiography: 'We expected there would be a little difficulty at first, as the Methodists were already in the field, and might oppose our coming. . . .'[12]

The council agreed to allow Wilson on the reserve, but trouble flared up again when Wilson tried to build a church on land donated by an Indian named Antoine Rodd:

7 PAC, Reel A-76, C. C. Fenn to Wilson, December 31, 1869.
8 Ibid.
9 Jean Usher, *William Duncan of Metlakatla: A Victorian Missionary in British Columbia* (Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1969), 18.
10 PAC, Reel A-76, Fenn to Wilson, December 31, 1869.
11 Ibid.
12 Wilson, *Missionary Work* (see n. 1 above), 20.

The difficulty is that no Indian has power to dispose of his own land, consequently the Indian whose land we are building on can only grant us the use of his land during his own lifetime and even this had been called in question by some of the Methodist party who oppose it.[13]

Nor did Wilson trim his behaviour to fit in with CMS guidelines. Faced with opposition from the Methodists, he pushed ahead and acted towards them with little less hostility than he would have exhibited towards Roman Catholics. Writing about this delay to build a church, he wrote:

I'am at present in communication with Government on the subject.... In the meantime we are continuing to build without heeding our opponents; this may seem rather rash to some people, but winter is coming on and we are anxious to get our work forward and trust to God for the issue....[14]

Since the band chief Wawanosh was a member of the Anglican minority, the Methodists went so far as to threaten his leadership status. It would seem that membership in religious denominations had become a factor in band factionalism.[15] Wilson was finally able to resolve the matter by petitioning the Canadian government which came to a decision favourable to the Anglicans.

Nor was this denominational squabbling to end when Wilson left Sarnia for Garden River late in 1871. Matters continued to make a mockery of Henry Venn's hope that the time would come when 'Churches composed of Bible Christians ... will outgrow the denominational features in which they were cast.'[16] Almost as soon as he arrived there, Wilson arranged for a day-school, engaging a young lady as school mistress at 60 pounds per annum, with her brother hired to take care of the Garden River post office and wharf and also to do some evening teaching. Soon however, Wilson had to write the following lines:

Already the Wesleyan Methodists have sent a school teacher here to *Garden River*.... It is a most unjustified proceeding, their sending a teacher here, as at present time, there is not a single family on the Reserve belonging to that Denomination ... and their only object can be to decoy away and proselytize our people. I think it would be only right for the Committee to communicate with the Hon. Joseph Howe, Secretary of State, who is at the head of the Indian Department, to request interference. I have already ... mentioned the inconvenience arising from the situation of our present school on *this side* of Garden River. The Methodists have taken advantage of this and have opened a school in the very midst of our people.[17]

Wilson's anger at this intervention was unbounded. Several months later he wrote that the Methodists seemed 'determined to thwart us in every possible way.'[18] He didn't leave protest over this state of affairs to the CMS sitting far from the scene of action, but had written to Howe himself, to the Rev. Enoch Wood 'the leading Methodist in Toronto,' and to the Toronto daily papers. Wilson was determined that his flock should not be lured by the Methodists. He wrote, 'The Indians here are all firmly attached to the Church—and have been so since first they embraced Christianity 40 years

13 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to the CMS Secretariat, November 2, 1868.
14 Ibid.
15 For band factionalism between Roman Catholics and Protestants see Schmalz, 'Sectarianism at Cape Croker,' in *History of the Saugeen Indians* (see n. 2 above), 191-209.
16 Usher, *William Duncan* (see n. 9 above), 18.
17 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to C. C. Fenn, January 9, 1872.
18 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Fenn, March 6, 1872.

ago.'[19] This may have been so, but the Methodists had sent preachers to Sault Ste. Marie in the past,[20] and it is arguable that they had as much right to intervene as Wilson had in southwestern Ontario. What is clear from this dispute is that denominational squabbles, on both sides, had superceded Evangelical distaste for divisiveness.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Wilson's behaviour and attitudes had engendered much of this climate of unseemly sheepstealing. Wilson's dislike for the Methodists was clear very early on in the history of his mission. In a summary of Wilson's letter to the CMS Lay Secretary, the latter mentioned Wilson's own avowal of his 'interfering' with the Methodists. The letter, dated February 3, 1869,[21] went on to show Wilson's lack of esteem for Methodists and how far he had fallen away from a spirit of conciliation a brief eight months after his entry to the field: 'Fears that there is little *spiritual* life among the Methodists. If their preachers were more earnest men "with the one end in view" he should feel "more delicacy about interfering with their work."'[22]

Wilson's conflict with the Methodists was still evident nearly a decade later after he had left the CMS. He accused the Methodists of the shocking charge (for Evangelical clergy) of encouraging their charges to drunkenness:

A good deal has been said of the wonderful progress of the Methodist Indian Mission at Garden River. As the Church of England clergymen at present representing that place, I have hitherto said nothing; but when it comes to the Methodists taking two of our prominent Church members to a Camp Meeting up the Lake, and bringing them back in a state of intoxication for which he got 15 days in the gaol, I think it is time to disabuse the public mind, as to the prosperity of that mission and to assert in simple words that although the Methodists have been using their utmost endeavours to alienate the Indians (since the time of our fire in 1873) from us, they have hitherto been entirely unsuccessful, as not a single Indian on the Garden River Reserve as far as I am aware, belongs to their denomination, unless perchance they have persuaded this unfortunate man in gaol to join them.[23]

There are a number of important points raised by the above situation. Did Wilson realize from the first that he would be more of a pastor than a missionary in a region already preoccupied? Did he realize the strength of the Methodists and the paucity of pagans? Did he enter this mission more at the initiative of Bishop Cronyn of Huron than from the CMS? Further study indicates an affirmative answer to the above questions.

Bishop Cronyn, an Evangelical bishop, was in a financial squeeze in his fast-growing diocese. The Indians tended to get overlooked since there were not even enough clergy or funds for the white settlements. One reason for the Bishop's trip to England in 1865 was to consult the CMS about the Indians in his diocese. His difficulties had not improved two years later: 'In that year [1867] the clergy in the diocese numbered eighty-eight, and the churches 145. Indeed the Bishop found it very difficult to keep his diocese supplied with pastors for at this time there were twelve vacant missions.'[24]

19 Ibid.
20 Mrs F. Stephenson, *One Hundred Years of Canadian Methodist Missions 1824-1924* (Toronto: Missionary Society of the Methodist Church, 1925), 78.
21 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to the Lay Secretary, February 3, 1869.
22 Ibid.
23 Wilson's Letterbooks, Wilson to the editor the the *Pioneer*, August 13, 1877.
24 Charles H. Mockridge, *The Bishops of the Church of England in Canada and Newfoundland* (Toronto, 1896), 160.

Matters came to a crisis just after Wilson's ordination as deacon. While in England for the first Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops,

> Cronyn interviewed the secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, who told him that the society had decided to reduce its annual grant to the diocese from 1200 pounds to 800 pounds. The reduction meant that assistance to ten missionaries had been withdrawn.[25]

Part of the Bishop's response to this blow was to institute a special fund drive campaign; another was to lay his case before the Evangelical societies: 'I made application to the Church Missionary Society to appoint the Rev. E. F. Wilson missionary to the Indians in the Diocese, and I am happy to say that my application has been granted. . . .'[26]

This convergence of influences is important since the CMS allowed itself to enter a field in which the usual careful research and extensive knowledge of the area had not been gathered. Here was an Evangelical bishop whose diocese was in financial trouble and who wanted support from his Evangelical brothers. The proposed missionary was the offspring of one of the most influential families that had taken a long-standing interest in the Society. The links were even closer since Henry Venn had, earlier in his career, been allied to the Wilson family by patronage. 'In 1834 he [Venn] accepted the living of St. John's Holloway, in the gift of Daniel Wilson, vicar of Islington, which he held till 1848' (six years after he had taken over as Secretary of the CMS).[27]

Wilson met Bishop Cronyn on the latter's visit to England in 1865. Cronyn and his archdeacon Hellmuth 'visited Wilson at Coleshill where he was a farm pupil and persuaded him that the opportunities were far greater in Canada.'[28] Wilson had intended to come to Canada as a farmer. But, he had been in Ontario only three days before the Almighty 'put it into my heart to become a Missionary.'[29] Wilson enlisted in the incipient Huron College (where his father's former curate, the Rev. Isaac Brock, was Principal). It is recorded in a history of the college that Wilson worked in the library.[30] More significant was a summer he spent during those college days. 'That same summer I spent a month or six weeks on an Indian Reserve, and became as people would say, infatuated with the Indians.'[31]

It is significant that Wilson did not go through the socialization process of the CMS' own college, at Islington. He was trained at Huron College far from the influence of Henry Venn and the CMS personnel in England. He was very subject to the influence of his local diocesan bishop and the weight of local opinion. This meant that he was not inculcated, almost brain-washed, in the CMS' ideas of conversion of the world in a generation or two and the Native Church programme. Huron College was very much the

25 J. L. Talman, 'Benjamin Cronyn,' in La Terreur (ed.), *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (see n. 2 above), Vol. 10, 209.
26 P. B. Moore, 'Edward Francis Wilson, Missionary to the Ojibway Indians (unpublished B.Th. thesis, Huron College, London, Ontario, 1959), 4.
27 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 58 (London, c. 1895), 208.
28 Moore, 'Edward Francis Wilson,' 3.
29 Wilson, *Missionary Work* (see n. 1 above), 13.
30 In fact, he was the first librarian of Huron College. See J. J. Talman, *Huron College, 1863-1963* (London, Ontario: Huron College, 1963), 24.
31 Wilson, *Missionary Work*, 13.

personal preserve of Bishop Cronyn who had established it in a somewhat unseemly quarrel with Bishop Strachan over High Church teaching at Trinity College.

Although Wilson's appointment was with the CMS, his migration to Canada, his education, and his specific recruitment to the mission field had all been due to Bishop Cronyn and Archdeacon Hellmuth. If Cronyn wanted a pastor to Anglican Indians and a rival counterweight to the Methodists, it was not unlikely that Wilson would be so influenced.

Wilson's inability to get along with the Methodists was also due to the growing trend among Evangelicals to take seriously the ties of the Church of England. As the nineteenth century wore on, the Evangelicals became less and less friendly with Methodists and dissenters. Charles Simeon, one of the great figures of Anglican Evangelicalism in the first third of the nineteenth century, encouraged this separation, and Bishop Wilson (E. F. Wilson's grandfather) was a friend of Simeon:

> Simeon was fundamentally and essentially an Evangelical of Evangelicals, but not less distinctly a loyal son of the Church of England. The fault which Simeon saw in some of his brother-Evangelicals he was himself most careful to avoid. Indeed, his determined churchmanship gave annoyance to some of his followers, who said that Mr. Simeon was more of a Churchman than a Gospel-Man.[32]

Bishop Neill has described this movement from flirtation with Methodists and other dissenters to a more firm churchmanship as follows:

> There had been a time in the eighteenth century when Evangelical clergymen had followed lines of action doubtfully compatible with loyalty to the Church of their ordination. The influence of Charles Simeon swung the movement the other way, and all the Evangelicals of the first half of the nineteenth century were convinced and devoted churchmen.[33]

That this stricter delimitation of boundaries had been adopted by E. F. Wilson was evident in an article he wrote in 1887:

> For 200 years past at any rate I know my ancestors have been church people. I was never brought up to intermingle with persons of other denominations, indeed I had an innate dread of 'dissenter' as a people below caste. . . .[34]

Given the climate of uncertainty about the mission, several options seemed open to the CMS. One was to move Wilson to its mission at the Red River in Manitoba. Another was to move Wilson to a different spot among the Ojibway. A third option was to leave Wilson where he was in order to build up a native church on the basis of the Christianized Indians. The second option was desired by Wilson. He visited the Great Lakes as far as present-day Thunder Bay. In a missionary tour to northern Ontario he 'was disappointed to discover that they were all Roman Catholics.'[35] In general he concluded 'I was a little disappointed that there was not a larger number of pagan Indians among whom I might look forward to establish Missions in the future.'[36]

32 S. L. Ollard, and G. Crosse, *A Dictionary of English Church History*, (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1912), 560.
33 Stephen Neill, *Anglicanism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1965), 236.
34 E. F. Wilson, 'Our Pagan Indians,' *Algoma Missionary News*, 9/7 (March 1, 1887), 60.
35 Wilson, *Missionary Work*, 63.
36 Ibid., 68.

Wilson seems to have been remiss in informing the CMS about the paucity of pagans further north as well as in southwestern Ontario, or the CMS was somewhat obtuse. Although the aim of conversion could not be accomplished in southwestern Ontario, the CMS decided to leave him there with the hope that he would then be able to carry the Gospel farther afield to other Indians, and free the missionary as well. In November, 1870, Henry Venn wrote that the CMS 'Fully concur on an observation in your last letter that it might be time enough to remove to the northern shore of Lake Superior when you have spent 3 or 4 years in trying to organize the Indians in the Huron Diocese.'[37] As late as August 1871, Henry Venn could still refer to Wilson being 'in a very different position in Garden River from that of Sarnia. In Huron the Indians were surrounded by Christian communities: now you have wastes of heathenism spread before you.'[38]

In explaining why the Native Church plans failed, there are a number of factors to be considered. The Indians were no longer in their pristine state, and had already been subject to a lengthy process of cultural decline and subordination. The European settlers had become the overwhelming majority, and it was clear that supporting a continued separate identity for Indians was hardly on the settlers' agenda. Since the Europeans often saw the natives in their state of decline rather than at their highpoint, they tended to doubt the capabilities of the natives. As a description of the actual state of affairs, their judgement of the Indians may have been closer to reality than many optimists would prefer. But as an analysis of why this decline had come to pass, the settlers were not eager to place the not inconsiderable blame on their own presence. The Indians themselves were split in their opinions on the new religion. Some thought the missionaries ought to be supported at all costs since the benefits of economic, military, and technological success would follow on adoption of the European religion. Others seemed to think that the conquest situation, or at least what one may call the process of marginalization, demanded considerable compensation by Europeans, including financial support from outside for the new religion.

By the late 1860s, the Indians composed in their own native land only three percent of the population. Moreover they were rather scattered and certainly divided among themselves. The Indians were thus less cohesive and effective in resistance to white domination than the Maoris in New Zealand had been. The white settlers quickly came to think of themselves as rightful inhabitants, creators of a new nationality. An editorial in *The Globe* from 1872 suggested that the Indians ought to assimilate as much as any immigrant:

> Englishman and Frenchman, Scot, Irishman, German, and Swede, are content to yield up their boasted nationalities, and mingle in the common Canadian stock. They are not exterminated by becoming Canadians; and neither need the civilized Indian be exterminated, though he share in the same lot, and merge in the common stock our Canadian people. The Indian tribes of Wyandotte, or Ottawa, Mississaguas, Mohawks, or Cayuga, will indeed disappear; but not by extermination or extinction. They will simply be merged into the common stock of the Canadian people, like the clan McNab, the seaforth Mackenzies, or any other body of emigrants who have cast their lot among us, and won thereby a share in the common prosperity of our Province and Dominion.[39]

37 PAC, Reel A-76, Venn to Wilson, November 11, 1870.
38 PAC, Reel A-76, Venn to Wilson, August 29, 1871.

This settler-colonial mentality had certainly affected Huron, and Wilson wrote in early 1870 to the opposition within the diocese of Henry Venn's ideas: 'The Bishop considers that it would be in vain to expect even at a distant period the establishment of a self-supporting native church and in that opinion all the missionaries agree.'[40]

Henry Venn, however, was a man who knew One Great Thing and he was determined to push ahead in all corners of the world. If one is to be critical of Venn it is precisely because he did not take local circumstances and social forces into account. Later in the CMS a more critical analysis of Venn's plans was written by Eugene Stock. Stock pointed out that the prime suitability was in non-settler colonies or independent countries where the local population was large enough to remain the strong majority. Stock wrote that success would result 'in a tropical or semi-tropical country, where the white man is only a traveller or a sojourner,'[41] and pointed to such examples as India, China, and Japan; Stock then pointed to other countries such as Canada and New Zealand 'where the climate invites the immigration of the white man on a large scale, and where, therefore, the white man necessarily and naturally, is the chief factor in the constitution of the Church.'[42] One might argue with Stock whether the main variable was climate. I would suggest that it was population density produced by the method of food production. The point is that Venn did not make any such distinctions.

Thus only ten months after Wilson had warned Venn of the local opposition, Bishop Cronyn was writing in protest to Henry Venn. It is worthwhile to quote at length this important letter by the first Bishop of Huron:

> The plan of erecting a native church under a native pastorate would undo what we have always been labouring to effect, the union of the Indians with their fellow subjects without distinction of race. Under our system the Indians have been recognized as members of our Church, they attend our meetings, they send delegates to our Synods, they contribute to our funds and they are taught to regard themselves as of the same household of faith.... Those who manage the secular affairs of the Indians are beginning to see that the Indians have been too long treated as children and that it is time to deal with them as with their fellow subjects, to grant them the same privileges and to lay on them the same burthens as their white brethren bear.... Were the staple population of the country Indian, and the whites a few scattered ones among them, then a native Church and pastorate would be necessary for them.... But in my diocese the staple population is white and the Indians are few and scattered and we feel it is for their benefit to make them as much and as soon as we can feel that they are one with us as fellow citizens and as fellow Christians.[43]

Although the bishop wished to place the same weights on Indians as whites, and to treat them as adults, he was not so confident as to wish them

39 'Our Indian Reserves,' *The Globe*, 29/56 (March 5, 1872).
40 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to the CMS Committee, February 7, 1870.
41 Eugene Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. 2 (London, 1899), 411.
42 Ibid.
43 CMS Archives, Bishop Cronyn to Henry Venn, December 15, 1870.

management of their own money: 'All who know the character and state of the Indians in this country will agree that they would not be good managers of the fund.'[44] This latter statement may well be true given the state of cultural decline and demoralization among the Indians. However, it is hard to interpret the bishop's letter in any other fashion than to suppose that the settlers felt that it would be easier to survey and control the Indians if they were part of the overall church structure. This is not to deny the humanitarian view; the bishop may have felt that it was a Christian step to allow the Indians the privilege of amalgamation.

Henry Venn took some time, almost ten months, to respond. In his letter, Venn granted the bishop's wishes, but obviously with some distaste. Venn wrote that:

> Our committee, unhappily, differ in judgment from the Church Society of the Diocese of Huron on the two points to which you allude, viz. first, the fusion of the two races in one church and secondly the separate Native Church Fund. The question has often been discussed in the areas of Rupert's Land, New Zealand . . . and other missions. The system of amalgamation naturally presents itself in the first instances, but the promise and results of the two systems, seems, in the judgment of our Committee to be negative to the attempt of amalgamation. But as you say that your diocese see the matter in another light and have long acted upon it, we are bound to give you credit for the knowledge of local circumstances to support your judgment in your case.[45]

Perhaps Venn had good reason for a feeling of some resentment, since the Society had been led into a mission without pagans, and then had been told they could not apply their own system. It must have seemed something like ingratitude on the part of Bishop Cronyn, who so recently had been acting the part of the mitred mendicant. The upshot of this correspondence was the removal of E. F. Wilson to Sault Ste. Marie in September, 1871 which at that time was still in the rather distant cure of the Bishop of Toronto. Venn had lost nothing of his determination that his Native Church plan be implemented. Only three days after writing to Bishop Cronyn, Venn wrote to Wilson that his duties were 'to stir up an aggressive missionary spirit amongst the converted Indians, so that some of them may go out as evangelists among their countrymen, at their own charges or supported by their converted Brethern. . . .'[46]

Despite the opposition of Bishop Cronyn, Wilson did take some steps (both in Huron and later in Algoma) to implement Venn's Native Chuch policy. Even with the support of the bishop and local clergy, great obstacles would have remained.

For example, Wilson had trouble providing Kettle Point with a catechist. Without consulting Henry Venn, Wilson tried to adopt a solution that completely went against the idea of a native agency. He was 'in communication with an Englishman [Burkitt] with a view of engaging him as catechist for Kettle Point, no native forthcoming.'[47] The only reason Burkitt was not engaged was his refusal to come out for less than sixty pounds a year salary. In consequence, although Wilson had not previously been able to

44 Ibid.
45 PAC, Reel A-76, Henry Venn to Bishop Cronyn, August 26, 1871.
46 PAC, Reel A-76, Venn to Wilson, August 29, 1871.
47 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to J. Mee, January 5, 1869.

find an Indian suitable for the post, adversity now spurred him to look harder. 'He is now in treaty with an Indian named Madwayosh for the office. The salary would be $200, equal to 41.3.4.'[48] At first Madwayosh, who was the middle-aged band chief, did well. 'His examination was satisfactory and his "si quis" was read in the church.'[49] But after a tenure of just under one year and a half, Wilson found the chief unsuitable. 'I was not well satisfied with him and I fear I must dispense with his services.'[50]

Wilson's greatest difficulties stemmed from the plans to educate Indians youths for future employment for native agency. At first he undertook to send Wilson Jacobs to the grammar school in Sarnia, but this failed. Then, he took Jacobs and another Ojibway boy named White into his family: 'He gives them 3 hours every day, and allows them $4 each per month towards board and clothing and shall charge this each quarter to the Society unless instructed to the contrary.'[51] This plan did not work either, however. 'The usual result has been that at the end of the quarter school has not been regularly attended and little progress made.'[52] Wilson responded by deducting the allowance, but naturally this had 'caused dissatisfaction.'

By this time Wilson had to acknowledge that the selection and education of native persons as catechists had become his 'greatest and most perplexing difficulty, every plan that I have tried hitherto has failed. . . .'[53] As Wilson realized, the plan of native agency would be 'comparatively fruitless' unless a suitable staff of young men could be trained.

At this juncture, Wilson decided to take matters into his own hands, to board, teach, and oversee the candidates in his own house. But this plan did not work out either, and faced with a reluctance on the part of the Indians to engage in voluntary work and to accept the responsibilities of independence, he virtually came to the conclusion that 'it seems to break down the scheme altogether for Native Agency.'[54]

When Wilson went to Garden River, his faith in his proteges had been shaken since they had been found attending 'Indian dances.' For this he temporarily suspended them. 'Notwithstanding the excellent character they bear and the high profession that they have made of religion, I still fear that they have been all the time deceiving me.'[55] Now his faith in them was completely shattered since they had broken into a dry goods store at Garden River and stolen some goods. Chief Shingwauk had apprehended them in the act. As far as Wilson was concerned, field conditions contradicted theoretical propositions constructed in far-off London, safe from any contact with aboriginal reality:

48 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to the Lay Secretary, January 19, 1869.
49 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to the Lay Secretary, February 3, 1869.
50 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Fenn, July 5, 1870. Madwayosh had attended Upper Canada College in 1847-1848, sent by the government. See Schmalz, *History of the Saugeen Indians* (see n. 2 above), 68. He was obviously a man of some distinction. If he could not satisfy Wilson the search would be difficult.
51 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to E. Hutchinson, January 11, 1870.
52 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Fenn, September 12, 1870.
53 Ibid.
54 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Fenn, January 9, 1872.
55 Ibid.

These are the only two young men among the Indians whom I have ever met that would seem at all suitable to be educated Teachers. There are none of this Garden River Reserve . . . and I feel unwilling to make the attempt again.[56]

Wilson also failed to enact another important point of Venn's native plan—the use of volunteer native labour and the promotion of the idea among the Indians that they ought to pay the costs of their own clergymen. Ultimately, Venn believed the Indians ought to be so seized by Evangelical spirit that they would want to pay for the costs of converting their neighbours as well. Wilson did spend a good deal of effort to persuade the Ojibway that they should pay the costs of their own mission. When he wanted to raise a frame church at Sarnia, he had asked the following questions of a Mr. Leviere, a French Metis resident:

Now, supposing we were to do this, what would the Indians be willing to give? Would they work without pay? I want the white people to see that the Indians are really in earnest; I would like to point to our church and say, 'The Indians built this church without pay, because it was their wish to build a house to God.' Do you think the Indians are ready to do this? Are you ready to give a helping hand yourself?[57]

One particular aspect of this volunteer, self-supporting attitude that Wilson had never been able to instill was a willingness by catechists and teachers to work unpaid. Venn wrote Wilson in 1871: 'The system of paid agency should always be regarded as secondary . . . to the voluntary agency sustained by the love of which "Little Pine" spoke well in Toronto for the extension of Christianity.'[58] Venn went on to describe the conversion of the Maoris. The catechists had received nothing, and they worked at a full-time normal job, only itinerating among their neighbours part of the year.

When food and clothing became dear, their allowances were only a blanket and occasional supplies of flour or potatoes. Under this system the whole population was in a few years prepared for instruction and baptism.[59]

Once again the present author would suggest that Venn's application of his plans suffered in some regions because he did not adequately consider the different levels of development reached by different groups of non-Europeans, and because he did not fully consider the impact of European settlement. The Maori were a more numerous people in a smaller geographical region. They were a semi-settled, horticultural, and fishing people as opposed to many Canadian Indians who were nomadic, hunting, and gathering peoples. The Maori were more culturally homogeneous. Canadian Indians were and are divided into quite different tribes with little historic or cultural affiliation. Finally, the conversion of the Maori under Venn's plans occurred before the overwhelming impact of white settlement, and before the Pakeha-Maori wars occasioned the military defeat, marginalization, and consolidation of the latter into a wider New Zealand church. Among the Ojibway, the process of defeat and marginalization occurred before Venn's attempts to implement his Native Church plans.

56 Ibid.
57 Wilson, *Missionary Work* (see n. 1 above), 22.
58 PAC, Reel A-76, Venn to Wilson, August 29, 1871.
59 Ibid.

Thus in a letter sent in early 1872, Wilson lamented:

The people appear to have had a great deal done for them under the New England Co. so that I have had difficulty even in inducing them to supply fuel and oil for the Church and School . . . the idea seems to be impressed on their minds that everything ought to come from the old country.[60]

The Ojibway chiefs were not oblivious of their marginalization, and expected various forms of compensation. One chief suggested, 'We Indians are too poor to help ourselves, and so we look to you white people who now occupy our hunting grounds to help us.'[61] The very motive for the adoption of Christianity, at least to some extent, was their awe at the power of the whites. Chief Shingwauk saw a paper-folding machine in southern Ontario and commented:

Ah, that is how it is with the English nation, every day they get more wise; every day they find out something new. The Great Spirit blesses them, and teaches them all these things because they are Christians and follow the true religion.[62]

This combination of attitudes—resentment at their marginalization, a desire for material compensation, and a tendency to look to whites as all-powerful beings 'from whom all blessings flow'—was not the most appropriate situation to institute the Native Church.

Another factor which made self-initiative plans difficult was the tendency among missionary groups, especially between Roman Catholics and Protestants, to compete for Indian loyalties by the bestowal of various forms of gifts and favours. The Roman Catholics were very competitive with the Anglicans and Methodists in southwestern Ontario and Algoma.

Evangelicals like Wilson were also reluctant to implement self-government plans because of their interpretation of lax moral behaviour among the Indians. It seems likely that a people placed into marginalization do behave as individuals in a demoralized fashion. This is suggested in the sociological literature on social demoralization by Elliott and Merrill: 'Social demoralization . . . is evident in societies that have been disrupted by forced migration, wars, economic disaster, individual revolution and extremely rapid acceleration.'[63] They also suggest that 'Social disorganization occurs when there is a change in the equilibrium of forces, so that many former expectations no longer apply and many forms of social control no longer function effectively.'[64] Furthermore, 'Much personal disorganization is . . . a result of social disorganization.'[65]

To discuss the incidence of social disorganization is a touchy matter for several reasons. Firstly, many sociologists are now liberal and tolerant of many forms of behaviour which previously they would have seen as pathological or deviant. Secondly, in the case of southwestern Ontario, the

60 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Fenn, January 9, 1872.
61 *Missionary Work*, 103.
62 Chief Shingwauk, 'Little Pine's Journal,' *Algoma Missionary News and Shingwauk Journal*, 1/8 (February 1, 1878), 62.
63 Mabel Elliott and Francis E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization* (4th ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1961), 23.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid.

sources are all from E. F. Wilson. Evangelical clergy were hardly the agency to tolerate what they considered moral indiscretions and may be said to have represented the official culture of ideals rather than the real culture of behaviour.

According to the Ritzenthalers, the Ojibway had been rather chaste in their pre-contact society: 'Apparently Woodland Indian girls were quite modest in their relations with young men, for they were closely watched by their mothers and grandmothers.'[66] Social scientists doing research in the present century have tended to emphasize the freeness of the Ojibway in sexual matters. Dunning makes the following comment:

> Strangers living in Ojibwa territory often label the people stupid, dirty, etc. It seems possible that the crudity and boisterous quality of the joking relationship might contribute to this kind of value judgment. In the same way the people are sometimes labelled immoral. This may be because of the pre-marital expression which is understood as license by foreigners.[67]

Much of the joking (which takes place between specified kinsfolk) concerns disparaging comments on the opposite person's genitals. Landes states that among the Ojibway, 'sex interest is high'[68] and mating was according to 'private inclinations.' Ford K. Brown has emphasized the view of sexual freedom entertained by Evangelicals: 'The lax sexual morality of the age was particularly a source of horror to the Evangelicals. One of the worst of sins, sexual promiscuity was taken as a matter of course beyond other immoralities.'[69]

Wilson did in fact label the Ojibway as immoral. In 1875, after leaving the CMS he wrote the Prime Minister, Alexander Mackenzie that the Ojibway were a difficult people to deal with and were

> low in principle, and are naturally of idle habits and low animal tastes.... [L]iving as they do, whole families in one room, tends to make them filthy in their persons and immoral in their habits....[B]oth men and women are exceedingly loose in their morals.[70]

If it is difficult to tell exactly to what degree Ojibway sexual morality changed after contact with whites, it was obviously the European presence that prompted Indian drinking. It is difficult to judge how much drinking is too much. Wilson certainly thought there was a drinking problem:

> Unhappily there was a considerable amount of whiskey-drinking among the men, and sometimes drunken fights would occur in close proximity to the house. A son of Antoine Rodd's was particularly vicious when under the influence of liquor; once he frightened us all by making a murderous attack on his father with his tomahawk and gun, and the old man had to escape back to the Bush for his life.... We did what we could to try and stem the tide of drunkenness by forming a Temperance society, which a large number of the Indians joined; but a more effectual check has of late years been put upon the terrible practise by the action of the Dominion Government.[71]

66 R. and P. Ritzenthaler, *The Woodland Indians of the Western Great Lakes* (Garden City, NY: Natural History Press, 1970), 39.
67 R. W. Dunning, *Social and Economic Change among the Northern Objibwa* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), 126.
68 Ruth Landes, *Ojibwa Sociology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937), 53.
69 Ford K. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians: The Age of Wilberforce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 21.
70 PAC, R G 10, Vol. 2040, Wilson to the Hon. A. Mackenzie, April 9, 1875.
71 Wilson, *Missionary Work* (see n. 1 above), 43.

That the use of alcohol was sufficiently excessive and not totally the result of Evangelical uprightness expressed in Wilson's reporting is suggested by the number of times alcohol use was tabooed by nativistic Indian prophets in North America.[72]

Finally, Wilson was somewhat apprehensive about the Indians because of their retention of witchcraft beliefs even after they had been converted. Diamond Jenness found strong fears among the Parry Sound Ojibway in 1929 and referred to its belief as 'universal.'[73] Wilson felt compelled to notice

> how superstitious the Indians continued to be even after their acceptance of Christianity. They seemed never to lose altogether their faith in witchcraft, especially in that form by which it was believed that certain persons had power to cause sickness or misfortune to others. They seemed also to have a firm belief in dreams.[74]

Ian Getty has written about 'The Failure of the Native Church Policy of the CMS in the North-West,' and has listed as reasons for this failure 'the reaction of colonial bishops, the unrealistically strict path to conversion adopted by the evangelical CMS missionary, and the missionary's lack of understanding of Indian culture.'[75] It seems that these factors were all present in southwestern Ontario and Algoma.

Wilson became so disillusioned with the Ojibway and with application of Henry Venn's plans, that he suggested that 'Under such circumstances, I feel sure the Committee would not oblige me to enforce the system.'[76] The Ojibway were so far from responding to Henry Venn's enthusiastic plans of voluntary labour that they even regarded a proposition to work without pay 'as an attempt to imposition or trickery.'[77] Less than a year later (about seven months after his move to Sault Ste. Marie) the CMS found that their own missionary, having just been removed from the obstructions of Bishop Cronyn, was unwilling to implement their policies.

Events proceeded rapidly. Wilson wrote this letter to C. C. Fenn and the CMS committee on April 8, 1872. On June 20, 1871 he had sent a letter to Henry Venn asking for support for an industrial training school for the children:

> ... I earnestly trust that we may soon have a seminary for training teachers and children and instructing in farming and various branches of industry. At the N.E. [New England] Co. Institution at Brantford they have 100 children and it answers admirably.[78]

By July 1872, Wilson was in England with an Indian, Bukhwujenene, soliciting funds for the new school. One June 25, the CMS Committee had met and was unable to decide whether to support their independent minded

72 See Vittorio Lanternari, *The Religions of the Oppressed: A Study of Modern Messianic Cults* (New York: Knopf, 1965), 70, 72, 102, 104, 108, 109, 110, 117, 119, 126.
73 Diamond Jenness, *The Objiwa Indians of Parry Island: Their Social and Religious Life* (Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, 1935), 87.
74 Wilson, *Missionary Work*, 56.
75 Ian Getty, 'The Failure of the Native Church Policy of the CMS in the Northwest,' in Richard Allen (ed.), *Religion and Society in the Prairie West* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, University of Regina, 1974), 19-20.
76 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Fenn, April 8, 1872.
77 Ibid.
78 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Venn, June 20, 1871.

missionary or not. On July 2, they met again. The Committee 'do not see their way to undertake a permanent Mission among the Canadian Indians: they hope that some arrangement may be made through the medium of other societies for supplying Garden River either by a Native Catechist, or Industrial Agent.'[79] They gave Wilson six to nine months to wind up his mission in the Great Lakes and then ordered him to the Red River 'to take charge of St. Andrew's Church, vacated by Mr. Gardiner, and to be associated with Archdeacon Cowley.'[80]

Clearly the reason for Wilson's dismissal was the conflict, long in evidence, between Wilson's desire to 'civilize' the Indians as against the CMS' desire to evangelize the heathen. Although concerned with the first, Henry Venn's primary focus was on the second. In the more imperialist climate which became predominant in the 1880s this distinction was less and less observable or important to the new imperialists. In 1890, in a stronger imperialist climate, *The Canadian Church Magazine* wrote:

> ... but the Church Missionary Society objected to support Mr. Wilson as a teacher only, and wanted him to go as a missionary to the North-West. This seems to us a strange mistake. Could there be a more effective missionary than the man who gathers together heathen children and teaches them the Christian faith, and instructs them in the ways of civilization.[81]

As early as December 1869, the CMS had pondered whether to move Wilson to Red River. C. C. Fenn had written at that time that if the Huron plan failed, 'the question would then arise whether you ought not to remove from Huron to some other District nearer the Red River, so as to have a basis of operations in Rupert's Land.'[82] Fenn added that the Committee would not go further into the matter 'as they trust the occasion for raising it may not occur.'[83] The intervening period in Sault Ste. Marie had been an additional failure in the eyes of the CMS. Not only had Wilson failed to implement the Native Church policy, he had actually placed most of his efforts into building a boarding school without receiving CMS permission. Because of his upper middle class background, and strong Evangelical family connections, Wilson did not need CMS support as many other lower class missionaries would have. Although somewhat shaken initially by the CMS decision to abandon him, Wilson was able to raise funding on his own, build the boarding school, and stay in Sault Ste. Marie until 1893.[84]

In the difference of opinion between the CMS and its missionary, it is obvious that Wilson's experience in southwestern Ontario had had considerable importance in his interpretation of events. He acknowledged that the Sarnia Mission had had 'a somewhat depressing effect'[85] in the uncertainty which surrounded its existence. He regretted that 'such continued changes

79 CMS Archives, GLC 1140, P. 162, Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence, July 2, 1872.
80 Ibid.
81 'Historical Sketches, No. 45—Rev. E. F. Wilson,' *The Canadian Church Magazine* 4/45 (March 1890).
82 PAC, Reel A-76, Fenn to Wilson, December 31, 1869.
83 Ibid.
84 See David Nock, 'E. F. Wilson: Early Years as Missionary in Huron and Algoma,' *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 15/4 (December 1973), 78-96.
85 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to the CMS Committee, November 24, 1872.

should have caused considerable expense to the Society.'[86] He did not wish to move once again after such a short period of time.[87] Added to this reluctance to move so many times was his stated concern for the health of his wife. He felt that a move to Manitoba would threaten his wife and he declined to go to 'any place where there would be much "coughing."'[88]

In the eyes of the CMS, the Ojibway mission was a failure. There were not enough pagans to justify it. Methodists and Roman Catholics were already in the field. The Bishop of Huron was opposed to Henry Venn's plans. The missionary himself was lukewarm, and subject to the weight of opinion of the local clergy and settlers. The initial failure to enter the field in the first place was probably due to a naive acceptance of the appeals of Bishop Cronyn and Wilson himself, based on shared Evangelical sympathies.

Although a number of factors contributed to the failure of the Native Church policy, the present author would be in agreement with Ian Getty in his statement that the failure of CMS policy was due primarily 'because of the different conditions of a settlement colony in which the local offshoot of European culture steadily pressed upon both the Indian people and the Missions among them.[89] The Native Church policy, despite early successes, failed in New Zealand among the Maori. If it failed there among a stronger, more cohesive, more numerous, and more economically advanced indigenous people, then it was bound to fail in a settler colony where hunting and gathering Indians numbered less than five percent of the population. Even if E. F. Wilson had been more effective in training natives to be clergy, the resistance by the settlers to any separate and independent Native Church would have meant failure for Henry Venn's programme. The trend to Anglo-conformity has proven too strong.

86 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
88 PAC, Reel A-80, Wilson to Fenn, March 27, 1872.
89 Getty, 'Failure of Native Church Policy' (see n. 75 above), 20.

Sources of Reference

How does one get at the early organization of the Chippewa? First, there are large compendia of published material, most of which represent gleanings from great masses of unpublished documents mostly in French from the seventeenth century, scattered in archives from Paris to Ottawa to Montreal to Albany, and in numerous other sources that in one way or another were connected with the fur trade, and with mission and government affairs. This material covers multiform relations in the entire St. Lawrence River system and large sections of the drainage areas of the Mississippi River and Hudson Bay. A glance at the map will show what a large area this was, for French trade, long before the turn of the eighteenth century, had penetrated as far south as the country of the Illinois, and even to the Arkansas tributary of the Mississippi on the west side; after the establishment of the Louisiana Colony in 1700, French trade tentacled east through the valley of the Tennessee and expanded west to the middle reaches of the Missouri, perhaps as far as eastern Montana.

It was, at the time I did my basic research, impractical to search the primary archival sources (Paris would have been a pleasant place to *cherchez les documents*), but very valuable material was available in the following records: the Jesuit Relations, that great collection of reports by Jesuit missionaries working in the Great Lakes and upper Mississippi regions from the 1630s right into the early eighteenth century; historical society volumes, or sections thereof, from such states as New York, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, containing great amounts of official correspondence on Indian affairs collected, translated, and annotated by excellent historians; the six volumes of French exploration and discovery compiled in the late nineteenth century by the historian, Pierre Margry. Also helpful were such one- or two-volume works as the translation by E. H. Blair of original manuscripts descriptive of French-Indian relations and Indian "customs" by the seventeenth century trader-official, Nicolas Perrot, and his later historian amanuensis, Bacqueville de La Potherie; and the strange and wild account of the trading and military adventures of the fantastic Pierre Radisson and his brother-in-law, Médart Chouart des Groseilliers written by the former in the quaint English of the period of the Stuarts. Radisson had an enormous capacity for leaving one in the dark as to precisely where he was at any given time, but he threw out many useful leads on Indian customs and behavior.

These are the main primary sources for the proto-Chippewa of the 1640–1670 period, all, except the Margry volumes, available in English translation. The Jesuit Relations happily have the original French (and occasionally Latin) on the left, or even-numbered pages, and the English translation on the odd pages. Although there is little direct information in these sources on precise factors of social organization, it will be seen how such factors may be inferred from the mass of material. This study is helped by writings from the nineteenth, and even the twentieth century that cast light on interpretations of material from the seventeenth. This will be, then, an exercise in extrapolation.

The Early Saulteur and Their Ceremonies

I will begin as if nothing is known of seventeenth century Chippewa organization. My only information is that certain people called, by the French, *Saulteur*, or, in English translation, People of the Sault, were living at least part of the year in the vicinity of Sault Ste. Marie, on the St. Mary's River, which not only divides Ontario from upper Michigan, but also carries the clear glacial water of Lake Superior over the rapids (the Sault, or Soo), into Lake Huron. This is known from looking up *Chippewa* in the Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico (Hodge 1907–1910 1:277).

In fact, the Handbook directs one to the Jesuit Relations as the first great source on these people. Volumes 72 and 73 comprise an index with references to peoples mentioned throughout the first 71 volumes. Under *Chippewas* the listings are *Ojibwas*, and also *Sauteurs*, *Saulteurs*, and *people (nation) of the Sault*, all variant terms for the same people, the ancestors of the modern Chippewa. These are supplemented with the accounts of Nicolas Perrot, cited above, who traveled and traded in the upper Great Lakes and contiguous regions from 1665 to 1695, and Radisson, who was in the Lake Superior region and adjacent areas at various times from about 1654 to about 1660.

I will turn to some of the material concerning the community life of the People of the Sault. Throughout the 1640–1670 period the center for these Saulteur was Sault Ste. Marie where the Jesuits eventually came, in the 1660s, to establish an important mission. The Indians from earliest times engaged in the fur trade, which preceded the missionaries there, as it invariably did. The Indians, as well as others in the area, were transporting great amounts of peltry to French depots like Montreal and Quebec on the lower St. Lawrence. It is true that at times the trade was interrupted by marauding Iroquois from the south side of Lake Ontario, but even in the worst of times, attempts were made to keep trade channels open.

There are five features of life which stand out in the Jesuit and other descriptions of the Saulteur and related peoples during the period:

(1) The Saulteur not only engaged in the fur trade, but had come to rely upon it for their very existence, acting both as trappers and as middlemen to tribes which had less access to trading entrepots.

(2) They engaged in periodic warfare as allies of other upper Lakes Algonquians against Iroquois to the east and Dakota and others to the west.

(3) They and their Algonquian neighbors, Nipissing and perhaps one or more of the tribal divisions of the Ottawa, conducted frequent joint ceremonials centering in the Feast of the Dead, which had as its main function the establishment and maintenance of alliances based on fur trade relations and common cause against common enemies.

(4) Sault Ste. Marie, aside from ceremonial activity as such, during the summer months was a gathering place for members of many groups who normally lived to the north and south, more or less close congeners of the local people. These were variously Potawatomi, Cree, and Algonquin, and perhaps the Siouan-

speaking Winn[illegible] were occasional visitors as well. Such groups, swelling the summer populat[illegible] of the Sault to well over 1000, came to feast on whitefish which were abundant in the rapids of the St. Mary's. They were often described as refugees from warfare, and also, as in the case of those who spent the winter in the inhospitable region of the Canadian Shield to the north, from periodic famine.

(5) Many of the peoples who gathered at Sault Ste. Marie were hunters and trappers, but it is emphasized that the dwellers there, and their closest kinsmen (various groups who together make up the ancestry of the Chippewa) maintained abundant fisheries at various river mouths, bays, and inlets along the adjacent shores of the two lakes connected by the St. Mary's, where they carried on seasonal village life.

There are numerous passages in the Jesuit Relations, supplemented by other general descriptions by Perrot and Radisson, of forest diplomacy, trade, warfare, ceremonials and subsistence modes covering 1640–1670, in which tribal life is portrayed, including extensive intertribal and Indian-French relations. These leave an impression of intensive cooperative relationships. The stereotype of Chippewa and other northern Algonquians as highly individualistic, hence non-cooperative, begins to crumble under the force of the descriptions of the period. I give here two sets of quotations, the first from the Jesuit, Jérome Lalemant, who visited Lake Nipissing east of northern Lake Huron during the summer of 1641 at the time of the annual Feast of the Dead. He described the arrival of visiting groups in enthusiastic terms (JR 23:211):

> Those of each Nation, before landing, in order to make their entry more imposing, form their Canoes in line, and wait until others come to meet them. When the People are assembled, the Chief stands up in the middle of his Canoe, and states the object that has brought him hither. Thereupon each one throws away some portion of his goods to be scrambled for. Some articles float on the water, while others sink to the bottom. The young men hasten to the spot. One will seize a mat, wrought as tapestries are in France; another a Beaver skin; others get a hatchet, or a dish, or some Porcelain beads, or other article,—each according to his skill and the good fortune he may have. There is nothing but joy, cries, and public acclamations, to which the Rocks surrounding the great Lake return an Echo that drowns all their voices.
>
> When all the Nations are assembled, and divided, each in their own seats, Beaver Robes, skins of Otter, of Caribou, of wild Cats, and of Moose; Hatchets, Kettles, Porcelain Beads, and all things that are precious in this Country, are exhibited. Each Chief of a Nation presents his own gift to those who hold the Feast, giving to each present some name that seems best suited to it.

There are several indications in this description of features of social organization which are important, even if their significance in a broad cultural context is not yet understood. These are the mention of *Nations*, the mention of *chiefs*, and the exchange of *gifts*.

Lalemant goes on to describe festivities including dances and games, more gift exchanges, the perpetuation of alliances, and rites of the transport of the bones of the dead.

The second set of quotations is from Perrot, who has the following to say about the ceremonial (Blair 1911 1:86–88). The hosts prepare

> . . . a large cabin, stoutly built and well covered, for lodging [illegible] entertain[illegible] all those whom they expect. As soon as all the people have a[illegible]ed, they take their places, each nation separately from the others, at the ends and in the middle of the cabin, and, thus assembled, they offer their presents. . . .

They

> . . . lavish all [illegible] they possess in trade-goods or other articles; and they reduce themselves [illegible] an extreme of poverty that they do not even reserve for themselves a single hatchet or knife. Very often they keep back for their own use only one old kettle. . . .

So now there are added elements; communal housing in great houses probably made from bark mats thrown over bent poles to form long domed structures. It is known from other descriptions that these could house as many as 200–300 persons (JR 55:139); the separation of the "nations," one from another; and, perhaps most important, the utter impoverishment of the hosts as a result of their outlay of gifts.

In another passage Perrot indicates the amount of *communal* activity which was necessary to conduct the ceremonial (Blair 1911 1:86):

> If the savages intend to celebrate the feast of their dead, they take care to make the necessary provision for it beforehand. When they return from their trade with the Europeans, they carry back with them the articles which suit them for this purpose; and in their houses they lay in a store of meat, corn, peltries, and other goods. When they return from their hunting, all those of the village come together to solemnize this feast. After resolving to do so, they send deputies from their own people into all the neighboring villages that are allied with them, and even as far away as a hundred leagues or more, to invite those people to attend this feast. In entreating them to be present at it, they designate the time which had been fixed for its solemnization.

Again there are mentions of: trade; hunting (apparently communal); and alliance, as prominent traits in the ceremonial complex.

From these descriptions I believe one gets a sense of vigor, and in the preparation and conduct of the rites a *joie de vivre*, which perhaps seems to some of us out of keeping with the solemnity of the occasion: after all, one of the main features was mass burial. But part of the ceremonial involved the "resurrection" of the names of dead chiefs now bestowed upon living descendants "elected" to the office. This, if the forms observed virtually everywhere among North American Indians were observed there, was done by the unanimous consent of the participants, a matter which quite naturally invited universal acclamation.

By this time it has been discovered, through a cursory reading of eyewitness accounts by intelligent French observers, that there was intensive group activity going on during the period of initial direct contact of Great Lakes Indians with French, activity that by that time had apparently become traditional. One must then ask the question: what was the *nature* of these groups; in a word, what structure did they have permitting such relations, within "nations," and among them. Clues now must be found in these and other writings of that and later periods, to lend refinement to this analysis.

Saulteur Social Groups: Clan Structure

To do so I must first turn, as usual, to the Jesuit Relations. One passage in particular is of overriding interest; in fact, it is of such special magnitude that it provides a terminal date for the proto-historical period. This passage is from a report of 1670 by the Jesuit, Claude Dablon, on the progress of his mission at Sault Ste. Marie. Dablon gives a sharp picture of conditions at the Sault; the passage also represents a summary of some of the pertinent material presented thus far (JR 54:133–135):

> The principal and native Inhabitants of this district are those who call themselves *Pahouitingwach Irini*, and whom the French call *Saulteurs*, because it is they who live at the Sault as their own Country, the others being there only as borrowers. They comprise only a hundred and fifty souls, but have united themselves with three other Nations which number more than five hundred and fifty persons, to whom they have, as it were, made a cession of the rights of their native Country; and so these live here permanently, except the time when they are out hunting: Next come those who are called the Nouquet, who extend toward the South of Lake Superior, whence they take their origin; and the Outchibous, together with the Marameg, toward the North of the same Lake, which region they regard as their own proper Country.
>
> Besides these four Nations there are seven others dependent on this Mission. The people called Achiligouiane, the Amicoures, and the Mississague fish here, and hunt on the Islands and in the regions round about Lake Huron; they number more than four hundred souls.
>
> Two other Nations, to the number of five hundred souls,—entirely nomadic, and with no fixed abode,—go toward the lands of the North to hunt during the Winter, and return hither to fish during the Summer.
>
> There remain six other Nations, who are either people from the North Sea [Hudson Bay], as the Guilistinous . . . [Cree] . . . and the Ovenibigonc [?], or wanderers in the regions around that same North Sea,—the greater part of them having been driven out of their Country by famine, and repairing hither from time to time to enjoy the abundance of fish there.

I have presented the English translation of this passage as it appears in the standard edition of the Relations, but I must, for the sake of accuracy, rerender part of one sentence of the foregoing quotation in French and then retranslate it to make better sense of a difficult construction. The phrase that begins,

> . . . and so these live here permanently, except the time they are out hunting: *Next come those who* [and so on; italics mine],

in French, after the word *hunting*, reads:

> *Ceux qu'on appelle les Nouquets* [and so on],

that is,

> Those who are designated Nouquet [and so on] . . .

so that there now are three new affiliates of the Saulteur, a[illegible], not three unnamed affiliates plus three other named folk only th[illegible]s temporary summer guests, but with permanent villages elsewhere. This is important, because, as I will indicate later, the [illegible] of the three affiliates have great significance in terms of the dynamics of [illegible]al organization of the time.

But here, for the moment, I must rest content with the idea, so graphically set forth by my Jesuit friend, that peoples of yet indeterminate origin and linguistic and cultural provenience were flocking to the Sault where a *people* resided, and in some instances attaching themselves to this people as *confederates*, not simply allies, and trading partners, clients, and so forth. I may be so bold here as to suggest that this confederation ended one era of social history and initiated another, but I incur, with broad statements of this kind, the risk of anticipating the data, of indulging in what the Germans somewhat architecturally call *unbegrundete Verallgemeinerungen*, baseless generalities.

It must be assumed that, having become confederated, or even merged, at a given time, the relevant peoples theretofore had been separate, each with rights to an extent of country, or territory, each presumably politically autonomous. I suspect that further search will indicate more about such groups and their relations with each other. One highly relevant question is, what did the Jesuits mean by "nation"? A passage from the Jesuit Relations of 1640 referent to the late 1630s, virtually at the beginning of the period of direct initial contact, and its interpretation seem apropos to this question (JR 18:229–231; brackets mine):

> Let us return now to the fresh-water sea [Lake Huron]. This sea is nothing but a large Lake which, becoming narrower in the West, or the West Northwest, forms another smaller Lake, which then begins to enlarge into another great Lake or second fresh-water sea [Lake Michigan].
>
> I have said that at the entrance of the first of these Lakes we find the Hurons. Leaving them, to sail farther up, in the Lake, we find on the North the Ouasouarini; farther up are the Outchougai, and still farther up, at the mouth of the river which comes from Lake Nipisin [French River which flows into Lake Huron], are the Atchiligouan. Beyond, upon the same shores of this fresh-water sea, are the Amikouai, or the nation of the Beaver. To the South of these is an Island in this fresh-water sea about thirty leagues long [Manitoulin Island of northern Lake Huron], inhabitated by the Outaouan; these are the people who have come from the nation of the raised hair [Ottawa]. After the Amikouai, upon the same shores of the great lake, are the Oumisagai, whom we pass while proceeding to Baouichtigouian,—that is to say, to the nation of the people of the Sault, for, in fact, there is a Rapid [Sault Ste. Marie], which rushes at this point into the fresh-water sea. Beyond this rapid we find the little lake [actually Lake Superior, the Jesuits being ignorant at that time of its size], upon the shores of which, to the North, are the Roquai [*Sic*: Nouquet]. To the North of these are the Mantoue, people who navigate very little, living upon the fruits of the earth.

Again, even with the imperfect knowledge the French had at that time of the upper Lakes area, a number of "nations" is clearly perceived, *each occupying its own territory*. An interesting aspect is that few of the peoples mentioned in the Jesuit writings exist today, nor have they existed as independent cultural units for the past one-to-two centuries. The question is, who were those peoples, and what became of them?

I must turn to later sources to answer these. Still relatively early, in 1697, a French fur merchant, Aubert de La Chesnaye, listed the residence of several Saulteur groups living on both shores of Lake Superior, among them: *Ouchipoë*, *Macomilé*, *Ouxeinacomigo*, *Mikinac*, and *Malanas*, or *gens de la Barbue* (Margry 1886 6:6). (All these are pronounced according to the French orthography.) There were other groups also mentioned by La Chesnaye, but they appear to have been Cree or Algonquin groups, so-called *gens de terre*, or People of the Land, and outside the compass of this study.

One feature that is striking about these "nations" listed by the Jesuits and others of early vintage is that the majority of them bear the names of animals, or referent to animals, some in the form of nicknames. This I conclude by comparing the early terms with names for local and clan groups recorded by later authorities, such as the Handbook (Hodge 1907–1910 1:279, and in both volumes under notices of the several groups; also see list of synonymies, vol. 2, pp. 1021–1178); Landes' *Ojibwa Sociology* (1937); Warren's history of the Chippewa (1885); and a list of Saulteur and other peoples compiled by Michel Maray, Sieur de La Chauvignerie in 1736 (NYCD 9:1053–1054). Some of the comparisons take a bit of acrobatic orthographic maneuvering, but, by and large, correlations seem to hold up. I have discussed at greater length some of the parallels (1962a: 78–79), but would have preferred to have had more linguistic material available. I point this out mainly to indicate how a concordance of historical, ethnological, and linguistic research can elucidate problems of synonymy significant for the analysis of social forms, even if the example here is far from perfect.

Thus, Nouquet, and also Macomilé is Bear (cf. Landes 1937: 40); Marameg, or Malanas (in French *barbue*) is Catfish; Mikinac is Snapping Turtle; Ouxeinacomigo refers to Birds in general (see Landes 1937: 40; Hickerson 1962a: 79); Amicoures, or Amikouai, is Beaver; Ouasouarini, or Auwause[e], is Fish (NYCD 9:1054; Hodge 1907–1910 1:279); Mantoue, or Mundua, is Marten (Warren 1885: 50); Outchibous, or Ouchipoë, is probably derived from Ojeejok (Hodge 1907–1910 1:279) plus the suffix /bwa/ connoting "voice" and referent to the Crane, hence *Voice of the Crane*; Achiligouan and Outchougai refer perhaps to Heron; and Oumisagai, or Mississague, perhaps to Eagle, as their crests, that is, the symbolic drawings they would affix to official documents, would indicate (NYCD 9:1053). But Heron and Eagle are called by somewhat different terms given in the Handbook following Morgan (Hodge 1907–1910 1:279), as *Mooshkaooze* and the vaguely redolent *Omegeeze* respectively. I almost run out here, and admittedly my last three efforts to relate tribal terms to animals might not stand up in court.

But still, there *does* exist a battery of correspondences, and when you add to the rest a term used by Perrot for another people, or "nation," the Nikikouek, or Otter (Blair 1911 1:153; Hodge 1907–1910 2:70–71), the list becomes that much more formidable.

Why this preponderance of animal names? The first thing that enters the head of an anthropologist is that animals might signify *totems*, a kind of mystical wellspring of *clans*. Indeed, the very word, totem, is Algonquian, and especially Chippewa, denoting a *local group of consanguines*. Hence, one is tempted to look upon those early groups, once separate from one another politically but linked

[illegible] myt[illegible] ce H[illegible]son
through ritual practice and common stores of legends [illegible]
1963), and in many instances prone to confederate, as at Sault Ste. M[illegible]n 1670,
as *clans*. I will not at this poi[illegible] into detail on the eventual fate of many of
these groups, which I [illegible] suggest were quasi-independent totem, or clan
groups, except to [illegible] with a few notable exceptions, namely the Missisauga
and perhaps some Amikwa (Amikouai), they gradually became absorbed through
a process of merging that began on a large scale in 1670 by the Saulteur, later
called Chippewa. By the nineteenth century all but the Missisauga had lost inde-
pendent status.

The Saulteur themselves, from earliest proto-historic times a community
that had no particular totemic or clan organization, apparently comprised an amal-
gam of members of many clans; they existed, perhaps in some sense, as a symbol
of the unity based on common language, culture, and traditions of all of them.
In socioeconomic terms, the Saulteur proper formed the nuclear settlement for
annual ceremonials, trade, renewal of alliances, and, to some extent, fishing, and
this status may well have reached back to aboriginal times.

There is a parallel for this. Among the related Central Algonquian Illinois
who comprised a number of kindred semi-autonomous tribal divisions (perhaps
originally matrilineal clan groups), one village, Kaskaskia, located on the shores of
Lake Peoria in central Illinois, during the 1680s a central location for trade,
diplomacy, and war, was unique in that it contained members of all other divisions:
Cahokia, Peoria, Tamaroa, Moingwena, and several others, all of these also main-
taining separate villages and territories elsewhere and normally following inde-
pendent pathways. The Kaskaskia, originally only one of the Illinois divisions, were
designated as "the real Illinois" (cf. Blasingham 1956: 198–199), due to their
focal position. As among the Chippewa groups, the Illinois peoples gradually lost
their separate identity, all of them eventually becoming subsumed under the generic
term *Illinois* before becoming virtually extinct in the early nineteenth century.

But I have strayed somewhat. I have not yet sufficiently demonstrated that
the groups forming the basis of the Chippewa, or Saulteur, who did *not* become
extinct, were indeed clan groups. By clan, in the context of the tribal proto-
Chippewa, I mean a corporate unilineal descent group with a fictitious ancestor.

This can be approached along two main avenues—analysis of surviving
forms, and inductive reasoning. First, in a purview of present and nineteenth
century literature it is discovered that most of the names of the proto-historical
semi-autonomous Saulteur communities have survived as designations for groups
of consanguines which are still referred to as clans (or synonymous terms such as
gentes or *sibs*). These groups are no longer local, nor have they been for two
centuries and more; but scattered among multifarious village, band, and reservation
communities the length and breadth of the vast Chippewa area, they still, in most
places, maintain exogamic relations. Hence, a Bear boy from Red Lake, Minnesota
would not be inclined to marry a Bear girl from Emo, Ontario, even though they
could not trace actual common descent. In 1640, those Bears would have been
living in the same village on the southeastern shore of Lake Superior, and referred
to each other as "brother" and "sister," that is, "member of my descent group of
my generation," male and female respectively.

Clan organization today, of course, is not a potent factor in political life,

and it is true that even exogamic structures are beginning to break down in many places, chiefly where common descent cannot be traced, but it persists as a mere fiction. But a century and more ago, such structures were still maintained. In the mid-nineteenth century, William Whipple Warren, a Chippewa historian and spokesman, himself half-Chippewa, described, in detail, ritual, political, and other functions of clans, which he also called "totems." In writing about important men he invariably gave their clan affiliation, and even referred to "principal men" of the clans, or rather, of phratries, which he called "grand clans," there being four or five linked clans in each of the five grand clans.

Other primary published source material from the early to mid-nineteenth century helps in this reconstruction. Henry R. Schoolcraft, the Chippewa agent at Sault Ste. Marie from 1819 to 1840, and a scholar of Indian life, had this to say about the Chippewa living on the south shore, and inland to the south and west, of Lake Superior (1834: 146):

> The most striking trait in their moral history is the institution of the Totem—a sign manual, by which the affiliation of families is traced. . . . And this institution is kept up with a feeling of importance, which it is difficult to account for. An Indian, as is well known, will tell his specific name with great reluctance, but his generic or family name—in other words, his *Totem*, he will declare without hesitation, and with an evident feeling of pride.

Elsewhere Schoolcraft wrote about the "ruling power . . . exercised by certain totemic families, who claimed the right by descent" (1851–1857 6:385). . . . With respect to this, Warren (1885: 336–337) recorded an incident in which a fur trader invited Chippewa to a council to urge them not to go to war against enemy Dakota,

> . . . and after stating to them his wishes, he presented some tobacco, and a small keg of liquor to each head, or representative chief, of the several grand clans, or totems.

The clans, then, as functioning units appear to assume more importance as one goes back in time. There are clear expressions of this in earlier nineteenth century sources. Recognition of clan exogamy is indicated by a Hudson's Bay Company fur trader and surgeon, Dr. John McLoughlin, in an unpublished report of 1822–1823 (WHS Mss.):

> . . . it is unlawful for a man to marry a woman of the same tribe or Mark, and children are Reckond in the fathers tribe.

Here *tribe* and *Mark* refer to *clan* and *totem* respectively.

Another trader, Duncan Cameron of the Northwest Company, wrote in 1804 that Chippewa living north of Lake Superior were divided in *totems*, and that totem mates considered themselves related even when blood relationship could not be traced (fictitious ancestor), and thus could not marry. Moreover, in a quarrel, a man would side with an "unrelated" clan mate against a closely related [cross] cousin, the cousin being, due to the rules of exogamy, a member of a different clan (Masson 1889–1890 2:246–247).

There is continuity in m[illegible] the cl[illegible] into the past, and I have established that the clan was of great importance in Chippewa social, political and ritual organization, even though, by the turn of the nineteenth century, clans did not form local groups. Also it has been seen that the names of modern clans (see Hodge 1907–1910 1:279) like Ahmik (Beaver), Auwausee (Fish), Noka (Bear), Mikonoh (Snapping Turtle), and others, had their parallels in the local groups of the proto-historic past.

Before turning to very early observers for further confirmation of this, I will present more evidence for this proposed locality of clans, from more recent authorities. Schoolcraft, who was a student of Chippewa language as well as culture, wrote that the very word, *totem*, was a derivation of *Do Daim*, the Chippewa term for village, that is, local group. Hence, clan equals local group. This is all the more interesting because there is confirmation, undoubtedly independently arrived at, in a communication from the linguist, Truman Michelson, cited by the contemporary anthropologist, Ruth Landes, to the effect that *dodem* [totem] is derived from *ode.na* which means *village* (1937: 33–35). These statements are highly suggestive of a condition in force at one time, but no longer, that the totem, or clan, was indeed the village, or local group, and vice versa.

What evidence might there be for this in the writings of the earliest authors? Very little. There are, however, four statements, two by Perrot and two by the flamboyant Radisson, strongly indicating the local autonomy of the clan. Perrot flatly states (Blair 1911 1:37; brackets mine):

> You will hear [the Indians] say that their villages each bear the name of the animal which has given its people their being—as that of the crane, or the bear, or of other animals.

This statement is relevant to several peoples living in the Great Lakes region, including Saulteur. Another statement by Perrot concerning totemic practices of the Amikwa, who later were absorbed by the Saulteur, and were linguistically and culturally indistinguishable from the generality of the Saulteur peoples, leaves little doubt as to the clan nature of their society (Blair 1911 1:62–64):

> . . . when any stranger or poor widow is in need near the Amikouäs or any one of their clan, they see a branch that has been gnawed at night by some beavers, the first person who finds it at the entrance of his tent picks it up and carries it to the head of the clan, who immediately causes a supply of food to be collected for the poor person, who has a memorial of their ancestors.

Here, then, is indicated the Amikwa (or Beaver) *clan*, a clan leader who is also the headman of the village, and the clan-village itself. I cannot help, in the light of Perrot's general statement cited above, proposing that Crane, Bear, Catfish and others had *their* clan-villages as well.

Radisson's statements are not as direct as those of Perrot, but they serve, in the light of other material, to strengthen my hypothesis. Radisson described a Feast of the Dead ceremonial in which he participated, held in 1660 in the interior south of Lake Superior among Saulteur, Dakota and others. After feasting and exchanging gifts according to the usual patterns, and during the bestowal of

[illegible] the establishm[illegible] of trade and alliance, Radisson remarks, with respect to the gift-giving (Scul[illegible]3: 217; brackets and italics mine):

> The 3rd [gift] was to oblige them to receive our propositions, likewise the Christinos [Cree], to lead them to yᵉ dance of Union, wᶜʰ was to be celebrated at yᵉ death's feast and *banquett of kindred*. If they would continue the warrs, yᵗ was not yᵉ meanes to see us againe in their Countrey.

"Banquett of kindred" refers to the feasting and gift-giving among the participants, and indicates strongly interlocking relationships among them, which can be inferred to be consanguineal and affinal relationships. This supposition is supported in another passage describing the ritual of the Feast. I give this at some length to provide some of the color of the ceremonial (at least as Radisson saw it), emphasizing with italics the passage most relevant to the specific interest of this study. Understand that the battle described is a ritual or mock battle, its purpose being to allay possible hostilities among peoples speaking diverse languages, the Saulteur peoples on one hand and Siouan Dakota on the other (Scull 1943: 218–219; brackets and italics mine):

> The feast was made to eate all up. To honneur the feast many men and women did burst. Those of that place coming backe [Dakota], came in sight of those of the village or fort, made postures in similitud of warrs. This was to discover the ennemy by signs; any that should doe soe we gave orders to take him, or kill him and take his head off. The prisoner to be tyed (and) to fight in retreating. To pull an arrow out of yᵉ body; to exercise and strike wᵗʰ a clubbe, a buckler to theire feete, and take it if neede requireth, and defende himselfe, if neede requirs, from the ennemy; being in sentery to heark yᵉ ennemy that comes neere, and to heare the better lay him downe on the side. These postures are playd while the drums beate. This was a serious thing, wᵗʰout speaking except by nodding or gesture. Their drums weare earthen potts full of watter, covered wᵗʰ staggs-skin. The sticks like hammers for yᵉ purpose. The elders have bomkins [not a small bom, but a knob] to the end of their staves full of small stones, wᶜʰ makes a ratle, to wᶜʰ yong men and women goe in a cadance. The elders are about these potts, beating them and singing. The women also by, having a nosegay in their hands, and dance very modestly, not lifting much their feete from the ground, keeping their heads downewards, makeing a sweet harmony. We made guifts for that while 14 days' time. Every one brings yᵉ most exquisite things, to shew what his country affoards. The renewing of their alliances, *the marriages according to their countrey coustoms are made*; also the visit of the boans of their deceased ffriends, ffor they keepe them and bestow them uppon one another. We sang in our language as they in theirs, to wᶜʰ they gave greate attention. We gave them severall guifts, and received many. They bestowed upon us above 300 robs of castors [beavers], out of wᶜʰ we brought not five to the ffrench, being far in yᵉ countrey.
>
> This feast ended, every one retourns to his countrey well satisfied.

The italicized phrase must be interpreted as an endemic feature of the Feast of the Dead, which attracted related peoples living separately for most of the time, to a central location where they encamped as separate units. Although non-related allies, in this case Dakota and French, in other cases such peoples as Huron and Cree, would be [illegible]ed to [illegible]tify [illegible]ces, [illegible] ours [illegible] would not normally be expected to intermarry with the hosts. Rather, [illegible] marriages "according to their countrey coustoms" would be precisely those occurring between members of the separate but related "kindred" groups congregating. This suits perfectly a situation in which those groups were local clan-villages with strict rules of exogamy. Without going into detail, there are parallels to this type of activity in kinship-based societies yᵉ worlde over.

Two Conclusions

I have applied specific anthropological techniques to the solution of the problem of the social organization of proto-Chippewa groups. I relied heavily on primary sources covering parts of the period between 1640 and the present era, all of which are published except one, the statement from an unpublished manuscript by Dr. McLoughlin of the Hudson's Bay Company for 1822–1823, which lives in a box in the archives of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at Madison.

Most important in this reconstruction was the discovery that clans that survive in highly fragmented, and I might say, decadent, form at present, were of great importance in the past. Only ethnohistorical research could have provided the empirical basis for this hypothesis, itself derived from a combination of preliminary casual reading in early documents and awareness of the broad distribution of clan societies elsewhere in North America and other parts of the world where socioeconomic relations are direct and simple.

Other factors, too, involving general anthropological knowledge, play a part, so much so that it is often difficult to state all the ingredients that go into such reconstructions as this. For example, surviving kinship terms in some areas in which Chippewa continues to be spoken indicate the equivalence of cross cousins and affines, and it may be assumed that that was universally so in the past. Although cross-cousin marriage, implied by this, no longer occurs among most Chippewa, especially those living in the United States, it must be assumed that cross-cousin marriage was a widespread practice in the past (cf. Hickerson 1962a: Ch 6). Although cross-cousin marriage is not necessarily functionally linked with clan organization, it is congruent with the type of clan relations proto-Chippewa and, no doubt, aboriginal Chippewa, had. In fact, it was with the breakdown of the local clan in many areas that cross-cousin marriage ended, although some of the terminology, always slow to change, survived.

There are two very general conclusions:

1) The existence of local clans is indicative of a stage of sociocultural integration which has evolutionary significance. It fits a widely held idea that aboriginal primitive society was *clan society*, with implications for intensive communal patterns, these in turn becoming disturbed by contacts, especially trade contacts, with more advanced socioeconomic systems (in this case European systems). One cannot, at this point, tell whether the local clans were matrilineal or patrilineal, although this too would have significance for possible evolutionary reconstruction.

This and related questions will eventually be answered by the development of techniques of reconstruction of proto-linguistic forms, especially kinship terms, and refinement, through inductive reasoning, of methods permitting an appraisal of the types of social organization which has given birth to such proto-forms. There are not as yet such means for reconstruction.

2) The clans, and communal behavior in general, broke down under the weight of contact. The genesis of this is a complex problem which will be touched upon in the next chapter, again through primary use of documentary evidence. (Also see Hickerson 1966.) In brief, the demands imposed by the fur trade and military and other conditions engendered by it resulted in the need for the permanent mobilization of much larger village groups than existed in pre-trade times when lake fishing and woodland hunting, with some limited trade with Indian neighbors, provided the means of subsistence. The large villages of the eighteenth to nineteenth centuries were made up of members of many clans who unified under village *tribal* councils. At first there were only a few large villages, but these later split into numerous smaller villages, not along clan lines, as might be expected, but in such a way that each daughter village contained all or most of the kinship elements—a replica, so to speak, of the mother village. But this is a different story, and not to be dealt with here.

4

Origin of the Midewiwin: A Historical Problem

Introduction

IN THIS CHAPTER I again employ early sources, chiefly from the pens of the old French priests and traders, but including later authorities like Schoolcraft and Warren, and also an unpublished source or two from the nineteenth century to help in solving a problem which, if at first blush might appear trivial, still has its significance. The problem is discovering when the *Midewiwin* began, and why. Unlike the last chapter, when reconstruction involved only peoples who formed the ancestry of the modern Chippewa, this chapter must use ethnohistorical material on neighboring peoples as well to marshal evidence for the central thesis—that the Midewiwin was postcontact. I would suggest at the outset that when, later in the chapter, such peoples as the Central Algonquian Fox, Miami, Mascouten, Menomini, Potawatomi, Illinois, and others are mentioned, such standard sources as the *Handbook of Indians North of Mexico* and the *Glossary* of the latest edition of the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* should be consulted. Also, the latest editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* contain useful, if somewhat encapsulated, information on many of the tribes.

In this chapter I rely heavily on logical constructions of culture history relevant to material presented in the last chapter, on analysis of written documents, on historical criticism, and on that most tenuous and difficult of all historiographic techniques, appraisal of *negative evidence*, which amounts to concluding something did not exist because it was not mentioned.