

turn, men of power saw the intellectuals, as Leacock once observed, as individuals with minds “defective and damaged by education”. As Shortt rightly comments, his intellectuals “tended to place themselves, in practical terms, outside Canadian society” (p. 6). So did most of the other leading intellectual figures of the time.

Canada’s intellectuals as early as the end of the nineteenth century were not only alienated, but powerless. They had in effect abdicated. If the world of power did not restrain the gossamer spinings of the imperialists and social gossamers, at the same time the creative and essentially moral spirit and energies of the intellectuals of the period did not really much influence the activities of the men who made the political and economic decisions in Canada. We now have enough evidence to indicate that the impotency of the Canadian intellectual is a tradition of long standing, going back indeed nearly to Confederation. We do not yet know whether the alienation goes back still further, though I would suspect it does not, for it is inherent in a specialization of function which was alien to the less sophisticated colonial society of the pre-Confederation period. John Strachan and William Lyon Mackenzie may not have triumphed, but they were involved. Perry Miller’s successful portrayal of early New England through the Puritan Mind may be unreplicable for later Canada, not because Canadian Minds did not exist, but because they had ceased to be integrated into the society.

In any event, the next step for intellectual history in Canada is clearly to investigate the relationship between ideas and the exercise of power. We have had a number of calls for such an investigation, but unfortunately, the works of Berger, Allen, and Shortt seem more to demonstrate the growing chasm between Minds and Power than the dynamics between them. So far Canadian intellectual history has neither succeeded in altering the standard perception that ideas did not much matter in the making of this nation, or in explicating what Perry Miller called the “buzzing factuality”.

J. M. BUMSTED

Women’s History: the State of the Art in Atlantic Canada

“The history of women no longer needs defending”. So Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice confidently begin their introduction to *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women’s History* (Toronto, McClelland Stewart, 1977). The rebirth of women’s history in the 1970s takes its impetus from the contemporary resurgence of feminism.¹ Canadian

1 For the most extensive annotated bibliography see Veronica Strong-Boag, “Cousin Cinderella: A guide to historical literature pertaining to Canadian women”, in Maryless Stephenson, ed., *Women in Canada* (rev. ed., Don Mills, General Publishing Co. Ltd., 1977), pp. 245 - 74; supplemented by *Recent Publications in Canadian Women’s History*, ed. by Beth Light and Alison Prentice (Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1977).

women, seeking to understand their present, look to their past and they have found it largely neglected by conventional or traditional history. That history, political, diplomatic, military, intellectual, and more recently economic, has been written by a male-dominated profession, and read principally by other male historians or men who held, or were being groomed to hold, leading positions in the country's power structure. It is male domination that made and still makes the male orientation of conventional history understandable. Less justifiable an instance of the blinkered vision it can engender, is the short shrift given women's challenges to male power.² A similar case of oversight is the neglect of women when policies affecting women are under consideration.³

Women's history and the new social history, which has broadened the scope of historical inquiry to include non-elites, have much in common.⁴ Both draw on other disciplines, sociology, anthropology, folklore, while preserving the unique component of history: chronology. Social history seeks to give voice to the "inarticulate masses" of the past; women's history seeks to bring into view the female half of the population formerly "hidden from history".⁵ If social history has the ultimate goal of reintegrating the subfields of history into a total history of society, so women's history has the ultimate objective of making written history as bisexual as the human species. While ideally these two goals should merge into one, at the moment social history concentrates on viewing history from below, and women's history on

- 2 See, for instance, Kenneth McNaught, *The Pelican History of Canada* (Markham, Ontario, 1975); and *Prophecy and Protest: Social Movements in Twentieth-Century Canada*, ed. by Samuel D. Clark, J. Paul Grayson, and Linda M. Grayson (Toronto, 1975), in which not one of the nineteen essays is devoted to the women's movement, mentioned in one paragraph of the Conclusion.
- 3 A case in point might be J. L. Granatstein, *Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government 1939 - 1945* (Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1975), which omits the Women's Division of National Selective Service and the mobilization of women's labour for the war effort, although the issue of manpower shortages figures prominently.
- 4 Although the synthesis and slant are my own, sources for the ideas expressed in this general discussion of women's history include: a definition of contemporary feminism presented by Linda Gorham at the Conference on "Research on Women: Current Projects and Future Directions", Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, 11 - 14 November 1976; Margrit Eichler, "Towards a Sociology of Feminist Research in Canada", Paper No. 6 of Group for Research on Women, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (First Draft, February 1977); Gerda Lerner, "Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges", *Feminist Studies*, III (Fall, 1975), pp. 5 - 14; Sally Alexander and Anna Devin, "Feminist History", *History Workshop*, I (Spring, 1976), pp. 4 - 5; Linda Gordon, *Woman's Body, Woman's Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America* (New York, Grossman Publishers, 1976), pp. xi - xviii; and many conversations with Jane Lewis.
- 5 Sheila Rowbotham, *Hidden from History: 300 Years of Women's Oppression and the Fight Against It* (London, Pluto Press, 1974).

seeing the past from a woman's vantage point. In social history, the category class predominates; in women's history the category sex. But just as a focus on class divisions should not exclude attention to gender in social history, so in women's history a focus on sexual divisions must not exclude awareness of the social hierarchy.

The focus on women answers a compensatory need of present women to recapture their past. But that focus and its present-mindedness can ensnare the women's historian. Since central to the women's movement is a sense of discrimination against or oppression of women, that sense coupled with a search for the class-crossing common denominators of women's past experience can lead to the reductionist conclusion that male supremacy is uniform and ubiquitous, and woman always a victim. Such a conclusion leaves one either with the endless search for the origins of male supremacy or the endless litany of man's injustices to woman, and the misogynist catechism. More useful is an examination of the *mechanisms*, social, legal, economic, and political, of women's subjugation. But that approach too has pitfalls. One is the tendency to mistake prescription for actuality; another is the tendency to view women only in a passive, reactive role, as the "other" of Simone de Beauvoir's existential dichotomy — mere reflections of male definitions and desires. A necessary corollary to the analysis of subordination is the endeavour to see women in their own terms, not merely as appendages to men or deviants from a male norm. Such a view opens up the analysis of subordination to include women's resistance and accommodation to it. Seeing women as actors, not merely the acted upon, as positive achievers and contributors to society, economy, and culture, variously resisting and accommodating themselves to a varying subordination, is the perspective of Naomi Griffiths' *Penelope's Web: Some Perceptions of Women in European and Canadian Society* (Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1976). To view women as persons in their own right, as human beings of reason, will, and feeling, is a feminist perspective, and obviously the only correct one. That feminist perspective is what legitimizes women's history as a field of study.

Women's history in the European and North American world generally is developing an historiography. One cannot yet say the same thing of the history of women in the Atlantic Provinces. Work is being done on women's past in the region, but the most it has produced so far is a scattering of disparate studies. A coherent chronology has not yet emerged.

A good place to begin, at this stage, is with autobiography, especially since the strong autobiographical statement, such as Elizabeth Goudie's *Women of Labrador* (Toronto, Peter Martin, 1973), edited by David Zimmerly, is invaluable for the endeavour to see women in their own terms. As Zimmerly remarks in his introduction, the life of the Labrador trapper, "as seen from the man's point of view", has been recorded, indeed glorified. Mrs. Goudie's

story is that of the trapper's wife. Proud of her mixed Eskimo, English, French Scottish and Indian heritage, and proud of her country Labrador, Elizabeth Goudie, née Blake, knew the life of a pioneer from her birth in 1902 till World War II when the establishment of an air base at Goose Bay "brought the old life of Labrador to a close" (p. 131). Recollections of that "old life" — as hard for the woman as for the man — form the core of her narrative. A trapper's wife had to develop self-reliance and endure loneliness, since her husband might be away trapping for five months of the year. In his absence their children's and her own survival rested entirely with her. She set snares for rabbits and shot partridges, fished through holes in the ice, cut and split wood, and melted down snow for water. Mrs. Goudie knew the encumbrance of many pregnancies and the pain of losing her first son, at age six, and her seventh baby, shortly after birth. But it was not all hardship and sorrow; female friendships enlivened the lonely winter months. Ultimately, however, it was a man's world and the skills and qualities of character essential for survival in that world were identified as male, as Mrs. Goudie's assessment of her own role indicates: "The wife of a trapper played a great part in [the old life] because she had to live as a man five months of the year" (p. 162). Elizabeth Goudie and her female contemporaries did not contest the benevolent hegemony of their menfolk.

It was the custom for the man to run the home, the women took second place. A woman could have her say around the house but about the main things in life, the man always had his say. His word went for most everything. Women accepted this and thought nothing about it. They were not hard men; they were kind. They were not very hard to please, . . . (p. 50).

Yet in the last analysis what seems to have characterized Elizabeth Goudie's relationship with her husband Jim was not male dominance and female subordination but a sense of partnership and mutual dependence. "We worked side by side those forty-two years together", Mrs. Goudie writes, and "We respected each other . . ." (p. 148).

Oral history is also of great value for the attempt to see women as persons in their own right. The source to turn to for a detailed description of the lives women led in a traditional fishing village is Hilda E. A. Murray's "The Traditional Role of Women in a Newfoundland Fishing Community" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1972), in preparation for publication under the title "The Woman Was the Mainstay". But description is too bland a word: Murray's work is a vivid evocation, coloured occasionally by nostalgia, of the experience of Newfoundland women in the first half of the twentieth century in the Bonavista Bay community of Elliston, where Murray herself grew up. Based on extensive interviews with twenty-

three informants, both male and female, her account recaptures the kaleidoscope of woman's experience. The reader cannot help but be impressed with the burden of work women bore, and the variety of tasks they performed. In the judgment of one male informant: " 'The woman was more than fifty percent' ". Attuned to the rhythms of the changing seasons, women's work reached a frenzied pitch at the height of the summer fishery. Although not involved in the catching of the cod, they took part in every phase of the curing process, from splitting and salting the fish to the final stage of drying it on the "flakes". Other outdoor tasks included vegetable gardening, tending livestock, making hay, shearing sheep, and picking bakeapples, blueberries and partridge berries. Indoors women faced another round of chores: carding and spinning wool and knitting it into clothing, mending and sewing, 'joining quilts', hooking mats, making soap, as well as doing the weekly wash and the daily bread baking, preparation of meals and house cleaning, all without benefit of running water or electricity. In between women bore the many children such a family economy required. Mothers got help from their children, but mostly from daughters, since the sexual division of labour came into operation early and, the house being the sphere in which females fetched and carried for males, sons were exempted from indoor tasks. This inventory does not do justice to Murray's account, filled as it is with detail and anecdote, custom and folklore.

Yet Murray's work barely touches upon the problem of analyzing the impact on women's lives of "modernization", industrialization, and economic development. Such study is complicated by the fact that "modernization" in the region has not gone hand in hand with a strengthening economy, but rather with increasing economic depression and "colonialization", i.e. increasing dependence of the region on the federal government and on the financial and industrial capital of central Canada and the United States. The arena for acting rather than reacting narrows for ordinary woman and man as the forces governing the material conditions of their lives move further and further beyond their control. Hence the focus on women's oppression in three papers given in the session on "Women's Work in Communities: Atlantic Canada" at the Conference on "Research on Women: Current Projects and Future Directions", held at Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, 11 - 14 November 1976.

In her paper "Women in Labrador: Capitalism in Everyday Life", under revision for publication in a forthcoming book edited by Naomi Black on "Women and Power: Feminist Studies in Canadian Society", Jacqueline Driscoll takes the northern mining town of Labrador City as a case study of "the consequences of the way in which women are articulated into the process of capitalist development". Seeking to explain the apparently "paradoxical dissatisfaction" felt by the residents of this "instant" resource town, Driscoll

emphasizes the “remote levels” at which the decisions “which shape and colour the everyday lives” of those residents are made. The dominating industry of the town, the open-pit iron mining projects and ore-processing plants, are owned and operated by the Iron Ore Company of Canada, which represents major American steel producers, is linked with the Argus Corporation in Canada, and has head offices in Cleveland, Ohio. The “paradoxicality” of Labrador City discontent Driscoll identifies as the discrepancy between the image of model town and “the reality of the situation”, between superficial affluence and the frustrations of everyday experience — inadequate housing, deficient services, shoddy merchandise. Women come in as the miners’ wives and mothers of their children, since “statistically the most stable workers are married men with families”. The deficiencies of the service sector fall especially hard on the housewives in their role of ensuring that the labour power of their husbands “is reproduced from day to day”. Further burdening the unpaid labour of housewives are the constantly rotating shifts, which interrupt household schedules, and overtime, which “adds to the isolation of women within the domestic” sphere. Competition within the world market for iron ore forced the Iron Ore Company of Canada to expand production in Labrador City between 1967 - 1972 and the financial burden of that expansion, unrelieved till 1975, necessitated cutbacks in expenditure on living conditions within the town. Driscoll’s general proposition is that the townspeople were “made to bear an unacknowledged portion of the costs” of that expanded production. Her particular argument with respect to women is that they, although standing “outside the organized structure of production” and hence all the more unable “to influence decisions at the corporate level”, are yet the ones “who in many ways are the most deeply affected”. It is Driscoll’s attempt to see the whole picture from corporate board room down to Labrador City living room that makes her well-structured, elegantly argued paper so persuasive: a fine example of focusing on women without losing sight of the larger context of their lives.

Ellen Antler’s paper on “Women’s Work in Newfoundland Fishing Families”, published in *Atlantis: A Women’s Studies Journal*, no. 2 (Spring, 1977), Part II, pp. 106-13, demonstrates the difficulty of capturing in a short space the full complexity of the changing picture. Antler is concerned with the consequences for women of the decay of Newfoundland’s traditional rural economy which combined subsistence production with the production for market of cured codfish. Her paper begins with a description of the pre-Confederation inshore fishery, showing the family organization for catching and “making” fish and stressing the importance of women’s labour in the curing process, as well as in the household production of subsistence goods and services for family maintenance. Disclaiming, for reasons of limited space, any attempt at thorough examination of all of the “sources” of the decay of the

inshore fishery and of subsistence production within the household, she offers as the most adequate explanation the “coercive” proletarianization of Newfoundland’s rural population to meet the requirements of industrial capital for “a ‘free’, dependable and inexpensive wage labour force”. In the process, outport women have become “either wage labourers in capitalist owned and operated fish plants”, where they have to work twice as long per day for many more weeks to earn the equivalent of their former “earnings” in the family fishery, or “simply houseworkers” who “labour privately and without the rewards that their previously productive labours brought”.

Certainly a crucial change in the relations of production in the Newfoundland fishery has occurred. But the schema as here presented so telescopes the historical process that the historical experience of the people involved is obscured. Take, for example, “the withdrawal of women’s labour from the fishery”. It first figures as “suddenly” happening “early” in the decline of the traditional fishery and working to drive fishermen out of the light salted, sun-dried trade. Then it in turn is explained as the result of “the massive influx of transfer payments from Ottawa” and the increasing marginality of the inshore fishery of which it was at first presented as a cause. A more carefully and fully articulated chronology might break open this apparent circularity. Also was “the withdrawal of women’s labour from the fishery” as involuntary as Antler’s analysis implies?⁶ Finally, Antler’s analysis of the erosion of women’s economic position with the decline of the traditional economy does leave a bleak picture. Has the provision of improved social services (in transportation, communication, medicine, education) counter-balanced that erosion? Antler’s depiction of “apathy and depression” as all too frequently the experience of present-day outport women implies not. Would women in the rural communities of Newfoundland agree? Frustrating as these loose ends are, Antler is among the first to raise these difficult questions about a complicated process and its implications for women.

Nanciellen Sealy’s “Women’s Worth and Work in an Acadian Maritime Village”, also under revision for publication in “Women and Power”, similarly explores the implications for women of changes in the fishery, this time in St. Simon in Northeastern New Brunswick. Here too a traditional household economy which combined subsistence farming with inshore fishing and on-

6 A complex of questions bedevils the problem of “the withdrawal of women’s labour from the fishery”: one concerns the voting patterns of women for or against Confederation in the referenda of 1949; a second (and related) concerns the effect of family allowance payments on women’s attitudes to labouring in the fishery, and their effect on the relation between husband and wife, as the checks were made payable to mothers and antedated the Unemployment Insurance Benefits to fishermen by eight years. This complicated problem is also touched on, but by no means resolved, in Cato Wadel, *Marginal Adaptations and Modernization in Newfoundland* (St. John’s, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1969), p. 54.

shore processing has been replaced by the fresh fish processing industry coupled with “the increasing mechanization of the inshore fishery and the re-emergence of an offshore fishing industry”. Here too women have been displaced from their economic position as “active partners in the production of goods for consumption and exchange” and have become specialized homeworkers and/or low-status, poorly paid workers in fresh fish processing plants (*usines*). These “technoeconomic” changes Sealy subsumes under the concept “economic development” rather than proletarianization. She concludes that “a hidden cost of development in the region appears to be a widening differential in the socioeconomic status of the sexes”. Whereas formerly control of capital, albeit minimal, and income-producing skills and knowledge were shared between men and women, “today capital and valued expertise are controlled by men”. But surely not uniformly nor by all men in the village. Has the “differential in the socioeconomic status” widened, for instance, between husbands and wives who are both *usine* employees? Sealy’s paper illustrates both the necessity and the difficulty of grappling simultaneously with the categories of sex and class.

Turning from the twentieth century to the nineteenth and from women’s work in the rural fishery to women’s employment in the cities, we find Yvonne M. Pigott seeking to place women in the mainstream of urban history through her study of paid female workers in “Fredericton 1861: The Experience of Working Women” (unpublished paper delivered at C.H.A., Fredericton, 1977). Using quantitative techniques to analyze data extracted with extraordinary energy from censuses and marriage registries. Pigott relates the age, religion, ethnicity and economic background of women workers to their entry and persistence in the work force and to their distribution among the five occupational categories of servant, labourer, dressmaker, shopkeeper, and teacher. These linkages take Pigott beyond showing what women worked at for pay to suggesting why. Mature black women had to work as labourers to support themselves and their children. Daughters from poor Irish-Catholic homes worked as servant girls, daughters from slightly better-off Irish-Catholic homes as dressmakers, in both cases apparently to augment otherwise inadequate family incomes. With the teachers and shopkeepers the question of motivation would appear to be connected with marital status, but as its linkage with occupation has not been systematically examined (there is no Table for Percentage Distribution, Marital Status by Occupation), the reader is left with questions. How many shopkeepers were single, how many widows, how many inherited their shops from fathers or husbands? In the case of the teachers, is the following sentence meant to imply that marriage disqualified women from the teaching profession in Fredericton: “Because teachers worked for a longer period of time than did the majority of other young women in this study, only eight [out

of 25] were located in the marriage records"? If 88 percent of the young women teachers in 1861 lived at home and a high proportion of them had the same residence in 1871, can we infer, as Pigott suggests, that the teachers entered the work force in search of "respectable independence"? Would not the large proportion who were daughters of skilled manual workers have been expected to contribute to the family income as much as the servant girls and dressmakers?

Ester Boserup has found the "polarization and hierarchization of men's and women's work roles" to be characteristic of "the modern, urban economy".⁷ In a fine essay, "The Feminization of Teaching" in *The Neglected Majority*, pp. 49 - 65, Alison Prentice has documented this process from 1845 to 1875 within the teaching profession in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well as Upper and Lower Canada.⁸ Women had, of course, been teachers in homes prior to the 1840s. The "feminization of teaching" took place during the period when schooling was being moved out of households into public institutions; teaching was being professionalized; and grading was being introduced as education was extended to older children, and smaller schools consolidated into larger ones. While women entering public teaching encountered prejudice concerning female abilities and woman's proper place, "the idea of a predominantly female elementary teaching force . . . gradually gained acceptance in British North America" as the sexual hierarchization of teaching allowed men to monopolize the higher grades and administrative positions and discriminatory wage differentials allowed school systems to hire two female teachers for the price of one male. Prentice analyzes the mechanisms of women's subordination in the teaching profession, but admirably her essay also pays attention to women teachers' resistance to subordination, suggesting a progression from women's defence of their right and ability to teach to assertion of their right to equal pay and opportunity with male teachers.

Perhaps more than any other genre in women's history, biographies of notable women serve a compensatory purpose. Yet that purpose is realized only when the biographer writes from the feminist perspective. *Don't Have Your Baby in the Dory!* (Montreal, Harvest House, 1973), H. Gordon Green's biography of Nurse Myra Bennett, illustrates how a male supremacist outlook can distort and ultimately trivialize the material of a remarkable woman's life. For more than fifty years, with little thought of remuneration and often under conditions of great physical hardship, Myra Bennett (née Grimsley)

7 *Women's Role in Economic Development* (New York, St. Martin's Press, 1970), p. 140.

8 Unfortunately the essay does not address itself to the question of the marital status of female teachers in the third quarter of the 19th century. Did law or custom forbid women the combination of marriage with teaching? Or was it a profession open not only to a self-supporting single woman but also to a wife seeking economic independence within marriage?

served as nurse, midwife, dentist, and surgeon to the people of Daniel's Harbour and surrounding communities up and down the west coast of Newfoundland's Great Northern Peninsula. Green is not unappreciative of Nurse Bennett's achievement, nor unsympathetic to her self-sacrifice. But when it comes to her severity in enforcing standards, and her intolerance, indeed occasional angry impatience with others' nonsense in emergency situations, one detects a note of unease. Green likes patting a woman on her head for selfless devotion to others; he does not like the idea that she could be intimidating. Green has difficulty transcending his male-centred outlook: he speaks of "our women" (p. 21) and addresses his readers as if he expected them all to be male (p. 11). The biography begins, not with Myra Grimsley, but with her husband-to-be Angus Bennett. At times Green's patronizing stance verges on lack of respect for his subject. "To this day", he writes, "no one in Daniel's Harbour or beyond would think of calling her by her first name. Always she has been given her title of 'Nurse'" (p. 60). Yet throughout the book Green himself calls her Myra. Nurse Grimsley-Bennett kept a diary. Passages directly quoted from it and from the interviews she granted for this book constitute the best parts of the biography.

"The fact is, you cannot study the history of women without at the same time studying the history of men", Arthur Marwick observes in his recently published *Women at War 1914 - 1918* (London, Fontana Paperbacks, 1977, p. 13). Given the distribution of power between the sexes, the reverse of that observation has not, however, been true. Even in accounts of social and economic change involving and affecting the female half of the population, women have commonly been treated as merely "there", as the "people" were merely "there" in conventional political history, or consideration of women has been tagged on as an afterthought. Hence the necessity of women's history. But as the admittedly egregious example of *Don't Have Your Baby in the Dory!* shows, just taking a woman or women as the subject is not enough. There must also be the attempt to see the situation through a woman's eyes. Certainly women have no monopoly on this skill, as David Zimmerly's sensitive editing of Elizabeth Goudie's autobiography demonstrates.

The study of the history of women in Atlantic Canada is only beginning and there are many questions which need to be explored, such as women's role in migration.⁹ The difficulties facing scholars currently at work in the field include not only those of the women's historian in general, such as the difficulty of juggling simultaneously the two categories of sex and class, but also ones peculiar to an economically dependent region, like the increased

9 See Anne Martin Matthews, "The Newfoundland Migrant Wife: A Power versus Powerless Theory of Adjustment", *Atlantis*, II (Spring, 1977), Part II, pp. 152-66.

temptation to see women as nothing but passive victims. A strong antidote to that temptation is Sophia Firth's *The Urbanization of Sophia Firth* (Toronto, Peter Martin, 1974), an excellent account of one woman's migration with her family from unemployment and a drafty shack with outdoor plumbing in Restigouche County, New Brunswick, to unsteady employment, a deteriorating neighbourhood, and hassles with City Hall Inspectors and Manpower and Immigration in Toronto. It is not merely a female version of *Goin' Down the Road*. Sophia Firth is a highly intelligent, tough-minded, trenchantly articulate, and self-aware woman. Her story does not end in crime and defeat, but in sustained dedication to helping, not cheating, one's sister and brother, to social justice and democracy and to a belief in individual and group action to make the government serve the people who pay it to govern. Her stand on women's liberation, as on many other issues, is individual and unorthodox. She even formulates her own philosophy of freedom through poverty. Her book can serve to remind us that the experience of women, present and past, is vast and varied and that the proper study of womankind is woman.

RUTH PIERSON

Whites and Indians

If in A. L. Kroeber's famous phrase, "culture is a precipitate of history", then the study of history may not be so much an attempt to illuminate the past as to come to terms with the present. For all the peoples of the Americas, an important constituent of this historic experience and one that uniquely shaped life here has been the complex inter-relationships between Whites and Indians. Thus, it is not surprising that ever since Europeans discovered what to them was a new world, these inter-relationships should be explored by writers of virtually every kind.

For the historian the study of Indian-White relations has its special problems. Two are of particular consequence. First, the Indians of the North American continent did not have writing systems; their societies lacked the centralized institutions, particularly commercial ones, that foster the development of such systems. Consequently, they did not leave for future generations the raw material historians demand for the practice of their craft: written documents. Second and of possibly equal importance, the Indians were not as infatuated with history as were their contemporaries of the Western world. The reasons for this are ill-understood, but may well rest on a different attitude than that familiar to us towards both time and cause and effect as expressed in temporal sequence. Those great bodies of tradition in Indian society that correspond to historical lore in our own often lack the particular sonorities we associate with accurate historical accounts and because we do not have at present the means of converting these traditions to