

Culture



An Affair to Remember: Winoque, 1965

Tom McFeat

Volume 3, Number 1, 1983

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1084161ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1084161ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Canadian Anthropology Society / Société Canadienne d'Anthropologie (CASCA), formerly/anciennement Canadian Ethnology Society / Société Canadienne d'Ethnologie

ISSN

0229-009X (print)

2563-710X (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

McFeat, T. (1983). An Affair to Remember: Winoque, 1965. *Culture*, 3(1), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1084161ar>

Article abstract

Following the exclusion of their children from the nearby Anglo high school in June 1965, a series of events occurred at the reserve community of Winoque which culminated in an apparently unrelated dispute over the proposed use of band funds to secure independence from the town.

The community had been divided between two factions, self-defined as crowds. The leader of the crowd I identified as *Restricters* was the chief; the leader of the other crowd I identified as *Extenders* would be that chiefs opposition in the November elections.

Crowds then, were in part ideologically committed to action at the Indian/non Indian boundary. *Restricters* idealized this as a barrier or void whereas *Extenders* idealized it as a path or boundary zone. Put to the test in the issue of whether the community should send its children back to the high school, if invited, the crowds were forced to modify positions in the face of public opinion.

An Affair to Remember: Winoque, 1965

Tom McFeat
University of Toronto

Following the exclusion of their children from the nearby Anglo high school in June 1965, a series of events occurred at the reserve community of Winoque which culminated in an apparently unrelated dispute over the proposed use of band funds to secure independence from the town.

The community had been divided between two factions, self-defined as crowds. The leader of the crowd I identified as *Restricters* was the chief; the leader of the other crowd I identified as *Extenders* would be that chief's opposition in the November elections.

Crowds then, were in part ideologically committed to action at the Indian/non Indian boundary. *Restricters* idealized this as a barrier or void whereas *Extenders* idealized it as a path or boundary zone. Put to the test in the issue of whether the community should send its children back to the high school, if invited, the crowds were forced to modify positions in the face of public opinion.

À la suite de l'éviction de leurs enfants d'une école secondaire anglophone au mois de juin 1965, une série d'événements se déroula au sein de la communauté de la réserve de Winoque. La crise trouva son point culminant en une dispute apparemment sans lien avec la question soulevée. Cette dispute porta sur une proposition d'utiliser des fonds de la bande afin que celle-ci acquière une autonomie en matière scolaire vis-à-vis de la municipalité.

La communauté se divisa en deux factions se définissant elles-mêmes comme foules. Le porte-parole de celle

regroupant ceux que j'ai dénommés les Restricters fut le chef de la bande et celui de la faction réunissant ceux que j'ai désignés du terme de Extenders le candidat de l'opposition au chef aux prochaines élections de novembre.

Les foules s'opposaient sur leur définition de la frontière entre Indiens et non-Indiens et sur leur mode d'intervention. Les Restricters voyaient cette frontière comme une barrière, un vide alors que les Extenders l'idéalisaient comme un chemin, une zone de contacts. Mais devant décider du retour ou non des enfants à l'école en cause, si jamais une telle proposition était avancée par la direction de l'établissement, les deux factions durent modifier leurs positions en regard de l'opinion publique.

Background

In July of 1965 a crisis in education faced the people of Winoque¹, a reserve situated a few miles from a town in Atlantic Canada. The ratepayers association of the town had voted to prevent further attendance of the Winoque boys and girls then enrolled in the regional high school. This rejection affected the entire community at Winoque whose five hundred people began to experience fundamental changes in their relations with each other and with the world around them.

Winoque was established as a reserve in the early nineteenth century; however, one can hardly

estimate its earliest times for the archaeology of the area continues to reveal ancient habitations.

Becoming a reserve entails more than a single act of having lands laid aside for a community's use; the transition marks ancient forms of living for disuse as well. The rolling country, the forest and streams, would henceforth be places to visit, or to hide, but no longer were they life supporting. Their hard demands would not again shape the lives of people. This tiny segment of humankind had entered a void where their new settlement was, for the first time ever, without a significant resource base and what remained of those resources were now monitored by powerful intruders. The dwindling resources left behind in their "surrenders" were soon legislated out of existence as short-season accessibility and prohibitively expensive licenses made it virtually impossible to practice established methods of fishing, hunting and trapping. And so it became obvious that they needed to reassess their environment and ask where resources other than those they had known might lie.

The nineteen-thirties were witness to the first local attack on this void, when Ray Bigjohn left a town north of Winoque to return home as chief. Ray brought with him a concept of the integrity of the reserve as a unit. In his arbitrary yet dedicated way, he declared war on those who had occupied "his" community and had used "his" people as they liked: the pulpwood company, the power company, the agent, the game warden were all included. So were non-Indians, especially resident farmers who occupied Indian lands. Even some local Indians were interlopers to him as they held no claim to reserve land at Winoque; Ray dispossessed them as well.

During Ray Bigjohn's "reign" (as he sometimes labelled his terms of office) until the late nineteen-fifties, a number of local developments took place. The most significant of these was the building of a council hall. This became an established focus of interest and decision as well as an important source of revenue where bingo games, dances and banquets drew in the people. Cash earned during summer and fall basket making and potato harvesting was in turn spent here. This money was then allocated by the council to various committees that were established to oversee activities of interest to the people as a whole: little league baseball, Brownies, Boy Scouts, Alcoholics Anonymous and community improvement, were some of the relevant activities. Without actually becoming a cooperative society, the people of Winoque had discovered mechanisms of cash redistribution that

were both efficient and effective within the community.

During the nineteen-fifties Ray began losing ground, and in his last unsuccessful election he could not believe that after so many years he still was not chief, and much diplomacy was exercised by relatives and friends to convince him that others were now running the community². From the mid nineteen-fifties to the mid-sixties, a transformation was taking place in response to conditions probably set in motion by Ray, for during that decade power in the community had come to be split almost fifty-fifty, and chiefs entered office with margins of less than half a dozen votes from a substantial voting population³.

A chief's or councillor's close associates, whether kin or not, were believed to be those most likely to be favoured recipients of the community's resources. The older formula (that a successful chief is one with many relatives) had given way to other considerations at Winoque; close relatives were often, but not always, important supporters whereas non-relatives may have been supporters and close relatives not. Some of the Winoque people themselves referred to voting in self-definition as between "our crowd" and the other-definition as "their crowd", perhaps more often as "that gang!". A crowd was spoken of as "those who go around together a lot."

If crowds were not wholly comprised of kin and were without associational umbrellas, there was nevertheless a strong ideological difference uniting each against the other. This was a view of the most desirable relationship between the community of Indian people and other specific non-Indians or specific issues. The view had become sharpened since the days when the older chief, Ray Bigjohn, had regarded the community as being in a contest with the world.

Since the issue at stake in 1965 was education, I designated these "crowds" in ideological terms as *Extenders* and *Restricters*⁴. *Extenders* behaved as if a boundary connecting the reserve with Anglo communities was their reference point: here, work, schooling, some associational attachments and trading took place in interaction with Anglos. *Extenders* regarded this as both necessary and worthwhile and they explored the void originally forced upon the community by its reserve status.

On the other hand *Restricters* looked upon the boundary between Indians and Anglos as empty space separating different entities — cultures, perhaps — to be maintained as a void. They were oriented both inward and to the past.

When in power *Extenders* organized activities

as a boundary zone rather than as a barrier; they liked to run the Boy Scouts, the little league baseball and hockey teams, and were more inclined than *Restricters* to join in associational activities in the nearby town; they sometimes talked of “influential friends” among Anglos. The *Restricters* organized activities more as resources at or within the boundary, such as building a community shop for the basket industry, turning part of the reserve near the highway into a trailer camp or motel, and establishing a beach for tourists. During the time of the school crisis, many also proposed to establish their own high school and cooperative store on the reserve.

The Two Weeks of Crisis

The chief of the reserve, Ron Beasley, told me that his telephone rang about eleven p.m. on the eleventh of July and (as he said), “I was just told flat out, like, that the ratepayers voted our Indian boys and girls out of the school.”

This message came to him through the official source of the district superintendent of schools, the man whose responsibility was to see that the regular ratepayers meeting was called. The district superintendent told the chief that the vote had been 24 in favour of exclusion, 1 against exclusion and that 4 had abstained. It was estimated that between three and four hundred ratepayers had not attended the meeting. No quorum was required.

The chief responded by calling the Indian superintendent’s office, fifty miles away, thus assuring rapid transmission of the information to Ottawa. He also spread the news in the community, and by the end of the next day it was everywhere. I was told (on arriving a week later) that public opinion formed very rapidly, and everyone felt shocked.

Group Interests

Indian Affairs had a high stake in the success of the association of Winoque with the town school. Having for years striven toward integrated schooling, they wore the success of the high school experiment like a badge. Winoque also had an interest, for there is no question that the children were succeeding in the school. Begun in 1958 with only 14 pupils, by 1965 they now comprised nearly a third of the school’s enrolment. As about a third of the families in the community were currently sending children to the high school, the matter affected them, but moreover, as we shall see later, realistic alternatives would prove to be either dis-

agreeable or not feasible. The children themselves had reason to want to stay, for though they had never been real playmates of the town children, the boys had for a long time played baseball against them, knew them, and now competed more or less successfully in school. Winoque boys were also dating some of the town girls. Finally, there was clearly institutional involvement, for the chief of the community, Ron Beasley, most certainly was about to be called upon to speak and act on behalf of the community and to represent it to the town as well as to Indian Affairs. But he did not, indeed could not, know that what he had to say would be taken down and quoted in newspapers all over the country.

Intervention of the News Media

Probably the chief, Indian Affairs, the town and county, all anticipated some normal set of events following this change in the schooling situation; there was also an expectation concerning the use of appropriate channels of communication. The normal expectation was for Indian Affairs and the county jointly to put quiet pressure on the ratepayers to reconsider their decision to exclude Indian students. In turn the ratepayers would quietly tell the county that it must allocate more money to the town for each student (this being the original point of dispute). The county would compromise. The people of Winoque would not be involved in any of this action. In the end the children would be told they could return to the school.

What otherwise might have been no more than a case for the record, so to speak, became a full blown affair, for the town itself and the people of Winoque were instant national news. This happened because of something no one had anticipated: the presence of a vacationing Toronto Star reporter. By immediately telephoning the story to his newsroom, he turned what might have been a clean little blast into a large and messy explosion.

The case also became an affair because other newspapers in the country took the lead from the Toronto Star, making it national; from this initial misinformation all took it for granted that the target of the rate payers’ action was none other than the Indians. For the newspapers the case was not just an affair, it became a *cause* on behalf of a minority group and seemed to present a clear-cut example of school segregation. Little Rock, Arkansas, was then known broadly in the land for its segregation policies.

For the ratepayers this was a private debate, or fight, which they thought of as confined to them-

selves and the county. For the newspapers, the county was entirely left out; to them it was a fight between the town and the Indians. Accordingly, some dubbed the town "The Little Rock, Arkansas of Canada".

Without reporters on the scene the country's newspapers were remote from the action. The Toronto Star reporter had a stake in the newspaper interpretation and even though on the scene, was not about to modify the story in favour of the ratepayers' version. Even the nearby town and city papers were unable to bring much in the way of new interpretations to the situation, in part because the ratepayers in question had retreated from view on the assumption, no doubt, that there was little they could do to improve their image.

But with increasing responsiveness of people from the town and Winoque to the local and regional press, personal views brought the issues more clearly into focus. Then the cameras of a major television station arrived on the scene and set up outside the house of the chief.

Chief Ron Beasley was counted among the *Restricters*; thus, he spoke for the community as a whole, but as a *Restrictor*. His main points were two: he supported the newspaper view that this was indeed racial prejudice. But he had something of his own to add, that Catholic Indians excluded from a Protestant school were also the victims of religious prejudice. With this latter point there appeared to be little agreement within the community. The people of Winoque occasionally voiced suspicion of their own Catholic church, especially priests whose reputations were then fifty or sixty years old and passed through various incumbents. The people did not seem much concerned in an issue involving Catholics and Protestants. But the question of racial prejudice remained open awaiting further judgment.

Would the community take a stand and, if so, then what? Was the issue racial prejudice or something else? There was every appearance of the news having hit the people very hard. Paula Sills (an *Extender*) said that she felt inside as though she had been crushed and, like other *Extenders*, (but apparently less so among *Restricters*) she was sensitive to expressions or stories of prejudice. Frank Paulis, another *Extender*, and the current chief's opposition in the coming November election, would not back away from the position he had earlier taken, that the people of the town were fair minded and friendly and thought of you as a person rather than as an Indian. For his part, said Frank, he could walk the main street of the town any day without fear of prejudicial treatment and carry on the ordinary business open there to anyone, White and

Indian alike. He bought his groceries there, some of his family's clothing, and would enter the barber-shop, as would others from the Community, without fear of rebuff⁵. He also gossiped on the main street, joked about fishing, knew and was known by most of the men of the town. But neither he nor his wife were likely to enter homes in the town, nor were those from the town about to be invited to his. Thus, when Frank Paulis spoke of the people as fair minded and not prejudiced, he was not testing all of that reality, for he responded only to the main street of the town, as though this commercial zone of male interaction were not in fact what it was: a sub-culture of the greater cultures of Anglos and Indians, the interaction between them forming the boundary zone in which *Extenders* were staking their claim. But there was an ambivalence in the attitudes of *Extenders* and it was difficult for them to hold to the position that the issue was not what the newspapers had said it was and what the chief had supported.

Action and Reaction

The preliminary question of appropriate action resolved itself in two ways.

First, pressure from newspapers, television and radio interviews, and possibly local public opinion in the town, made it inescapable that the ratepayers would call a second meeting in the expectation that it would be better attended. A question would be put before them once more, but not that concerning the share of money the town should receive from the county; the question was now whether the original motion to exclude the Indian children from the school should not be set aside. The original issue for the town was dead, and if the ratepayers decided in favour of doing away with the original motion everything should fall back into place as though nothing much had happened. It was believed both on the street of the town and at Indian Affairs that this would occur.

Second, it was not clear that the people of Winoque would permit their children to return to the town school even if invited back. The attitudes and feelings at Winoque, where everyone seemed either hurt or mad, or both, now favoured the *Restricters*. Speaking for them, the chief said that he would send observers to the ratepayers meeting, if invited to, but for his part, he, Ron Beasley, did not want any of his children to return to the town high school again. However, this was not to be his decision. Rather, if the ratepayers invited the Indian children back, he would call a meeting of the community and ask for a vote on that question. He

stated publicly that the community may refuse to send the children back.

The chief set about exploring alternatives. By the end of the first week he made known the possibility that the school in another nearby town might take grades ten and eleven, while grades eight and nine could be accommodated at the local reserve primary school. Failing that, the only alternative was to send the children to the Catholic high school in the city, about a hundred and twenty miles away. When the first alternative proved to be unworkable only the city alternative and its Catholic high school were left. But this alternative seemed widely unacceptable, mainly because of the distance involved and the consequent need for the children to be boarded there. There is little doubt then that the chief's strategy and this outcome tended to move public opinion back toward the *Extenders*.

In the meantime, new possibilities were being advanced by some of the more conservative *Restricters*. They were asking why they could not enlarge the grade school on the reserve (that is, in the community) so that the people of Winoque could have their own high school right at home. They would then invite Indians from all over the Atlantic region and even the Iroquois could attend the first real Indian high school.

Where should the money come from? Although the chief did not publicly ask this question, several of those associated with him did. They said that the three hundred dollars paid out by the federal government to the county for educating each Indian child (which the ratepayers and county would both have lost) should be redirected to the community so that the school could become self-financing; it would actually make money which could be deposited with the Band fund.

What the chief did say publicly was that they should draw from the Band fund to establish a community cooperative store which would look after their needs for groceries, drugs, clothing and hardware; this, in turn would help fund the school. At any rate, they would certainly take no more of their trade back to the town; after all, they earned their money in Maine; why, then, should they spend it in a town like this one?

On this final point the issue began to crystallize, but not exclusively on the question of prejudice at all, for among the *Extenders* the first real signs of indignation were evident over the chief's plans for the use of Band funds. They were saying, "What does he think he is making himself into, and with money that belongs to the community?" The most active members of the *Extender* crowd, among

them Frank Paulis, were now saying they would "have to stop the chief on that."

Following these assertions of plans for the cooperative store, a split was now becoming evident in the unity of the *Restricters* themselves. Speaking at length on the disposal of Band funds, Ray Bigjohn, the old ex-chief, warned the people of this "road to disaster". It was he who had nurtured the career of the present chief, and had kept him on council, and thus, close to the action. It was he who was now saying that Ron Beasley was "getting out of hand and spoiling his chances of being re-elected". That the inner circle of *Extenders* had become aware of the possibilities in this breakdown of unity became evident at the first Band meeting called for July 20 in order to choose a deputation to the ratepayers' association meeting in the town⁶.

At this Band meeting the current chief suggested that he and his council represent the community, but this suggestion was deftly challenged by Frank Paulis who would be the challenger in the next election. He got up from the center of the crowded hall and asked all council members to show that they really knew what the issue was all about.

What *was* the issue? Was it racial prejudice? Was it religious prejudice? Was it education, no matter where? Or was it the arbitrary use of Band funds? It was all of these and nobody could name a single issue precisely; each of the five council members in turn stood at the behest of the chief to confess this. Each said that he or she did not feel adequate to represent the community at the ratepayers' meeting, and did not understand the issue. After they had all in turn spoken and then sat down, there was silence and, if I read it accurately, a feeling of the void, for no one at that moment appeared available to represent the community at the forthcoming ratepayers meeting in the town.

But the *Extenders* were waiting to fill the void, and at this time one could see the outer aspects of their inner circle. First, Paula Sills, Frank's sister, nominated her cousin John Nichols; Frank's wife nominated Frank and Frank nominated Philip Paul and then Noel Bigjohn, son of the old ex-chief, but identified with the *Extenders*, though a middle-roader.

This group visited a packed ratepayers' association meeting in the town to witness a reversal of the vote. It now stood at 250 in favour of inviting a return of the Indian children to the high school and 50 against. Word was that those 50 were the original 25 with their wives!

For a week following this meeting a change appeared to take place in the postures of the two crowds, the *Restricters* and the *Extenders*. For the

first time, television interviews appeared that involved high school students themselves. Both Indian and Anglo boys and girls were interviewed in groups but separate from each other—the Anglos in town, the Indians at Winoque. And they all said much the same thing, namely that they liked being together. They played basketball, baseball and hockey together, ate in the lunchroom together and went to the school dances. Anglo kids said “Some of my best friends are Indians” and Indian kids said “Some of my best friends are White kids”. The question pertaining to racial discrimination had, it appeared, been diluted. Even the *Restrictor* arguments that kids interviewed were especially selected so as not to show prejudice, while probably true, carried little force. After all, two of the chief’s six children were among those interviewed!

The date of the second and final Band meeting had been set for July 28. During the week that intervened between the second ratepayers’ meeting in the town and the second Band meeting at Winoque, some issues fell aside. Much of the steam had been taken from the discrimination arguments, so that neither race nor religion were spoken of as issues any more. I think people were relieved, for they liked the street in the town and knew they did not walk it like skulking interlopers even if they also knew they had no full claim to the place.

But they expressed hurt over the affair, and the hurt in some was real as I witnessed at the ratepayers’ meeting where the people from Winoque heard themselves discussed as though they were not present at the meeting at all. Frank Paulis, the committed *Extender*, said, “I never felt I was being judged until tonight. It sure is queer to hear them talk about you like this.”

Then I began to hear that some people, having previously agreed with the *Restrictor* position of not sending their children back to the town school, were changing their minds; among them, I was told, was the chief himself. Two women from the *Extenders* independently told me that the chief’s wife had stopped talking to him forty-eight hours earlier when he announced his change of mind. While I had no judgment of the truth of this statement, I recorded it as one among other indicators that *Extenders* were beginning to perceive disunity among *Restrictors*.

Talk still continued among some of the *Restrictors* of plans both for the cooperative store and the community high school. At the final Band meeting Aubrey Paul spoke of how Indian history could be taught so that Indians might learn about their heroes as the Whites do, and he spoke of Louis Riel as one of these. But Aubrey was thought of as

too extreme and too immediate in his designs for the community⁷.

Gradually word developed, first from one and then another, that as this vote went at the Band meeting, so too would it go in the coming November elections; the whole event gradually changed to become a kind of trial election as well as dealing with all the issues so far reviewed. But the issue of education remained, perhaps with increased delicacy in the light of that remaining, undesirable alternative, the city boarding school. Even the old chief, Ray Bigjohn, calling Frank Paulis to his wheel chair, said to him before the meeting began: “Don’t let them send our children down to the city; that will set us back a hundred years.”

The meeting took place on July 28. It was a long meeting with speeches made both for and against a return. But the first to speak was the current chief, Ron Beasley, who repeated what he had originally said. He spoke of how he had been hurt and insulted as all his people were at what the town had done to them, of how he had determined never to allow his children to return to that school, of how he had been unable to discover feasible alternatives and of how he had made a new decision, namely that he now favoured a return to the town high school in September.

With this act Ron probably finished his career as chief of the Band; however, since he was studying for a job in the city with the new Community Development office, it is possible that he did not care. Or perhaps pressure had been centered upon his shoulders by the veteran of many reserve conflicts, the agent. The agent, the regional supervisor, the county and the town had all been in regular consultation with each other and sometimes with the chief; these were closed meetings and I was not part of them.

The issue was not just one of group solidarity and unity of the crowds; it also involved significant shifts in value-orientations that clustered in the ideologies of *Restrictors* and *Extenders*. The outcome of the voting demonstrated this shift, which was 130 in favour of a return and 67 opposed, approximately two to one. As a predictor of the election outcome the following November, this was not bad, for in a community which for a decade had elected chiefs with majorities of usually two or three votes, this time there was an upset: in November 1965, Frank Paulis was elected chief at Winoque with a majority of thirty-four votes⁸.

Discussion

I may appear to have interpreted the events so

far described as social formations that followed from the initial actions of a dedicated but arbitrary leader. The residue of feelings about Ray Bigjohn, especially his move against other Indians — “his own people!” Paula told me with renewed astonishment — were recounted during the nineteen-sixties, and some twenty years after these exclusions had taken place stories still circulated of the pleadings of older people for Chief Bigjohn to “leave them be”.

Several young men had been in the armed services and on return Frank Paulis, Joe and Paula Sills, Phil and Leslie Thoma, and a few others, formed the core of the *Extender* crowd; this was said in the community to be in response to the continued “dictatorial” actions of the old chief. At this time Ray Bigjohn with Ron Beasley and Lawrence Fox, formed the nucleus of the *Restrictor* crowd. Ray sought early to sponsor those whose support on his council he could count on⁹.

Crowds formed without much adherence to kinship other than marriage and sometimes siblingship. Noel Bigjohn was Ray’s (the ex-chief’s) son, yet he was an *Extender*. Don Bigjohn, another *Extender*, was the old chief’s paternal nephew and Frank Paulis was his maternal nephew. Those remaining with him were only remotely connected to Ray through kinship, although in general the wives of *Restrictors* were not only strong crowd supporters but sometimes driving forces within them.

While we have rather shallow “efficient” causes for the formation of crowds, these crowds were nevertheless intent on defeating each other at elections, and their actions were frequently expressed in terms of some adulation or condemnation, depending on the side, of Chief Bigjohn. The *Extenders* certainly asserted that, but for the repressive acts of the chief, there would have been no need of the defences crowds set up against each other.

But the broad ethnographic panorama yielded frequent occurrences of “crowds”; whatever form they may have taken of power groups, cliques, action-sets or the more familiar factions and moieties, dual-organized groupings were everywhere. Murdock took note of these occurrences long ago, and his enumeration of their wide distribution was very convincing. (Murdock, 1949: 90). Therefore, despite arguments to the contrary, there is significance in the numbers of factions in a community (Epstein, 1962: 139, as quoted in Nicholas, 1965: 23), though not any number. Their significance lies in being only two, as though earlier situations of multi-factionalism resolved themselves into two member stand-offs. As “everywhere

people deplore factions”, writes Bailey, and as they think of factions as signs of decay, (Bailey, 1977: 21), it may be that persons react this way only in communities that are literally ridden with factions. Factions existed at Winoque in the sure knowledge of the issues that separated one from the other. Rather than lacking concern for the future, or of having “limited the ‘moral horizon’ to the membership of one’s own faction” (Ibid: 23), their asserted claims to exist were always premised on the needs of the community as a whole. Secretive, tactical, joke telling at each others’ expense, and far from any sense of corporateness (Nicholas, 1965: 29), Winoque factions were self-perpetuating through actions that both defined and consolidated crowds: “going around together”. Shopping, travelling, fishing, partying together, crowds indulged in interactions frequently and for long durations, thus affording themselves the illusion of continuity. But crowds they were, and for them life was not a total preoccupation with political issues.

Fenton reviewed the literature on several North American native groups in order to show not only that factions were widespread but also that they arose in a diversity of situations and this gave them a variety of local colourings. But he also argued that dual organizations (either moiety or faction) were appropriate responses to needs for social order when centralizing agencies had not evolved. With evolution, hence central control, factions would become transformed into political parties under hierarchical authority (Fenton, 1955: 331).

These models do not bring automatic understanding to what occurred at Winoque. Under acculturative influence, hence local evolution, have these crowds become “real” political parties? At one time there was talk among *Extenders* of working with the Liberal party establishment; had this been achieved, the crowds would have been absorbed by political action groups with bases elsewhere than in Winoque; but the crowds remained intensively local. Thus, if a position has to be taken along the continuum between party and faction, I will settle more on the side of faction and measure the results against some recent situational models.

Bailey’s model of faction, though describing a single ethnographic case as though an ideal type, (Bailey, 1977) affords some insights on the situation at Winoque. The first criterion is, at any rate, satisfied, where there must be a “whole” out of which group differentiation can take place in factional form. Since everyone at Winoque seemed to be speaking for that “whole” when asked, this

would prove to be true were it not for the fact that the “whole” described by *Restricters* did not much resemble the same “whole” described by *Extenders*. Lévi-Strauss observed that the dualities in dual organizations are not necessarily symmetrical (Lévi-Strauss, 1963: 133), which, in this situation was true, for not only were the models different, but so were the sociological features of the crowds: *Restricters* were on average less affluent than *Extenders* and less likely than *Extenders* to form networks outside the community, other than those with potato-farmer patrons. Indeed, the asymmetry of the two organizations is everywhere true of dual-organized wholes.

But the “whole” was the same for both in other respects; it was the same in space, time, identity and especially in the widespread occupational commonalities in the basket industry that was community-wide and entrenched in sentiment, yet operated without ideological leanings either toward *Restricters* or *Extenders*. (McFeat, 1962)

A probable divergence from Bailey’s ideal model lay in the absence of showdowns¹⁰; rather, Winoque seems to have cultivated persisting mutual disapprovals and suspicions as the people were currently and perhaps chronically involved in disputes that never were settled.

Seen through the Winoque Affair of 1965, disputes appear to have been the activities of factions and were never confined to, or even begun with, two persons and then extended to their supporters, as in cases described by Gulliver (1973: 689). Rather, they reached across the community, often from the chief who would be accused of misusing funds or giving favourable jobs or limited resources to his friends and relatives, and with the chief in return fuming that some part of the community (meaning “that gang”) were out to get him. “Goddamit, I’ll resign before I’ll open my books to them!” was the reaction of a chief in the early sixties, some three or four years after the community had unseated old Ray Bigjohn.

Disputes were always over resources, especially those tied into the Band fund and its misuse, real or imagined, where the person in power was accused of fixing books and making under-the-counter deals with friends. The community as a whole was a place of disputes in search of an issue.

Following Gulliver, we would expect a dispute to become known in the community after an initial act, a fight. Once this occurred and social forces had born upon the disputants, there should be the search for an “arena” and the narrowing of the terms of the dispute to the “dispute proper” where core differences were identified. Finally, an agree-

ment should be arrived at in the presence of both supporting and uncommitted witnesses and the outcome ritualized, as a kind of binding which ends the dispute, and thus more or less assures a settlement. Gulliver (1973: 688) also cautioned that this need not be the order of events in the process.

The Winoque crowds turned the process around, for they were always in dispute and, as Bailey pointed out in his ideal situation of faction, there were no mediating statuses; however, there were always behind-the-scenes actions by federal officials working with or against the chief in the interest of government policy.

In this dispute, as it was eventually to become, the Band council hall stood only as an all-purpose arena. Its ambiance had not as yet matured so as to accommodate the “dispute proper”. Time marked off a set of events that aided in the search, not so much for the arena, as for the dispute. The events were as follows:

First Event: Ratepayers Exclusion and Press Reaction; Winoque Withdraws

Before this occurred there was no evidence of unusual disturbance between the crowds at Winoque, nor did the ratepayer vs county dispute ever become a significant aspect of the affair. Positions were taken in the light of the new situation which had made everyone feel angry and hurt by what had happened. The sentiments of the people seemed to be driven into the orbit of *Restricters* as the significance of what had been done to them began to penetrate discussion.

Second Event: Television Interviews with the Chief; “Who does he think he is?”

The chief took a hard line on racial and religious prejudice and reaffirmed the *Restricters* philosophy. Then began a dialogue that culminated in proposals for alternatives; these included other local schools, the community school and the city school. The co-operative store, backed by the Band fund, as a proposal, began to turn sentiments back again. “Where will the children go?” “Can we trust this chief and that crowd?”

Third Event: Band Meeting to Select Deputation; Games People Play

Following Rapoport’s (1960: 9-11) classic conflict model, the object of a *fight* is to destroy or drive away an opponent; of a *game* (where the opponent remains in place) the object is to outwit the opponent. In a *debate*, on the other hand, the object is to convince the opponent and, more parti-

cularly, the observers. To this triad I would add *ritual conclusion*¹¹, where the object is to incorporate, and thereby redefine the opponents and to deny that any oppositions exist (Turner, 1977). This continuum of fight-game-debate-ritual conclusion is relevant to the Winoque affair.

The fight¹², of course, was yet to come and the debate had been going on for a long time under the steam generated by the crowds. Occasionally a kind of play-fighting erupted with elections, either maintaining or displacing incumbents, especially chiefs. And if a ritual conclusion was to arrive there certainly was no place for it now. Now, it seemed, was the time to outwit an opponent. This took place when Frank Paulis called the chief, Ron Beasley, on the question of "who can name the issue?". Council members were quite taken aback, and having accepted the rules of that game, they fell one after another as the *Extender* crowd put themselves in. And even though the *Extenders* did not volunteer to name the issue, they went as a deputation anyway since they did not carry the same obligation as the official incumbents, chief and council.

What, then, did winning this contest mean other than that the community was about to be represented in town by those most friendly to the town? However, they were not *real* representatives and I am sure the *Restricters* on the council were happy to stay home.

Fourth Event: *Ratepayers' Reversal;* *Firming Public Opinion at Winoque*

There still had to be a vote in the community following the new invitation from the town, for the chief had so decreed. But contradictory events maintained states of uncertainty about what the issue in the voting would involve. The wide publicity surrounding the event would make it difficult for the *Restricters* to have it their way; on the other hand, it would make the *Extenders* look like collaborators if the game were won too easily. Furthermore, statements emanating from the stage of the town school at the second ratepayers' meeting were very unsettling. Members of the deputation, all of them *Extenders*, could not believe what they were hearing, especially where not one of the voices addressed Indians directly on any issue; they appeared to be pawns, their children symbolized as "those brown hands that were there along with the white hands that reached into my wife's cookie jar" which was recorded from the stage that night. So the contest won earlier by the *Extender* crowd really carried little weight in the real issue, which was now more clearly the availability of a good

school in the immediate area. Following this meeting, persons in the community were increasingly repeating the question about what would happen the following September now that the invitation to return had been issued and alternative arrangements had fallen through.

Gradually the influence of the "whole" began to be felt and, unlike Bailey's ideally factored community with its underlying element of *anomie*, or Gulliver's absence of a mediating incumbent, there was, in fact, a whole and a mediating force. Both turned out to be the community: no single leader was involved, for the existing leaders could not mediate any part of an issue on which they had already made public declarations. However, the collectivity *did* mediate as information came in from both sides, from the *Restricters* that they could provide no reasonable alternatives, from the *Extenders* that their friendly town people were displaying racial prejudice that was alive and well, to say the least.

The game was now over and the fight would begin. The question of the intended use of Band funds for a cooperative store was now paraded as the dispute proper. Identifying the dispute seemed to consolidate the issue, that is, the *real* issue. The *Restricters* hardened their stand and the *Extenders* intensified their criticisms. The question no longer pertained only to Band funds for a cooperative store; rather, it pertained to the chief himself who was now represented as willing to tap the Band fund for any purpose at all. That is what made up the dispute proper.

Fifth Event: *Final Band Meeting; Debate*

The "real issue" (schooling) was hemmed in by the "dispute proper" (Band funds). When the Band meeting began, the chief had reversed his own position and, much against the wishes of most of his own crowd, he had asked the people to vote for a return to the town school. This statement seemed to relieve the "real issue" of schooling of the burden of carrying the "dispute proper", Band funds.

Thus was the "dispute proper" (Band funds) shelved and the real issue (schooling) settled. The "dispute proper" emerged in November at the election when the issue then was of the care and handling of Band funds.

The crowds did not disband. On my return to Winoque in 1978 they had much the same inner core and they did not appear to like each other any more than they had before. But they were older and less effective in steering election issues. Besides,

the issues had changed although they took account of both *Extender* and *Restrictor* philosophies in modified form. Councils worked with a more inclusive context that involved concepts of pan-Indianism and aboriginal rights which had no widespread support during the nineteen-sixties. As for work in the boundary zone, the new leaders maintained relations with good lawyers, knew how to manipulate the media and how to win at conferences and influence governments. But I noted that the school issue was still strong, reflecting the same two "crowd" philosophies. A new grade school had been built in the community, and had taken a most charming traditional shape. Members of the community were intent on administering it by and through their own people. They were not doing it happily and several families had sent their children to the town grade school while others were strong supporters of the community school as it stood. A small faction, now, but a big issue.

The faction and dispute models drawn from Bailey and Gulliver, respectively, appear to be ideal types that would be dependent on more predictable and less complex conditions than those at Winoque where administrative interference and, in 1965, the media, were powerful presences. Nevertheless, the question was self-defined and locally settled; both the dispute and the arena sat squarely in Winoque. And while "dispute" and "faction" components were present, their self-ordering was different from those models and seemed to describe quite different sets of relationships. The in-fighting and low blows one expected to follow from an anomic situation at the pinnacle, as reflected by Bailey's or Fenton's assumption concerning absent (or underdeveloped) leaders-in-hierarchy, did not hold for Winoque. On the other hand, the role of public opinion proved to be a powerful mediating and judging force as, for example, Firth (1949), Hoebel (1954), and Burrige (1969), all described as general features of dispute settlement or faction mediation. In the end the real issue cut through the interests of the crowds and won over the less committed members; the disputes trundled on, having found new ground with old crowds in the local school.

Gulliver identified a sequence moving from fight to arena search through to dispute proper, and on to settlement and ritual conclusion. Here, again, wide divergence has to be allowed. For the Winoque crowds there was no real dispute, only an ongoing debate-fight that was never settled; then the issue of a vote about a return to the town school suggested a dispute proper which had been a long time in surfacing but, when it did, brought other dispute

items with it well beyond the arena into future elections. The people had, of course, their arena in the Band council hall¹³ but that stood only as a shell without an issue. Here, then, they were not engaged in searching for an arena nor did they really have one either, until issue and arena could be matched one to the other. The people of Winoque were engaged in preparing the arena by exercising public opinion in advance of the dates set for the final Band meeting.

As Gulliver's model would predict, there was a ritual conclusion. The children themselves participated in television interviews where kids of the town and kids of Winoque independently said to their interviewers that they had no quarrels with the other kids, and they liked each other and wanted to remain together, and the ritual phrases "some of my best friends..." were repeated frequently as mutually incorporative gestures. Some months later the local newspaper reported that two of the Winoque boys had been elected class president and secretary of the student council in the town school. The former was the son of the new chief, the latter the son of the ex-chief.

Those ritual acts were media events and not generated in the community. Nevertheless, they involved the kids who, in the community, were thought of as untainted by the hard feelings of the crowds.

In the end the real issue proved to be broader than schooling and deeper than the terms of the dispute proper concerning Band funds. The real issue stood firmly on who could be depended upon to administer the affairs of the community through its Band funds, its land holdings and land claims, and in its negotiations with outside agencies on questions of importance to the community. That is why the ex-chief did not run in November and why the new chief was voted in with a good majority and why this vote cut through traditional leanings that had made factions of the crowds and the crowds politically relevant. This was not because the *Extender-Restrictor* issue was dead, for it certainly was alive (though in a different sector of political life), but because of the need of the people to persist and change, yet still maintain a community that could be shared by everyone.

SUMMARY NOTE

The aspect of Nicholas' study of factions I found most interesting pertained to political change. He identified four factions (or near factions) at an Ontario Six Nations reserve, and from the literature he notes the widespread factionalism that ac-

companies contacts with Anglo society (Nicholas, 1965: 50 ff.)

This study suggests a related direction. The events that took place during the six weeks of observation were related to previous or ongoing actions stemming from contact with Anglos: the ratepayers, Indian Affairs, and various media outlets. The purpose of studying these events as boundary-directed toward "voids" and "boundary zones" (through *Restricters* and *Extenders*) was made clear from the data of the events. Two directions are therefore suggested as the basis for another study: that Barth's boundary model should set the direction of the study (Barth, 1969: Introduction) whereas Wallman's "dissonance" model of inconsistent experiences between ethnic groups should provide the rationale for relating factions to ethnicity (Wallman, 1978).

NOTES

1. The names of all persons and the community have been changed. Funds for this study were generously provided, both in 1965 and in 1978, by the National Museum of Man, Ottawa. I extend my thanks to the "specialist" referee for critical observations and helpful recommendations; of the latter, I acted on all but one.

2. The shift reflected feelings about Ray's policies.

3. Events of the nineteen-fifties at Winoque were not observed. Information for the period between the mid-thirties and 1961 was derived from the personal recall of half a dozen people.

4. Imposing labels on the crowds is at best an arbitrary way of trying to be reasonable. But *Extender* and *Restrictor* are better labels than "conservative" and "radical" which carry distracting connotations. Titiev's (1944: 84ff) "Friendlies" and "Hostiles" were cogent in the context of Puebloan factionalism, but seemed to be more "action sets" (Boissevain, 1974) than groups forming into "crowds". Like the people of Northern Harbour, Newfoundland, these crowds were self-labeling; like Northern Harbourites, "the sources of crowd relationships are multiplex" (Schwartz, 1974: 83). As these ideological friendship groups are not "just" Friendlies and Hostiles, they are also not "just" crowds. That is why I depicted them as *Extenders* and *Restricters*.

5. Most hair cutting was done at Winoque at a cheaper rate than in the town.

6. Band chief, Band council and Band list (of persons) are official, indeed political, designations. Members of the Band, including the chief and the council, resident at Winoque, are those I have referred to as community.

7. Here is an example of a *Restrictor* whose "conservative" ideas were not advanced enough for the situation in 1965 yet would be considered forward looking in 1980.

8. The paper, thus far, and without present revisions, was completed in 1966. Out of respect for the privacy of the persons involved, I have not until now circulated it for publication. I read this part of the paper at the C.E.S. meetings in Vancouver (1982); it was also read on my behalf by Dr. Shuichi Nagata at the meeting of Americanists in Manchester, September, 1981.

9. This reflects Nicholas' observation that factions are recruited by a leader. However, it appears only to apply to *Restricters*.

10. Bailey (1977: 23) writes that "...action is violent, outside the existing rules of competition, argued on by fanatical enthusiasm." Crowd action at Winoque was never violent, and so hardly fanatical.

11. I am using "ritual conclusion" specifically to fit the dispute model.

12. Bailey writes that factionalism is a form of contest, a fight as much as a game where it is important to outguess the opponent "by striking first" and when necessary to "go straight into action" (Bailey, 1977: 23).

13. This was an "arena" council on major issues, an "elite" council on all others. On this distinction, see Kuper (1971: 13), and for the Winoque variant, see McFeat (1974: 49-59).

REFERENCES

- BAILEY, F.G.
1977 The Definition of Factionalism. In M. Silverman and R.F. Salisbury (eds.), *A House Divided: Anthropological Studies of Factionalism*. Social and Economic Papers No. 9, Institute of Social and Economic Research, St. John's, Memorial University.
- BARTH, F. (Ed.)
1969 *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Oslo, Scandinavian University Books.
- BOISSEVAIN, J.
1974 *Friends of Friends*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- BURRIDGE, K.
1969 *Tangu Traditions; A Study of the Way of Life, Mythology and Developing Experiences of a New Guinea People*. Oxford, Clarendon.
- EPSTEIN, T.S.
1962 *Economic Development and Social Change in South India*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- FENTON, W.N.
1955 *Factionalism in American Indian Society*. Proceedings, 4th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (Vienna, 1952), Vol. 2: 330-340.
- FIRTH, R.
1949 *Authority and Public Opinion in Tikopia*. In M. Fortes (ed.), *Social Structure*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- GULLIVER, P.H.
1973 Negotiations as a Mode of Dispute Settlement: towards a General Model, *Law and Society Review* 7: 667-691.
- HOEBEL, E.A.
1954 *The Law of Primitive Man*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- KUPER, Adam
1971 Council Structure and Decision Making. In A. Richards & A. Kuper (eds.), *Councils in Action*, Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology, No. 6.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, C.
1963 *Do Dual Organizations Exist?*, Social Structure, New York, Basic Books.
- McFEAT, Tom
1962 *Two Malecite Family Industries*, *Anthropologica*, 4: 233-271.
1974 *Small-Group Cultures*, New York, Pergamon.
- MURDOCK, G.P.
1949 *Social Structure*, New York, McMillan.
- NICHOLAS, R.W.
1965 *Factions: A Comparative Analysis*. In M. Banton (ed.), *Political Systems and the Distribution of Power*, A.S.A. Monographs No. 2, London, Tavistock.
- RAPOPORT, Anatol
1960 *Fights, Games, and Debates*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- SCHWARTZ, Ronald
1974 *The Crowd: Friendship Groups in a Newfoundland Outport*. In Elliott Leyton (ed.), *The Compact, Selected Dimensions of Friendship*, Social and Economic Papers No. 3, Institute of Social and Economic Research, St. John's, Memorial University.
- TITIEV, Mischa
1944 *Old Oraibi, A Study of the Hopi Indians of Third Mesa*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. XXII, No. 1, Cambridge, Mass.
- TURNER, David
1977 *Ideologues of Band Society*, Toronto Semiotic Circle Monographs, No. 1, Toronto.
- WALLMAN, Sandra
1978 *The Boundaries of 'Race': Processes of Ethnicity in England*, *Man*, 13: 200-217.