

Culture



Richard Salisbury's Anthropology: A Personal Account

Edward J. Hedican

Volume 10, numéro 1, 1990

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1080930ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1080930ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

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

ISSN

0229-009X (imprimé)

2563-710X (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce document

Hedican, E. (1990). Richard Salisbury's Anthropology: A Personal Account. *Culture*, 10(1), 14–18. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1080930ar>

Tous droits réservés © Canadian Anthropology Society / Société Canadienne
d'Anthropologie (CASA), formerly/anciennement Canadian Ethnology Society /
Société Canadienne d'Ethnologie, 1990

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des
services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique
d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de
l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à
Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

delà du fait que ce texte ait pu lui être imposé par les devoirs de sa charge de doyen, on peut y voir un symbole: Stendhal fut en quelque sorte un écrivain de l'exil, dont les meilleurs livres furent non seulement écrits ailleurs que dans le pays natal mais qui

de plus traitaient des manières de vivre rencontrées dans le pays d'adoption. On peut légitimement penser que Dick s'est de fait reconnu dans cet écrivain de l'exil.

Richard Salisbury's Anthropology: A Personal Account

Edward J. Hedican
University of Guelph

Richard Salisbury was our friend, mentor, colleague and clan elder¹. He will no doubt play an important role in the "origin myth" of our anthropological society, and it is unfortunate that he should be taken from us at a time when we would benefit from his wisdom and direction. We have a new name for our group, the Canadian Anthropology Society, and are trying to establish new directions for anthropology in Canada. His guidance and thoughtful suggestions will be missed. In academic circles, Richard Salisbury will no doubt be known for his three books, *From Stone to Steel* (1962), *Vunamami* (1969), and *A Homeland for the Cree* (1986). He played an important role in the developing field of economic anthropology, especially in his attempts to quell the furor generated by the substantivist-formalist debate. As he indicated in his summary of issues in the *Annual Review of Anthropology* in 1973: "The possibility of sterile debate is clearly present, if polarization proceeds further. What may be ignored is the degree of complementarity between the analyses" (1973: 92).

Throughout his academic career, this search for "complementarity", or a middle ground on which disputing parties could find a basis of common or mutual understanding, was one of his important contributions to anthropology. Take, for example, his study of "The Anthropologist as Societal Ombudsman" in David Pitt's book, *Development From Below* (1976). This study is essentially an analysis of how disputes involving the Cree of northern Quebec and the Tolai of New Guinea might be settled. Both of these activities, as Salisbury indicates, "imply a somewhat new conception of the role of the anthropologist as an intermediary in trouble situations between central agencies and local groups" (1976: 255). It is work such as this that begins the process of charting out a new course for anthropology - what one might call an applied anthropology with a humane face. But he also made it clear that anthro-

pology would be best served if anthropologists avoided choosing sides in conflict situations. As he explains:

I am convinced that when an anthropologist commits himself to one side only, he nullifies many of the benefits that his professional training could give to that side. He is not able to retain any confidence from the other side and so is unlikely to make an accurate analysis of that side's point of view, while any analysis he makes of his own side's point of view is unlikely to carry weight with the other side (1976: 257).

This thoughtful commentary has much relevance for the future course of our discipline. The current Hopi-Navajo land dispute could serve as an instructive case study of the dilemma faced by contemporary anthropology, as anthropologists line up in support of various causes, without sufficient thought given to the role that anthropology can serve in bringing about a cessation to the conflict. Surely Salisbury's warning is that we must avoid becoming active participants in disputes because it will only further exacerbate the problem, ultimately undermining any contribution that anthropology might make to solving human problems².

What emerges from Salisbury's work overall is a consistent concern with human problems in the face of large-scale changes brought about by outside influences. The study of Saine economic and political change in *From Stone to Steel* (1962) remains a classic work in this regard. However, the deleterious effects of outside pressures is pursued in a more vigorous fashion in his important *American Anthropologist* article entitled "Despotism and Australian Administration in the New Guinea Highlands" (1964). He clearly indicates that:

Although the indigenous ideology was one of democratic equality and competition, the empirical situation at this time [of fieldwork in 1953 and 1961] was one of serial despotism by powerful leaders" (1964: 225).

The controversial issue that Salisbury raises concerns "the apparent totalitarianism that seems to be universal in the first stages of developing nations" (1964: 239). There is no doubt that many anthropologists would prefer the view of indigenous New Guinea leaders as democratic and checked in any attempt at firm rule, but it is a testament to the integrity of the man that he should stake his professional reputation on his own convictions derived from thorough fieldwork.

Salisbury's move to McGill University in the early 1960's continued his emphasis on basic research coupled with attempts to place research in a more general context of discussion. This interaction between research and theory ultimately led to new directions in the application of anthropological studies to the study of public policy. His address to the National Social Science Conference in 1975 was an important attempt to push the social sciences more firmly into the area of governmental decision-making. In his paper "Policy Regarding Native People: An Academic Social Scientist's Perspective", we are led to the realization that:

if the verdict on social science knowledge is that there is a large store of it, that much of it is related to outdated issues, and that what is relevant to current policy issues is not recognized as applicable, the question of how far it is used in policy making is very simple to answer. Hardly at all (1975a: 3).

But, despite this pronouncement, the paper maintains an optimistic, or more precisely, an encouraging perspective. "The problem", he says, "is how co-existence can work equitably...Everyone needs knowledge of how to resolve conflicts" (1975a: 2).

This theme of anthropology in pursuit of "policy-relevant research ... as the best guarantee of a strong basic social science in the future" (1975a: 12) finds further expression in Salisbury's presentation to the Royal Society of Canada in 1979. In his paper called "Application and Theory in Canadian Anthropology: The James Bay Agreement", he puts forward the argument that:

the present high international status accorded to Canadian applied anthropology can be related to its strong emphasis on theory ... and to the mutual trust that has developed in Canada

between researchers and policy-makers (1979a: 229).

One suspects that the "mutual trust" to which Salisbury refers is largely a result of his ombudsman role in bringing forward basic research on Cree communities and presenting this in a language that the governmental personnel involved in the formulation of the James Bay Agreement could understand. In this way he was able to evoke trust and confidence from both parties - the Cree and Quebec government officials - involved in the search for an equitable settlement to the dispute.

Salisbury has certainly set high standards that will be difficult to emulate, but it is also part of his legacy that he left us with a role model which is imbued with the admirable qualities of intelligence, empathy for others, and the sense of integrity that he brought to his life's work. The enduring strength of his work largely emanates from the fact that he never became aloof or autocratic, despite his success. He relied on the enduring strength of anthropology itself: field work, participation, and knowledge gained through first-hand experience. As Salisbury indicates in a paper called "The North as a Developing Nation", delivered to the 8th Northern Development Conference, held at Edmonton in 1979:

The parallel between the north and the Third World is for me so clear that I hope I may be excused in presenting it in terms of personal experience. I began my field research into Third World Development in 1952 in Papua New Guinea...During my year living in a village three days walk out from the airstrip, I experienced all the frustrations of there being no "infrastructures", no stores, no regular mail, no roads, no one to repair broken typewriters unless you filed your own pieces of metal to replace what wore out, and learned why you have to have a patient attitude to schedules if you are to exist without ulcers (1979b: 1-2)

Richard Salisbury never forgot what it was like to do fieldwork, and this is the source of perhaps his greatest contribution to anthropology - the sense of excitement for doing anthropology that he instilled in a generation of anthropology students. Above all, Salisbury was a gifted teacher and communicator - and he led by example. The Programme in the Anthropology of Development at McGill (PAD), which he directed for over two decades, was the centre of academic life for graduate students who now find themselves in anthropology departments, government and in industry across Canada and the world. He gave students financial and intellectual

support, insisting always that basic research be placed in the larger context of practical and theoretical issues.

There is much that went on behind the scenes, that no one ever heard about – but his students remember. He was not coercive or meddlesome. He let you make mistakes and to learn from them. But always you knew he was there, thinking about his students, whether they were in Labrador, Ethiopia, New York City or anywhere else. To give a personal example, in the mid-1970's I embarked on a field trip to an Ojibwa village in northern Ontario. This was a community without roads or cars, telephones or television. It was a log cabin village of hunters and trappers, where the Ojibwa language was still spoken all the time. It was the sort of place where an anthropology student could soon forget why he was there in the first place, given the constant search for firewood and food. Through it all, Salisbury's (1975b) letters kept me in touch with a sense of purpose, encouraging me on with "gentle reminders"³.

By the end of winter in 1975, when I had almost forgotten what money was, since I lacked most of the usual avenues for spending it, the following letter arrived:

May 22, 1975

Dear Ed:

We decided to make you an award of a nine months research assistantship (currently the rate for Ph.D. students is \$325 per month) after you return from the field. Although this will presumably be in September, we are beginning the period of payment in June to make use of some expiring funds. We hope that you will not object to having a nest egg on your return from the field. Good wishes with the fieldwork.

Dick.

Now that I felt financially secure, if not down right wealthy, at \$325 a month, I was able to continue my field work with renewed vigour. However, in July I received a letter that I now view as the pivotal point in the development of my dissertation, and perhaps in my career. It was the sort of letter that served to crystallize my work, to infuse it with a sense of purpose and direction:

July 4th, 1975

Dear Ed,

I would add a gentle reminder about the possible usefulness of reports. You obviously have ideas about a) different perceptions of development b) the role of leaders, their perceptions and followers' perceptions, and c)

the organization of productive tasks. Are you sure you are writing these ideas down? Are you discussing them with people in the field? One month from now will you remember how your thinking developed now, so that you could trace out that development? Are you confident you have the right data to be able to support your ideas in the arena of a thesis defense, seminar paper, discussion with colleagues? All of these questions, if you answer "no" to any of them, suggest to me that writing down in very preliminary form what you are thinking and formalising would assist you in many ways.

At a minimum I am suggesting that sitting down and "talking" to paper (at a time like when it is raining, or when you feel depressed) and trying to think abstractly about the practical reality which you are very tightly involved in, is useful in focusing your work as you go along. It is easy to get right out of academic, theoretical thinking completely.

Good luck, and I hope to hear from you

Dick.

This is the letter that has acted as a sort of touchstone for all the other work that I've done since. Every once and a while I pull it out, not in a sentimental way, but as a manual or set of guide-lines for doing the job right. Actually there is a follow up to this letter which arrived a month later, containing the same sort of useful advice:

August 25th, 1975

Dear Ed,

I enjoyed your August 18th letter. If you have short pieces written on all the topics you list, you need only some editing to have the bulk of a thesis. I can't really comment, of course, without seeing them, but they seem to indicate some creative and empirical thinking about the interplay of local and national actions over development issues. Have you looked back at some of the early ones, comparing them with later ones to see how your thinking has developed? Or to see how mutually consistent the early and late ones are?

Good luck,

Dick

When graduate students returned from the field, our discussions continued, centred around PAD offices at 3434 McTavish. They also took place in each other's apartments, since many of us were residents, at one time or another, of the infamous 'student ghetto' east of McGill. Dick Salisbury was a frequent visitor at these gatherings, usually sitting on the floor with four or five students gathered around. Who can forget those sparkling eyes, wavy black hair combed straight back, the omnipresent bow tie, or those large hands poised in mid air?

PAD's monograph series was another mechanism of support; most of these reports were co-authored by Salisbury and his students and evaluated the results of various field studies, including the social impacts of the hydro-electric proposals, the use of subsistence resources, development attitudes in the Mackenzie District, communications in Paint Hills, training and jobs among James Bay Cree and so on. It was these reports that taught us how to organize ideas and to prepare the results of our field work for a larger audience. We also knew that, with Salisbury's name on many of them, and with his backing of them all, academics would treat them as serious research documents.

These were all aspects of a valuable training experience. In fact, Salisbury wrote about this in a 1977 paper to the Canadian Ethnology Society Meetings in Halifax entitled, "Training Applied Anthropologists - The McGill Programme in the Anthropology of Development 1964-1976". The results of the training programme over this period are impressive:

The 25 students who have done fieldwork under PAD auspices include 12 now teaching, 7 in research or administration, 4 full-time students, and 2 dropouts. Eight have Ph.D.'s. Eighteen have some consulting experience" (1977: 1).

Of course many more students were to go through the PAD programme over the ensuing decade, although figures on the turn out here have not, to my knowledge, been compiled. In all, it would be reasonable to say that it is these students who currently form a fair proportion of the Society for Applied Anthropology in Canada's (SAAC) membership.

In his last major work, *A Homeland for the Cree* (1986), Salisbury summed up his thoughts on "Anthropologists and the Cree" in this final paragraph:

The relation of trust that they [the Cree and the anthropologists] have worked out, of willingness to use anthropologists for appropriate tasks, and of collaboration with studies by outsiders if the studies seem relevant, is one aspect of Cree confidence in their dealings with the wider world. Anthropologists can feel happy at the role they have played in the emergence of a regional society - the Cree homeland" (1986: 156).

The profound and enriching impact of Richard Salisbury's relationship with the Cree was representative of his influence on everyone with whom he came into contact, not least of all his students. We are dimin-

ished by his absence, but sustained by the memory of his excellence. If I might be permitted to end on a personal note: good luck, Dick, wherever your research has taken you now.

NOTES

1. A previous version of this paper was presented to the "Richard F. Salisbury Memorial Session" of the Canadian Anthropology Society meetings, Calgary, 1990. I wish to thank Stan Barrett for his thoughtful comments on the initial draft of the manuscript.

2. This is not meant to imply, of course, that anthropologists should not take a stand against injustice, poverty, racism or other significant social issues. The danger is that objectivity in the form of fence-sitting can lead to support for whomever has power. In this context, Salisbury can be credited with opening up an important area of debate within the discipline regarding the appropriate role of the anthropologist in the modern world, even though a consensus has not been reached on the characteristics of this role or how it might be enacted.

3. This fieldwork provided the basis for several publications which were inspired by Salisbury's own research in applied anthropology, such as studies of government Indian policy (Hedican, 1982), northern economic trends (1985), anthropologists and social involvement (1986a), as well as a book on Ojibwa leadership and economic development (1986b). Needless to say, it was with considerable pride that I was able to send him copies of my work.

REFERENCES

- HEDICAN, Edward J.
 1982 Governmental Indian Policy, Administration, and Economic Planning in the Eastern Subarctic, *Culture*, 2(3): 25-36.
 1985 Modern Economic Trends Among the Northern Ojibwa, *Man in the Northeast*, 30 (Fall): 1-25.
 1986a Anthropologists and Social Involvement: Some Issues and Problems, *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 23(4): 544-558.
 1986b *The Ogoki River Guides: Emergent Leadership Among the Northern Ojibwa*, Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- SALISBURY, Richard F.
 1962 *From Stone to Steel: Economic Consequences of a Technological Change in New Guinea*, Melbourne and Cambridge, The University Presses.
 1964 Despotism and Australian Administration in the New Guinea Highlands, *American Anthropologist*, 66 (4): 225-322.
 1969 *Vunamami: Economic Transformation in a Traditional Society*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
 1973 Economic Anthropology, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 2: 85-94.

- 1975a Policy Regarding Native Peoples: An Academic Social Scientist's Perspective. Paper Prepared for the National Social Science Conference, Ottawa.
- 1975b Personal Communications, May 22nd, July 4th, and August 25th.
- 1976 The Anthropologist as Societal Ombudsman, In D.C. Pitt (ed.), *Development From Below*, The Hague, Mouton.: 255–265,
- 1977 Training Applied Anthropologists – The McGill Programme in the Anthropology of Development 1964–1976. Paper presented to the Canadian Ethnology Society Meetings, Halifax.
- 1979a Application and Theory in Canadian Anthropology: The James Bay Agreement, *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 17: 229–241.
- 1979b The North as a Developing Nation. Paper prepared for the 8th Northern Development Conference, Edmonton.
- 1986 Homeland for the Cree: Regional Development in James Bay 1971–1981, Montreal, McGill–Queen's University Press.

Some Thoughts on Regional Development and the Canadian North in the Work of Richard F. Salisbury

Colin Scott

McGill University

I enrolled at McGill for graduate studies in anthropology in 1976, drawn mainly by the work of Dick Salisbury and his students at the Programme in the Anthropology of Development on issues confronting the James Bay Cree. The James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, the first comprehensive settlement of a modern aboriginal claim in Canada, had recently been concluded. I had gained some limited experience with indigenous communities in northern Saskatchewan and southern Venezuela, and was interested in how hunting societies could oppose the deleterious effects of metropolitan development. An anti-development rhetoric that combined elements of Indian rights activism, neo-Marxism, and environmentalism had already strongly shaped my outlook.

As Dick let me know in our very first conversation, he thought that my view of the politics of development was overly polarized. He insisted that although development meant different things to different social actors, the differences were not as irreconcilable as I imagined. He pointed out that northern native people wanted many of the things valued in EuroCanadian culture, but on terms that would allow continuity of their own traditions. Development was not a zero-sum competition for a limited good; there were ways for all parties to come out winners.

I thought Dick's view of the world was too optimistic, assumed too much liberal *decency* on the part of social actors; and I certainly let him know. If this ever taxed his patience, he never lost his humour. He was adept at seizing the right opportunity

to inject an unsettling comment, question, or fact that as often as not left me with the feeling that *he* was the realist, not I.

Human values were incontestably the heart of Dick's enterprise. In seminars, he defined development as social change that enhanced the circumstances of life from the viewpoint of the local participants. Development, furthermore, must improve participants' ability to control those circumstances, and must respect participants' wishes for continuity as well as innovation. Decision-making, he wrote, "should be ideally in the hands of the people affected by the decision, but in practice be decentralized to as low a level in any organization as possible (1972a:5)."

On strategy, Dick's position was clear: "confrontation doesn't get you anywhere" — words heard more than once as we discussed current events in Indian politics. His approach was transactional, that each party be able to formulate its position in the best possible knowledge of the perceptions and expectations of others, and that out of such transactions the structure of future relationships could be influenced for the better (1977a, 1979b). This, he felt, could result in development without jeopardy to the autonomy of any party to the process. He expected that people could be convinced to take the interests of others into account, in their own long-term interest. Of the James Bay case, he wrote:

The challenge to the anthropologist — concerned with cultural and sub-group differences, was one of showing what were the different pay-offs to different sub-groups, of a solu-