In an effort to clamber up on the shoulders of scholars in the field, the following will review the secondary literature dealing with Indian/non-Indian contact giving particular emphasis to the fur trade. A summary of this paper will appear as part of an introduction to a study of Swampy Cree/trader relations in The Pas area from 1670-1840. Commentary will therefore centre primarily on what has been written about early contact situations.

The past writing of the history of Native peoples in North America has been roundly criticised in recent years. In the case of the treatment of Indians in histories written for public schools, J. Henry (1971) in an American study and G. McDiarmid and D. Pratt (1971) in their review of Canadian social studies textbooks have demonstrated a catalogue of omission, over-simplification, bias, negative evaluative assertions, distortion, falsification, stereotyping, and simply bad scholarship. Indeed, McDiarmid and Pratt (1971:51) have determined that Indians receive by far the worst treatment of any group, including that of Afro-Americans.

Disappointingly, James Walker (1971) in his evaluation of university undergraduate level books finds similar problems. Many of the supposedly more rigorously scholarly works reviewed are characterised by the same use of negative value-added descriptors; the pervasive neglect of Indian roles, initiatives, interests and importance to modern society; as well as the un-scholarly use of sources. Although receiving positive evaluations from Walker, even historians such as Eccles, Stanley and
and Innis are not entirely free of blame as will be shown below.

Although Canadian Historians have tended to be less interested and less venturesome in attempting general wide ranging histories of Indian experiences, there are Canadian parallels to Buch's works as E. H. Spicer's (1969) *A Short History of the Indians of the United States*. Nevertheless, few "mainstream" Canadian historians give more than a passing comment to the significance of the Indian other than in relation to early strategic military or fur trade concerns. In both cases Indians are portrayed only as ancillaries to Euro-Canadian interests.

A. S. Morton has produced the standard reference work on the history of the Canadian West (original 1939). Morton (1973: xxiv-xxv, 129) displays certain biases against the French as well as Indians, while he is partial toward the Hudson's Bay Company. Van Kirk (1980:13) also believes that Morton has distorted the relative success of the Nor'Westers in their relations with the Indians since the former were but products of a colonial setting which had produced a negative view of Indians for some time before they were encountered in the West.

W. L. Morton's (1957) *Manitoba: A History* fits generally with the criticism that Indians are underplayed in the European story. His writing is also open to Walker's criticisms concerning terminology. These criticisms are even more appropriate, however, for the recent "official" diamond jubilee history of Saskatchewan by J. H. Archer. Although he utilises some current sources on Indians such as Ray (1974), Indians as usual soon disappear from the picture. Archer (1980:45, 133) also takes a position which tends to ignore the importance of Metis grievances ("highly
coloured charges") and their role in the struggle for responsible government (attributing it to "the old settlers, mainly from Ontario and Britain"). Again, the admonition of Walker and many others such as Patterson (1972) for a central place for Indians in our history has been ignored.

Diamond Jenness (1937) and George Stanley (1952) do make an attempt to establish an "Indian Background" to Canadian history, however, their efforts bear little fruit in the writings of the historians following them. Perhaps this is just as well; for, although the writings of Jenness and Stanley have been important sources for anyone studying Canadian Native peoples, their underlying attitudes are no longer acceptable for modern scholarship.

It is perhaps too easy to criticise Jenness for reflecting what were only the common attitudes and scholarly opinions of the day. However, it is important to point out the shortcomings of his approach precisely because he continues to be cited so often. In his The Indian Background to Canadian History Jenness (1937) makes an awkward attempt to refute some of the unacceptable explanations for the so-called "backwardness" of North America's Indians. In doing so, he succeeds only in reinforcing these ideas by using the literary device of presenting them positively, yet only weakly refuting them. Indeed he replaces these inaccurate interpretations with one which is equally unacceptable. Jenness (1937:5) argues that it is not racial intelligence per se, but rather inherited "temperament" or "genius" which explains the differential success of European and Native peoples. In the end analysis of course, this approach is
fundamentally a racist one and it is this concept along with that of inevitable European progress which forms the "background" of his writings.

Jenness (1972:264) continues this analysis into the historic period in his popular *Indians of Canada* (original 1932) where he argues for the inevitable disappearance of all the tribes" and declares an end to any further cultural contributions of Indians except as objects of study. These attitudes should give pause to all who uncritically use Jenness, since his ethnography cannot help but be coloured by these underlying concepts and attitudes.

Although Walker seems to be generally satisfied with G. F. G. Stanley's approach, he too is a product of an unscientific outlook and an ethnocentric milieu. It must be granted at the outset that Stalley has devoted a great deal of attention to the history of Native people and cannot be accused of ignoring them as many other mainstream historians can be. Stanley's (1973) approach to Indian history is exemplified in his widely utilized study *The Birth of Western Canada* (originally 1936). The Stanley (1973:vii, 48-9) approach is based on an ethnocentric view of the inferior cultural/racial characteristics of Metis and Indian people and an unscientific dependence on the concept of "primitive". While anthropologists such as L. K. Hsu (1964) have determined that the concept "primitive" is analytically useless, historians such as J. E. Foster (1976:71) have argued that the value judgement inherent in Stanley's approach are also entirely unacceptable. Native people were resisting the advance of EuropCanadian society, not out of an inherent "primitive fear of progress" as Stanley maintains, but from
completely rational and justified concerns about their political and social future.

More recently, E. P. Patterson (1972) has attempted a general overview of the Indian history of Canada. A Colleague of Walker's, Patterson (1972:3-4) makes a plea for an Indian centred approach to history as a prerequisite for understanding the contemporary Indian viewpoint and actions. Despite his own admonition, however, Patterson seems to end up by presenting a Eurocentric outline. As R. F. Berkhofer (1971:364) asserts, even those historians claiming to focus on the "Indian side" of the story get caught up by the non-Indian focus of the documentation available.

Patterson's work does not seem to have made any significant impact on the writing of Canadian history. His book tends to be too generalised to be used as a reference and in addition he depends somewhat uncritically on Jeness and Stanley. Some of his interpretations have also been challenged by Milloy (1972:82ff). Unfortunately, perhaps the most significant aspect of Patterson's book seems to have been ignored. Despite his assertion that there have been several attempts at analysing "colonial parallels" to other parts of the world, such comparisons are few and far between. Patterson cites A. G. Price (1950), but this is now a dated and ethnocentric study typical of the time of its publication. More recently, W. R. Jacobs (1971) has written a short article which can only establish some superficial comparisons and a three-stage model. In concert with his interests in the other aboriginal peoples of the "Fourth World", G. Manuel (1974) has also attempted to [woded] the analysis, but few others are interested in following this lead by directly comparing the
colonial experiences of Native peoples throughout the world. Even Patterson himself drops the effort at colonial parallel analysis in the second part of his book, leaving it to the reader to draw comparisons, which in effect ensures that these parallels will not be drawn.

A minor fault in Patterson’s book (and a criticism which is perhaps a trifle unfair given his ambitious scope) is the lack of detailed attention to the Subarctic area. This gap is partially filled by R. Pumoleau’s (1973) study on Treaties 8 and 11, but less ably so by K. J. Crowe’s (1974) A History of the Original Peoples of Northern Canada. This latter study is not only unnecessarily disjointed, but a history from the Native viewpoint in name only. It ends up as an Indian history in still another Euro-Canadian framework.

Aside from the more general efforts of Jenness, Stanley and Patterson, the prime emphasis in the history of Canadian Indian/non-Indian relations has been focused on regional studies alike that of Crowe’s just mentioned.

In eastern Canada the seminal work is A. G. Bailey’s (1976) The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures 1506-1700 (original 1937). As the title suggests, Bailey, like many of his contemporaries, takes the position that a “cultural clash” was inevitable and that it ensued soon after contact. He surveys an interpretation based on the concept of “deculturation” which is now being questioned by anthropologists such as Koolage (? ) as well as by historians such as Patterson (1972:104-5). Patterson (1972:70) is also unhappy with Bailey’s uncritical use of sources, while O. P. Dickason (1976:117) contradicts
Bailey's assertion that Indians quickly came to see themselves as culturally inferior as a result of contacting the Europeans and their superior technology. Of course, C. J. Jaenen (1974 and 1973) has clearly documented that, although acknowledging the practical usefulness of European technology, Indians continued to view themselves as completely superior to the French.

Bailey's general contention that Europeans were dominant in the relationship is also contrasted by L. F. S. Upton's (1979:xv, 171) assertion that the Micmac for example retained control over their own fate until the British establishment of Halifax and the influx of United Empire Loyalists after 1783. Unfortunately, the work of Jaenen continues to be disregarded in favour of the Bailey interpretation by modern scholars such as Anderson and Frideres (1981:218-220).

W. J. Eccles (1969) has written a highly regarded study on the westward movement of the French frontier, however, Indian interests again tend to be subordinated to the French imperial story.

The eastern Subarctic region has long been the focus for scholars such as E. Leacock studying such topics as the origins of Algonkian family-owned hunting territories. However, except for the work by Harold Hickerson on the southern periphery, the central Subarctic has been generally neglected until quite recently. Charles Bishop (1974), Arthur J. Ray (1974) and Ray and Freeman (1978) have begun to rectify this situation.

Although Bishop's work is widely regarded as being excellent, he on occasion relies too uncritically on the opinions of fur traders and seems to question their perceptions only when it suits his purposes (cf. Bishop 1974:190, 269, 292). In his
critique of Saum (1965), Hickerson (1966:822) cautions historians about the use of fur trade sources as does Drinnon (1980:363) concerning other types.

E. S. Rogers (1977:671) objects not only to the awkward structure of Bishop’s book, but also to his at times questionable manipulation of what is termed “sparse, often vague, and sometimes contradictory” data. On the whole, however, Bishop’s ethnohistorical and ecological approach is one which is increasingly seen to be a useful one.

A similar approach, with the addition of quantitative methods, is taken by Ray (1974) and Ray and Freeman (1978) to the question of trade relations with the Assiniboine and Cree in the area southwest of Hudson’s Bay. Although criticized on literary, editorial, and structural grounds by Van Kirk (1976:51) and Martin (1977:729), Ray’s Indians in the Fur Trade is an important study which identifies the parklands ecotone as a crucial factor in any interpretation of the fur trade in the area. Ray is also able to corroborate Rich’s (1960) important article delineating the Indians’ atypical (in Western terms) economic responses to prices and markets.

Ray’s (1974:227) conclusion concerning a speculated inability of some Indian groups to re-adapt to later fur trade conditions, however, is not a convincing argument, given all the prior stress given to the adaptability of Indians to new fur trade conditions. This unexplained failure of Indian adaptive strategies is perhaps what Carter (1976:651) somewhat cryptically refers to as Ray’s inability to deal adequately with the problem of social change.
Ray's (1979) attack on Calvin Martin's book seems to have stimulated an ongoing battle, as the latter is relatively critical of Ray's collaborative effort with D. Freeman. Martin (1979:1503) objects to the "frustratingly uneven" character of 'Give Us Good Measure', but more importantly he is critical of the terminology used. The terms "market", "middleman" and "mark-up" etc. are deprecated as "malapropos" and "ethnocentric". Martin argues that Indians' economic behaviour was so manifestly non-Western that the use of such terms as "middleman" is not at all heuristic. Martin (1979:1504) claims that what has been referred to by others as "numbers crushing" is a methodology which cannot answer the questions Ray and Freeman put to it, namely: why Indian demand remained inflexible and why Indians engaged in trade at all. Nevertheless, many along with Trigger (1979) [who has criticisms of his own], agree that Ray and Freeman have produced an important study concerning the changing responses of Indians to the fur trade. One might suggest as does Van Kirk (Judd and Ray 1980:164), that more attention be paid to Indian responses to fur traders.

Representative of the work that has been done on the Plains area is Oscar Lewis' highly regarded book The Effects of White Contact Upon Blackfoot Culture. Lewis (1942: 23, 27-28) establishes the value of ethnohistory in correcting historical error and is among the first who suggest that differences in trading company organization had an effect on the types of relations between traders and Indians [cf. Brown (1980) and Van Kirk (1980)]. Nevertheless, some of Lewis' interpretations have been questioned. Rich (1960:50-51) contradicts the asser-
tion that alcohol became a major trade (as opposed to gift) item (Lewis 1942:21). As will be discussed below, more recent interpretations by Marxists as well as non-Marxists would question the statement by Lewis (1942:21) that the monopoly established after 1821 had a "wholesome effect" on Indians.

J. S. Milloy (1977:36ff., 82ff.) has written an M. A. thesis which reinterprets aspects of the history of the Plains Cree westward movement presented by Patterson and others. One shortcoming of Milloy's (1972:v1) thesis from an anthropological perspective is his dependence on the concept of "tribe" in his analysis. As M. H. Fried (1975) and J. Helms et al. (1968) have pointed out, "tribe" is a vague and seriously flawed concept with little empirical validity. It is a concept which must be demonstrated not assumed as does Milloy.

There is a relatively wide range of secondary sources dealing with the Indian history of British Columbia. Wilson Duff presents an accepted general account using traditional interpretations which are now being re-evaluated. For example, Duff (1969:53) repeats an assertion concerning the particular susceptibility of Carrier culture to acculturation influences. This interpretation which is based on the earlier work of Morice and Goldman can now be refuted using ethnohistorical methodology.

Duff's book has been followed by several excellent studies including those of Robin Fisher (1977) and Rolf Knight (1978). Although Fisher's book Contact and Conflict (again note the "conflict" theme) has been deemed worthy of the Governor General's award, it is not without its faults. 

Following a common tendency (discussed below) to assume
Indian "dependence" on the fur trade, Fisher (1977:33, 39) ends up by contradicting himself concerning Carrier dependence on interior H. B.C. posts while coastal trade through the Tsimshian was still viable. In addition, Fisher is among those who bear the brunt of Knight's Marxist critique. Knight (1978:9, 22) who has written a valuable book on the history of Indian labour in British Columbia, clearly documents that Fisher's (1977:23, 96) assertions that Indians were not members of the proletariat and that they became irrelevant after 1858, are incorrect.

Apart from the regional focus just examined, a number of other trends emerge from the secondary literature on Indian/non-Indian relations.

An important recent trend is for historians to place much more stress on the Injina initiatives and to portray them as more that mere pawns of big players in an essentially European centred story. In fact, many historians such as Bishop (1974:409)96-7), Ray (1974:62), Fisher (1977:44, 96-7), and Rich (1967:94) are finding that Indians were in control of the relationships and the trade for much longer than has been acknowledged previously. These findings are beginning to refute the long-held generalization of early dependence on the European and his technology (cf. Hickerson 1973:23-24). Indeed authors such as Innis (1962:143) (original 1930) have for some time been stressing a strong degree of interdependence in the relationship between trader and Indian.

In the case of supposed dependence on guns for example, Morantz (1980:40-41) and Ray (1974:79) illustrate that during the period under discussion the trade figures for guns and powder preclude the possibility of any major reliance on fire
arms. Bishop (1972:64) makes the point that the situation of dependence was a complex one. For example, while the coastal Cree were dependent, the inland Ojibwa remained relatively independent until late in the eighteenth century [cf. Ray (1974:75) for the Assiniboine and Woodland Cree]. As for the assertions of those such as Jenness (1972:254) and Murphey and Steward (1956:336) that once enmeshed, Indians found it impossible to withdraw from dependence on the fur traders, the findings of Parker (1972) and Sloan (1979) on the Chipewyan are beginning to refute this generalization as well. Quite simply, generalizations concerning "dependence" have seldom been documented, nor can the concept be applied across the board as has so often been done.

Another major discussion in the literature concerns the economic response of the Indians once confronted with the fur trade. Some portray them as quickly adopting European economic concerns and motivations, while others picture the "uneconomic Man". Oddly enough, much of this discussion seems to occur in an ethnographic vacuum. Only Harold Hickerson (1973) and to a lesser extent Abraham Rotstein (1967) seem to place any importance at all on examining the aboriginal nature of trading systems as a basis for understanding their behaviour in the European-introduced system. Indeed some deny that aboriginal trade existed to any significant degree.

Motivation becomes a key point of discussion. Although in a contradictory way, Adams (1975:24-5) asserts that Indians adopted the profit motive, while the work of Rich (1960) and Ray and Freeman (1978) demonstrates that Indians did not res-
pond to prices or supply and demand as Western economic theory would expect them to. As Rotstein (167:107) maintains, in fact Indian patterns of trade, not European, came to dominate the system in North America. Morantz (1980:56) attributes the blindness of the traditional interpretation to the latter to the perception of the trading system in terms of the more familiar modern economically dependent Indian society.

Another important divergence of opinion among the sources surveyed is whether or not Indians were unconsciously exploited by participating in the fur trade. Marxists such as Hickerson (1973) and Myers (1972) agree that Indians were severely exploited. On the other hand, many such as Rotstein (1967:113), Rich (1960:43) and Ray (1974:141) maintain that the Indians were quite able enough to exploit the system in their own right by manipulating traders, especially during times of competition. Indeed, A. J. Ray (Judd and Ray 1980) refers to Indians in terms of modern demanding consumerism.

A major theme which also runs through the secondary literature is that of cultural conflict. The influence of Jenness, Stanley and Bailey on this theme has already been identified. More recently, authors such as Sheehan (1969:270) and Larrabee (1976:39) give conflict a central place in their analyses. In particular, Marxists such as Hickerson (1966:822) stress the character of economic conflict in the relationship and some like Sweet (1975:498-499) maintain that it was a crucial aspect of even initial contact.

Of the opposing view are those such as Washburn (1957:48-49) who argue that initial contacts were remarkably free from con-
lict and that, for areas outside the advance of the Anglo-American agricultural frontier, economic relations should be classified as mutually beneficial or "symbiotic" until monopoly conditions obtained. Even Hickerson (1973:23) indicates that early trade was not in fact disruptive. More will be said about exploitation below.

In recent times, some new themes seem to be emerging. As previously indicated, scholars such as Upton (1979), Ray (1974), Milloy (1972), and Fisher (1977) are demonstrating a keener interest in the "Indian side" of the story and are attributing importance to Indian interests and initiatives. Rich (1960) and Ray (1974) have clarified unique Indian responses to the trade by contradicting the assertions of historians such as Saum (1965:6) that the trade remained an essentially European, "civilized" venture. These trends, as well as an increasing stress on social, as opposed to commercial and European biographical, studies are indicated in the papers presented at the four North American Fur Trade Conferences between 1965 and 1981. The new orientation toward social history was especially apparent at the 1978 conference in the papers by Bishop, Morantz, Martin, Nicks, Van Kirk, Brown and Judd (Judd and Ray 1980). Nevertheless, D. P. Bibeau was still able to level many of Walker's criticisms at the 1981 Grand Portage Conference in a paper entitled "The Fur Trade Literature From a Tribal Point of View".

Another relatively recent trend in the literature is that toward increasing significance being afforded to Indian and mixed-descent women in economic as well as social terms. Sylvia Van Kirk and Jennifer Brown are the leaders in this direction.
Although Brown (1980) acknowledges her debt to M. W. Campbell, the latter's book The North West Company (Campbell 1957) is not really a precursor to this new emphasis on women in the fur trade. Campbell (1957:38-9) takes a relatively condescending approach, mentioning women only in relation to the recreation of European men. Her book is essentially a commercial history which pays little attention to Native men much less Native women. Perhaps this connection between Brown and Campbell explains why Brown's book deals much less with the Indian side of the story, stressing the backgrounds of the company men and commercial structure more than Van Kirk (1980) who places more emphasis on the Native background. Mainstream historials such as W. L. Morton (1967:11-12) have made passing reference to the important role of women in the fur trade, but they have failed to give the attention warranted. Van Kirk (1980:?) asserts that in fact intermarriage and the contributions of Native women were the fundamental basis for the emergence of a distinctive and self-perpetuating fur trade society.

Another refreshing tendency in the more recent literature is the attack on overgeneralization. As mentioned above, in the past, particularly the fur trade literature has been characterised by incredibly broad statements attributing everything from dependence to Indian or European motives across the board. As Trigger (1976:24) maintains, rarely if ever did the European or Indian groups form homogenous interest groups. To portray the Europeans as such is a mistake. Brown (1980:xx, 1) and Foster (1975:574) indicate point out the influence of varying social backgrounds and com-
pany structures on relations. On the Indian side, Ray (1974:75), Bishop (1974:64-5) and Knight (1978:8) stress the diversity of not only Indian ethnic groups (which is rather better recognised as a result of Jenness) but also their varying responses and adaptations to changing conditions.

The interpretation of Indian history as the history of working people is also a relatively recent approach. Although G. Myers (1972) (original 1914) was one of the earliest to analyse the Indian situation in terms of the ownership/labour dichotomy, Rolf Knight's (1978) *Indians At Work*, as well as Goldring (1979) and Judd (1980) have only recently picked up on the topic. The past neglect of this perspective is not really surprising, as Professor K. Osborne, head of Canadian Studies at the University of Manitoba, has stated, since labour in Canadian history as a whole has been generally ignored (Winnipeg Free Press, March 23 1980). It will be interesting to note, in given the historic antipathy toward Indians, how the latter will fare in the emerging field of labour history. Although, Judd (1980:313) for instance denies the need to utilise Marxist analysis, she seems not to take analysis of surplus labour to its logical conclusion. On the other hand, Knight (1978:20-22) (who is critical of those like Fisher who deny the applicability of this analysis) argues that Indians were almost totally integrated into the system of surplus wage labour at various times across the country. At any rate, this perspective opens up some very interesting possibilities in an area/that has been severely neglected.

If one were able to step back from a close-up inspection of
of the various topical trends in the study of Indian/non-Indian relations, a distinct overall pattern emerges. In very broad strokes, the picture which emerges from the secondary literature is contained within three major frameworks. These frameworks centre on different aspects of the relationship: first, the "cultural clash" approach; second, the psychological or "idealistic" approach; and third, the economic approach.

To a certain extent, the "culture clash" school has already been discussed above. Contemporaries writing in the 1930s such as Jenness, Stanley, Morton, and Bailey interpret Indian/non-Indian relations in terms of an inevitable conflict due primarily to not only differences in culture, but different degrees of advancement in "civilization" which made the Indian inherently inferior and conflict inevitable. More recently, E. M. Larrabee has proposed a model of Indian-European cultural interaction which also places heavy emphasis on conflict. Larrabee (1976:39) argues that the reason for widespread similarities in patterns of contact lie in the conflict between antagonistic "cultural themes". It is this conflict which, according to Larrabee, provides the major impetus for movement through his proposed sequence of relations. Crucial to this argument, however, is the fact that it depends on the European agents of contact being "yeoman farmers" with goals and attitudes. In the fur trade context, however, it appears as if conflicting "cultural themes" may play a less significant role, being replaced at least initially by a mutually beneficial, or "symbiotic" relationship based on complimentary cultural goals and attributes brought to the relationship.
The second major framework for the analysis of Indian/non-Indian relations is the metaphysical approach. This interpretation places emphasis on the European psychology as the key factor in determining the cross-cultural relations between the two groups. This "idealistic" approach is depreicated by materialists such as Marvin Harris (1979) who takes the position that the material conditions of the situation (i.e. the "infrastructure": technology, demography, ecology etc.) are the real causes behind social phenomena, not the metaphysical conditions (i.e. the "superstructure": ideas, values, beliefs etc.). This is not totally a Marxist position (which Harris also opposes), but a "cultural materialist" approach: i.e. materialism without the dialectics.

At any rate, many scholars in the field of Indian/non-Indian relations such as Berkhofer (1979:196), Jacobs (1972:108), Sheehan (1980), Drimon (1980), and Surtees (1977:113) maintain that it was the pre-existing images, ideas and attitudes (both positive and negative) among Europeans which conditioned their approaches to North American Native peoples. For example, "Attitudes (eg. prejudice)" is a central variable in the model for the study of intergroup relations suggested by Jaenen (Judd and Ray 1980).

Although O. Mannoni (1964:32, 204) acknowledges the importance of economics, he argues that the colonization of aboriginal peoples must be explained in ways other than economic. He suggests a psychoanalytical approach since so much exploitative behaviour was in his view manifestly uneconomic. He asserts that the "pure pleasure" of domination became the prime motivation for colonial exploitation.
Another idealist interpretation, that of Calvin Martin (1978), is presented in the book *Keepers of the Game: Indian-Animal Relationships and the Fur Trade*. Martin attempts to place emphasis on the supernatural concepts and "cognized models" of Native people as an explanation of their response to the fur trade. Although welcoming this novel approach, many scholars such as Ray (1979) argue that Martin's hypothesis is not documented strongly enough, nor does it explain the persistence in modern time of the traits he claims disappeared during the fur trade. Martin's explanation of disease and "despiritualization" as explanations for overhunting in response to the fur trade does not seem to hold up when tested with data on the Swampy Cree for example. Materialists such as Harris would agree that Martin should look for this explanation in the material conditions prevailing, and not depend on secondary idealist explanations.

In opposition to such idealist interpretations stand those scholars who make up the proponents of the third major framework which stresses the primary importance of economics. Many of the sources dealing with the fur trade quite naturally focus on the European economic features of the business aspect of the story. Innis (1962), Davidson (1967), Campbell (1957), and McManus (1972) are all examples of this traditional economic focus. Within this economic framework, however, there is another important stream of interpretation opposing the "liberal" school above. This is the school of Marxist analysis represented by those such as Myers, Hickerson, Rothney, and Knight.

The "liberal" analysis of fur trade relations is one which assumes that both sides benefitted to such an extent that even
monopoly conditions had a "wholesome effect" on Indians. The work of Ray (1974:141), Rich (1960:43, 49-50) and Rotstein (1967:113) for example tends to reinforce the interpretation that Indians were not exploited any more than they took advantage of the trading companies, especially during times of competition. In their view Indians bargained hard, understood the intricacies of "overplus", and were able to threaten to take their fur elsewhere if their wishes were not granted. Van Kirk (1980:7, 9) argues against the exploitation interpretation, asserting that it is an oversimplification, since as late as the mid-nineteenth century the Hudson's Bay company did not exert direct authority over Indians in Rupert's Land and that the two groups were mutually dependent.

Even with regard to sexual exploitation, Parker (1972:44) in agreement with Van Kirk (1980:4), argues that the institution of marriage en façon du nord makes the situation open to an interpretation different than that of pure and simple exploitation.

In opposition to this "liberal" approach, there is now coming to be a significant body of alternative analysis by Marxists in the field of Indian/non-Indian relations. As mentioned above, this analysis takes the position that Indians very quickly lost control over the means of production and became a dominated and exploited underclass in the fur trade. Following similar Marxist analysis of non-North American contexts as in Frank (1967:123) and Rodney (1972), Hickerson (1973:15) and Myers (1972:5, 124) for example argue for a deliberate undermining of the Native economy and lifestyle by the international capitalist system. The dialectical process involved
in the underdevelopment of the Indian economy is explained by Loxley (n.d.), Rothney (1975), and somewhat less effectively by Adams (1975). In concert with Knight (1978:24), these authors contradict the liberal interpretation that the basic problem is the exclusion of Indians from the economic system. The Marxists argue that in fact Native people have not been excluded at all, but have been well and truly integrated — but only at the very bottom levels of the capitalist system. In addition, contrary to the idealists above, Adams (1975:4-5) speaks for all of the Marxists when he states that racism is a product of the economic system, not the reverse.

A general criticism which could be leveled at many Marxists is that they often seem to lack a correspondingly sophisticated concept of anthropological and ecological issues. For example, contrary to Hickerson (1973:20) and Rodney (1972:10) who tend to romanticise the ecological awareness of the Native, it seems clear from the work of Marvin Harris (1979) that such "native" peoples lacked truly ecological knowledge, did not in fact "understand the laws of nature", and indeed over-exploited existing resources (even before contact with the fur trade). This is not to say that some members of the "liberal" school are not just as naive about ecological issues (cf. Jacobs 1972:126), but those who classify themselves as "materialists" of one form or another should not be able to ignore a major facet of the "material conditions" of life, i.e. the human ecology.

Rothney (1975:25, 114) is one who tends to overgeneralise about "dependence" on the fur trade. He also seems to mis-
understand and to be self-contradictory concerning the basic concept of the "neolithic" which has an integral part in his analysis. By definition, neolithic technology implies horticulture, a mode of production which was not practised by the Indians in question. Beyond this, the work of many anthropologists contradict Rothney's (1975:iii) assertion that so-called "neolithic" technology precluded production of a surplus. If Rothney were truly a "materialist", he would be able to see that it was not in any theoretical (but empirically false) difficulty with technology, but the ecological conditions which precluded production of a surplus.

Rothney (1975:86), Adams (1975:24) and Hickerson (1973:20) also seem to have ignored the findings of Rich (1960), Rotstein (1967) and Ray (1974) which indicate that Indians did not adopt traditional Western economic concepts of the profit motive and personal economic gain. Instead, they were motivated more by political and social considerations.

Since the area of expertise of many Marxists often happens to lie outside North America, it is perhaps understandable that Louise Sweet (1975;497) [Who is primarily interested in peasant societies of the Near East] can deny that the trading companies did not need to deal with 'entrenched protectionism.' This assertion is despite the fact that she mentions that a following paper by Ray deals with such local protectionism. Of course, the political and economic efforts of Indian middlemen in attempting to prevent European penetration is a major theme in the history of the fur trade in North America. There seems to be little purpose, much less factual basis, for denying this.
In general, a major unresolved problem with Marxist analysis of the North American Fur trade is that the capitalist system was able to force Native peoples to change their mode of production. It seems clear to those in the liberal school that Indians were able to make their own conscious choices to adapt their modes of subsistence. Perhaps more importantly, especially in the early stages of contact, Europeans did not have the power to force Indians to do anything. This is not to say that eventually Indians became trapped in an economic niche that was being systematically underdeveloped by the capitalist system (Loxley n.d.). However, this situation did not obtain immediately upon contact as many scholars of both persuasions seem to argue.

In the end analysis it may be precisely because early Indian trader relations are indeed "devoid of historically propelling class conflict" (as Rothney (1975:5) criticises non-Marxist analysis), being instead what social scientists term cross-cultural, inter-ethnic, or racial relations until the loss of autonomy well after initial contact. "Class" relations per se imply a type of dominance that was not evident in early Indian trader relations.

This brings us to what must be at this stage a brief consideration of a fourth alternative framework for the analysis of historic Indian/non-Indian relations. This approach might be described in terms of a sociological paradigm based on the concept of multi-variate analysis. It must be said that contemporary sociological theories of ethnic relations are not necessarily valid when applied in an historical context (Schiermerhorn 1970:195). Their applicability must be proven.
Nevertheless, sociological theories on intergroup relations provide a flexibility and an holistic approach not always found in Marxist analysis (or in liberal for that matter), yet which allow for consideration of economic and even psychological variables.

The following approach is outlined in Barth and Noel (1972). These sociologists argue that the various phases of the development of ethnic stratification (emergence, stability, adaptation, and change) are best explained by different frames of reverence or "perceptual contexts". In the past the "Conflict Framework" (focusing on incompatible goals of the interactive units) has been the one which predominates among scholars in both the "culture clash" and the Marxist school. According to Barth and Noel, however, this framework is best applied to analyse change in interethnic relations, while the "Race Cycle Framework" is more useful in explaining the period of emergent relations.

This latter framework places stress on an evolutionary processural interpretation. It takes into consideration several variables in the contact setting including the groups' sociocultural complexity, pattern and cause of migration, as well as the type, characteristics and size of the groups in contact. Variations in these factors lead to different outcomes beside the commonly assumed stratification: i.e. exclusion, symbiosis, pluralism, or assimilation.

Perhaps the most important concept to emerge from this approach is the necessity to distinguish between patterns of initial intergroup contact and later manifestations. Few if any of the sources reviewed attempted this, usually preferring to project later, but better documented, situations back into
the initial contact period. Washburn (1957:48) has indicated a need for more detailed study of the initial contact period.

If it is possible at all to summarise the foregoing overview of the secondary literature on Indian/non-Indian relations, it might be said that finally in the last decade of historical writing the admonitions of Walker, Berkhoffer, Patterson and McDiarmid and Pratt are being taken to heart. Not all "official" historians have done so, but much of the recent historical work is focussing on Indians as the central interest. Their behaviour is indeed coming to be better understood in terms of their own motivations, perceptions and advantages.

In order to continue this trend, scholars such as Foster (1975:571) have called for the combination of the various perspectives in order to produce an Indian history which can transcend the problems identified above.

It seems clear that an awareness of these varied perspectives, combined with the utilization of ethnohistorical methodology, will be able to provide deeper insights into the populations between Swampy Cree and traders and help to avoid at least some of past mistakes in the study proposed at the outset.
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