

## Culture



**Sally M. WEAVER, *Making Canadian Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda 1968-1970*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1981. 236 pp., \$10.00 (paper)**

Richard K. Pope

Volume 2, numéro 3, 1982

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1078123ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1078123ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

### Éditeur(s)

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

### ISSN

0229-009X (imprimé)

2563-710X (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

### Citer ce compte rendu

Pope, R. (1982). Compte rendu de [Sally M. WEAVER, *Making Canadian Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda 1968-1970*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1981. 236 pp., \$10.00 (paper)]. *Culture*, 2(3), 149–151.  
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1078123ar>

Tous droits réservés © Canadian Anthropology Society / Société Canadienne  
d'Anthropologie (CASCA), formerly/anciennement Canadian Ethnology Society /  
Société Canadienne d'Ethnologie, 1982

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/>

**é**rudit

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/>

and access to resources. He suggests these interpretations were based on incomplete data and in both cases offers his own cogent interpretations. In a final chapter he examines the system of land tenure. Since the concept of ownership of land is non-existent this discussion could easily have been fitted in elsewhere (and is to some extent) but Tanner rightly isolates it because of the prominence accorded in the literature to the issues of the development of individual hunting territories. In the process of showing that the question of land tenure is basically one of a hunter's relations with the resources, governed by the ideological system, he has also provided much useful detail on the contemporary situation as well as challenged the thinking of others.

Tanner's study is eclectic in that he utilizes a variety of analytic tools. It is unusual to find in an Algonkian work both Marxist analyses of the mode of production and structural analyses of myths. This however has produced an unevenness. Whereas Tanner sets forth several models with which to view the Nichicun hunter's relationship to the capitalist/industrial system, his structural analyses, by contrast, are based on his own interpretation of parallels and symbolism, leaving this reviewer wondering just how to go about evaluating his conclusions about their significance.

This is a scholarly work, well-illustrated with maps and figures, which should appeal to a wide variety of interests. It is of considerable value to the student of Northern Algonkians and hunters and gatherers in general, to the cognitive and economic anthropologist, the structuralist, the fur trade historian, the archaeologist and so forth. Furthermore, with its detailed description of this intricate religious system honed to a hunting life, Tanner's work should be required reading for all those historians who accept as even plausible Calvin Martin's thesis in *Keepers of the Game*.

Besides the valuable insights Tanner has provided, one should also be grateful to him for the high standards he has set for ethnographic fieldwork and interpretation.

Sally M. WEAVER, *Making Canadian Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda 1968-1970*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1981. 236 pp., \$10.00 (paper).

By Richard K. Pope  
University of Regina

Sally Weaver's study of the so-called "White Paper" or statement on Indian policy of the Canadian Government in 1969 is a landmark of research in applied anthropology. Much of what she tells us in this interesting blend of investigative journalism and anthropological research is not new: those who are concerned with this topic have known for years what the abortive White Paper was and much of why it was; Indians understood it best of all when they called their own collectively produced response to it a "Red Paper" and by so doing highlighted their own perception of it as being a policy produced by and for White men. One would in fact, be hard put to find a more ringing endorsement of Anglo-American civil libertarian concerns of the 1960's (or of the preceding century) than is to be found in the White Paper. What Sally Weaver has done is to use her very considerable investigative skill to create a fascinating account of *how* the policy was produced.

Her study is mostly concerned with events occurring within the Canadian Federal Government during the formative first year of the Trudeau regime, that is, from the summer of 1968 through to the summer of 1969, along with some description of the "wrap around" years before and after this period of actual intensive policy making relating to the "Indian Problem". And what was the "Indian Problem" of the 1960's? Surely all of us can remember that Canadians were no further away from the "Indian Problem" than they were from their television set because that is where it was — in compounded images of the civil rights struggles against segregation in Mississippi, of the threat of ethnic confrontation and violence in Québec and of the mournfully chronicled media accounts of Indians living substandard lives in Reserve ghettos. What Blacks were to America, Natives (or were they called that then,) were to Canada. Having lived through the period myself, especially in its New Left atmosphere, I have a nostalgia for some of the details of this period which Weaver leaves out, but she certainly does an adequate enough job to make her point. The point is simply that the newly elected Government of Pierre Trudeau, which had promised a "Just Society", felt compelled to deal in a decisive way with the "Indian Problem" if it was to have

credibility as a reform administration. Weaver maintains that the public defined the problem; perhaps she minimizes the role of the media in shaping this definition, but that would be another book. In any case, many officials in the new Government felt that the Government had to bypass its own Department which had the obligation to manage Indian Affairs because that Department itself was perceived as being part of the problem. The heart of Weaver's analysis is the recounting of a factional struggle between two groups of Government officials with two different philosophies and two different styles of governing.

On one side was the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development headed by its Minister of the day, Jean Chrétien. Weaver's account, which slides back and forth from description to analysis to author's value judgments, makes it clear that the good point about the Department officials was that they did know something about Indians and Indian views; the bad thing about them was that they accepted the usual constraints of Government prerogative and secrecy in making policy when this was clearly not appropriate to the new situation.

On the other side were the "activists", who tended towards being bright, articulate and uninformed about Indians. The archetypal activist official believed in Indians participating in formulating the policies which would affect them and in massive social programs; he also believed that there shouldn't be a shred of what might be termed discrimination in the way in which Government related to Indians, thus, there should be no special status for Indians, nor any special agency of Government to provide services to them. His views were ahistorical and universal rather than particularistic. He laboured to develop a wholistic policy which would apply to Native people in all legal categories and in all regions. Consistency and rationality were extremely important to him. Indian ethnicity was seen as a negative concept, as a reaction to deprivation. The "activist" was optimistic about social change and lived in a world of class analysis and social science abstractions. Most of the activists had practically no understanding at all of Indians nor any contact with them.

The Policy was prepared for Cabinet decision making in terms of policy options. The White Paper itself seems to have been the result of a kind of a "binding arbitration" by Cabinet officers who somehow managed to take the worst, in terms of Indian acceptance of the policy, from both policy-making factions. The White Paper was a sweeping demand for termination of Government services to

Indians as Indians which was prepared in secret. It was logically correct in terms of the original definition of the problem as one of removing the legal basis of "discrimination"; it was extremely damaging in a practical sense because it had no comprehension of the real problems of Indians and it lacked even the remotest historical understanding of the points at issue between European derived political societies on the one hand and the aboriginal peoples of North America on the other, especially in relation to land.

I happened to be attending a meeting of the Indian Association of Alberta along with the late D'Arcy McNickle in June, 1969, when the White Paper was announced. We weren't at a loss for words. We talked about the Menominee and Klamath Reservations and about what had happened to them as a result of the Indian Termination Policy in the United States. In the next few weeks and months, so did every other anthropologist of whom I knew who had heard about the White Paper. It was a clear case of the Emperor's clothes, especially galling to Indians because they had been led down a garden path of increasing expectations through "consultations" with the Government just prior to the policy announcement; it was a shock to anthropologists that a U.S. policy that had been acknowledged a failure even by the U.S. Government itself could be repeated even more thoroughly in Canada. To add insult to injury, so to speak, the wide ranging and recent study of the condition of Canadian Indians conducted under the leadership of anthropologist Dr. Harry Hawthorn of the University of British Columbia was almost totally ignored by the framers of the new policy.

As with any colossal failure of the past, the first question one asks is whether it could happen again that an issue upon which there is considerable agreement and knowledge among anthropologists could again find us shut out in the cold. In the late sixties "Canadian" anthropologists were more likely to meet each other at an annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association than anywhere in Canada. In terms of the usual professional paraphernalia of organizations and journals, we have come a long way since then. In terms of direct input into the governing process, there are others more knowledgeable than myself who might have an answer. I hope so.

There are dimensions of the subject not covered in this book. Weaver believed that it was out of the scope of her study to interview Indian leaders of the period because she wasn't studying what *they* were doing; many of them were, however, extremely shrewd observers themselves of the motives and

philosophies of civil servants and politicians and I think she missed an opportunity here. Also, in retrospect, the battle between the Departmental loyalists and the interdepartmental policy rationalisers has been, in the total context of the Trudeau years, not by any means limited to issues affecting the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development ; several other Departments have had very similar conflicts with the same "activists" in the Privy Council Office. Political scientists and historians take note.

Weaver has documented and convincingly portrayed one rather frightening instance of insularity in Government policymaking which should be required reading for all bureaucrats as well as those shiny young students bucking for marks in faculties of administration. It is well to remember that she did it by taking seriously a basic tenet of applied anthropology to which we all pay lip service, namely, that it is an anthropologist's obligation to study the "culture" of an innovating organization.

---

Rémi SAVARD et Jean-René PROULX, *Canada derrière l'épopée, les autochtones*, Montréal, L'hexagone, 1982. 232 pages.

Par François Trudel  
Université Laval

Depuis la publication par Robert Jaulin de son maintenant classique ouvrage intitulé *La Paix blanche* (1970) et traitant de la récente histoire de la rencontre entre les Indiens Bari de l'Amazonie et les Blancs, la réflexion sur le phénomène appelé ethnocide s'est poursuivie et élargie. Résultats d'un colloque tenu en 1970 par la Société française des Américanistes, deux recueils de communications (*Le Livre blanc de l'Ethnocide* et *De l'Ethnocide*) ont paru en 1972, sous la direction de Jaulin, et ont exploré plusieurs facettes de l'ethnocide en Amérique, en plus d'amorcer un questionnement sur les fondements, les prétentions et la validité de la « civilisation » occidentale. Plus récemment (1974), Jaulin s'est efforcé de poursuivre ce questionnement en réunissant d'autres textes sous le titre de *La Décivilisation. Politique et pratique de l'ethnocide*, par lesquels il a cherché à démontrer comment l'ethnocide conduit aussi bien à la disparition des cultures minoritaires qu'à l'effondrement actuel de l'Occident.

De l'ensemble de cette réflexion, il se dégage essentiellement trois résultats : d'abord, une définition de plus en plus précise de l'ethnocide, mot bâti

d'après le terme génocide et présenté tour à tour comme acte de destruction d'une civilisation, acte de décivilisation ou encore comme effort systématique de désorganisation de la quotidienneté des autres civilisations : ensuite, une prise de conscience de plus en plus forte de l'ethnocide en tant que système, des différents agents qui le supportent, des procédures qu'il suppose et de la déchéance et soumission qu'il entraîne : enfin, une dénonciation du système de l'ethnocide et une recherche de solution dans le cadre d'une modification des rapports de l'Occident à la totalité de l'univers.

Au plan empirique cependant, force nous est de constater que la réflexion sur l'ethnocide est restée jusqu'ici dominée par Jaulin et par un groupe d'ethnologues français intéressés avant tout par le contact entre l'Occident et l'Amérique latine. On a bien fait place, dans les trois derniers ouvrages mentionnés ci-haut, à quelques autres études de cas (Inuit, Amérindiens du Canada et surtout des États-Unis), mais la recherche et l'analyse sur l'ethnocide ou certains comportements ethnocidaires y sont nettement restés sous-développés par rapport à la partie méridionale du continent américain. De plus, ce sous-développement n'a pas été comblé par d'autres ouvrages qui eussent abordé directement ou indirectement le contexte nord-américain selon la problématique de l'ethnocide, à moins que l'on ne donne un sens très large à diverses études sur les contacts entre Amérindiens et Blancs publiées dans des revues comme *Ethnohistory*, par exemple.

On ne peut dans ce sens qu'accueillir avec beaucoup d'intérêt la récente publication de Savard et Proulx, qui ont obtenu en 1979 un contrat de l'Alliance Laurentienne des Métis et Indiens sans statut du Québec « pour étudier le contexte socio-économique dans lequel s'étaient structurées les relations entre le gouvernement canadien et les peuples autochtones ». Ce qu'ils publient ici est une version remaniée de leur rapport à l'ALMISS, version d'abord intitulée « Les Peuples autochtones et l'État canadien : Histoire d'un ethnocide raté », mais dont on a par la suite décidé de modifier le titre.

L'ouvrage suit un mode d'exposition chronologique et est divisé en trois parties. La première est un survol très rapide du processus d'expansion européenne au nord du Rio Grande jusqu'en 1800. Les auteurs décrivent en arrière-plan la conjoncture économique et politique et insistent particulièrement sur la mise en place et le développement progressif, dès le XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle, par les appareils étatiques euro-américains, des différentes procédures nécessaires au contrôle des autochtones et sur la réaction amérindienne face à l'invasion