AN EXAMINATION OF THE WORKS OF FRANK GILBERT ROE AND HIS INTERPRETATION OF THE CULTURE CONTACT PERIOD ON THE GREAT PLAINS 1850-1890

by

GRACE ALEXANDER
B.A., University of Victoria, 1977

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

in the Department

of

Anthropology

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]
Kathleen A. Mooney

[redacted]
David S. Moyer

[redacted]
Brian W. Dippie

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

April 1981

culture contact problems, is given particular attention.

From a study of Roe's autobiographical manuscripts, it is apparent that his family and his early life experiences did contribute to the development of the empathetic attitude that Roe exhibits in his writings. From reviews concerning Roe's evidence for United States government and military involvement in the extermination of the buffalo with a view to the suppression of the Plains Indians, it is ascertained that their authors do not quarrel with Roe's hypothesis. Further it is concluded that reviewers' attitudes to non-Indian treatment of the Plains Indian in the culture contact situation is more empathetic in the 1950s than attitudes expressed in the literature during the period 1850-1890. Finally it is suggested that Roe's presentation of his material rather than its content is responsible for the rejection of his third manuscript.

Examiners: [redacted]

Kathleen A. Mooney

[redacted]

David S. Moyer

[redacted]

Brian W. Dippie

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I extend sincere thanks to Dr. Kathleen Mooney and to the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. David Moyer and Dr. Brian Dippie. I particularly appreciated Dr. Mooney's straightforward comments on the several thesis drafts and Dr. Moyer's invaluable aid in respect to organization of manuscript material. In addition, special thanks must be given Dr. Dippie who provided the basis for my initial historical approach.

I am especially indebted to Dr. Robert Lane who introduced me to the Roe material and who guided me through the preliminary stages of interpretation and analysis.

I wish to extend my appreciation to the various members of the anthropological department who offered studies that were informative and challenging. My particular gratitude is offered to Dr. L. Donald for his continuing support in practical matters, to Dr. N. Rolland for stimulating my interest in archaeology, and to Dr. R. Crumrine for his interest in me as a teaching assistant. Special thanks, also, to Mrs. Irene Block, Secretary, for her cheerful assistance from time to time.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge my debt to the University of Victoria for financial assistance, and to the personnel of the Special Collections Division of McPherson Library who facilitated my research in their department.

Finally, a sincere thank you to my family, to Melanie, Cliff, Kerri, Brian, Carole, and Les, who endured my neglect and who were there when I needed encouragement.

DEDICATION

TO MY FAMILY

of the anti-Indian sentiment of the past, by the time he writes his unpublished manuscript "Not Guilty!", Roe wonders whether " . . . the old cankering, corrosive, anti-Indian animus is yet subconsciously present, even in scholarly minds" ("C":8:Appendix "A" 27:8). For example, Roe maintains that the more modern anthropological scholar, John C. Ewers, [4] is biased when he discusses the continued and, perhaps, even increasing onslaughts upon the buffalo by the Indian ("C":8:Appendix "A" 27:8) but neglects to include in his work the role of the white hide hunter and buffalo butcher. Roe believes that these non-Indian hunters, with the encouragement of government and military officials, were far more responsible than the Plains Indian for the final disappearance of the buffalo.

Roe particularly examines the ideological aspects of Indian behaviour in his two major publications. Thus in his chapter "The influence of the buffalo environment upon Indian mentality" (1970: 601-70) and, to a lesser extent, in his chapter "Horses and tribal psychology" (1955:316-31) Roe argues that the many differences separating the two cultures would have been a subject of less concern if the non-Indian society had placed more emphasis upon understanding the Indian from an ideological point of view. To illustrate, Roe compares the attitudes of two of the earlier authors.

a) McDougall [1896] shows . . . that Indian habits which white men are prone to condemn very readily along our own mental lines of reasoning, may require a totally different explanation. Along with certain forms of religious or semi-religious emotion--commonly "superstition" . . . --there went on these occasions a species of half-occult influence over the animals. . . . [This may] . . . be referred to [as] the accumulated traditional experience derived from age-long study of and familiarity with buffalo. . . .

b) It would scarcely be correct to say that all this is lost on Hornaday. There is no visible indication that it ever crossed his mind--even as a prelude to immediate rejection--that the clue to Indian habitual traits might possibly be discoverable in Indian psychology (1970:647).

Roe's work, in addition to his two book-length publications and his unpublished manuscript discussed above, includes other published material dating from 1929 through 1970. There are at least thirty-three articles written on subjects as diversified as buffalo and Shakespeare. Further, Roe's unpublished work comprises several articles and eight book-length manuscripts [5] other than "Not Guilty!". Since many of these published articles and much of the unpublished material are not pertinent to the topic of this thesis, however, they will not be referred to in this paper. Nonetheless there are two unpublished autobiographical manuscripts, namely, "Alberta in the Early Eighteen-Nineties" and "That's How It Seemed To Be: An autobiographical essay" that are used to determine how and why Roe became involved in Plains Indian/non-Indian culture contact problems.

Despite the academic nature of his work, Roe was not an academic and writing was not his only career. He had been forced, through economic necessity, to terminate his formal education in England in 1890 at the age of twelve. Four years later he came to Canada to homestead in Alberta, then gave up farming after fifteen years to begin a thirty-four year career with the railway in 1909. [6] Thus, even though his interest in writing developed much earlier, with his first article appearing in 1929, it was only after his retirement to Cadboro Bay, Victoria, B. C. in 1943 that his two major works were published and his writing career gained Roe academic recognition.

Because the focus of this thesis is on the work of Frank Gilbert Roe, PART I begins with a biographical sketch of the author. His two autobiographies (Roe "C":1 and 2) are examined in order to assess what influence, if any, family background and early life experiences have had in cultivating Roe's interest in culture contact problems and in developing the views that he expresses later in his written work. Finally some of the high points of his writing career are discussed.

In the material selected for study, and particularly so in reference to culture contact, Roe writes primarily about the Plains Indians of North America. Therefore PART II gives a short outline of those portions of North American history that relate to the Plains Indians from the time of initial contact with the southern Plains tribes by the Spanish in the sixteenth century to the year 1890.[7] Thus, because Roe's defense of the Indian tribes of the Plains so involves the buffalo, PART II begins with a brief history of this North American ungulate. Responsibility for this animal's extermination east of the Mississippi River, which Roe dates circa 1820 (1970:233), is compared with that for the final extermination west of the Mississippi which Roe dates 1870-1874 for the southern plains and 1880-1883 for the northern plains (1955:191). In turn, his comparison prompts an examination of the invasion of the Plains by the Euroamerican, and reasons why the Indian was in the way. Then, because the mounted Indian posed a threat to Euroamerican settlement, the role of the horse in Plains Indian culture is also investigated. Finally responsibility for extermination of the buffalo is discussed.

PART III is concerned with Roe's interpretation of the causes and effects of the Plains Indian/non-Indian culture contact problems of the last half of the nineteenth century. This subject is examined largely through a study of his two published books and his personal reasons for writing them. His contribution to an ethnohistorical understanding of culture contact problems is assessed through an examination of Roe's position with respect to the extermination of the buffalo and the effect on Plains Indian culture of that extermination.

PART IV considers the published opinions of reviewers from both the academic and non-academic worlds. These opinions are presented in fifty-three reviews covering both editions of The North American Buffalo (1951 and 1970) and in sixty-seven reviews written on The Indian and the Horse (1955). Of the total one hundred and twenty reviews, one hundred and fourteen are located in the Roe Collection, while the remaining six are not. With so few reviews missing from the Roe Collection, it would seem that the Roe files are fairly complete and provide a good basis for assessing reaction to Roe's work.

PART V deals with Roe's four hundred page unpublished manuscript "Not Guilty! The true story of the Indian and the buffalo." This material also covers culture contact in the 1850-1890 period, but does so in more depth and at greater length. Further, this manuscript was read by potential publishers during the 1960s and early 1970s, and as this was a period of renewed interest by the public in culture contact problems, reasons for its rejections are explored. This research is carried out largely through a study of correspondence, dated from 1957

through 1961, between Roe and Savoie Lottinville, Director of the University of Oklahoma Press, the institution responsible for publishing Roe's The Indian and the Horse. Less attention is given to correspondence between Roe and other potential publishers who, after examining "Not Guilty!" also turned down the manuscript.

NOTES

[1]There are two editions of this book, namely, 1951 and 1970. In this thesis, the 1970 edition was largely used in order to have the author's latest information available. In such cases, the content has been checked with the 1951 edition, and information quoted or referred to in both have been similar.

[2]Roe's unpublished material is located in the Roe Collection in Special Collections Division of the McPherson Library at the University of Victoria. The Appendix lists this material including those works used in this thesis. These latter are complete with reference system, of which the above is an example, employed in citing from them.

[3]This is the nineteenth century author and long-time 'authority' on the buffalo, William T. Hornaday, whose major work The Extermination of the American Bison (1889) Roe attacks and/or disagrees with, often successfully, according to many reviewers of Roe's published work.

[4]This is only one disagreement among several that Roe has with Ewers. As this particular one is, however, from Roe's unpublished manuscript "Not Guilty!", Ewers has had no opportunity to reply. There are other critical remarks made on both sides. It can be said, then, that a certain rivalry existed between the two authors.

[5]See Appendix for a list of these manuscripts. All of them are to be found in the Roe Collection.

[6]This was the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway out of Edmonton, Alberta, that later became part of the Canadian National Railway.

[7]This latter date is applicable for it is the year in which the massacre of nearly 300 Indians at Wounded Knee, South Dakota (Driver 1969 [1961] :483), effectively destroyed Plains Indian determination to continue to resist non-Indian aggression.

PART I

A Biography of Frank Gilbert Roe

PART I deals with Frank Gilbert Roe as an individual and begins with a personal but brief outline of his life. To better understand Roe as a person, his family background and early life experiences are explored through an examination of his two autobiographical manuscripts. It is noted that this study provides some indication of why Roe's initial interest in the Plains buffalo developed into a particular concern with Plains Indian/non-Indian culture contact problems. Finally a short survey of the important dates in his writing career uses George F. G. Stanley's "Frank Gilbert Roe—1878-1973" (1974) as reference.

A. Early Events and Influences in Roe's Life:

Frank Gilbert Roe, born in Sheffield, England, in 1878, emigrated to Canada with his parents and older brother in 1894. The family arrived in what is now the province of Alberta to work homestead land located eleven miles from Lacombe, a community near the present-day city of Red Deer. Within eighteen months of arrival, the father passed away, and shortly after Roe's older brother left home to work his own land near Stettler, Alberta. Due to this loss of family members, the younger Roe had to assume additional responsibilities for his mother and the farm.

Roe was not to make farming his life's work however. After three successive years of crop failures, he decided to give up farming and work for wages. Thus in 1909 Roe began a career in railroading that he was to pursue for thirty-four years until his retirement to Cadboro Bay, Victoria, B. C. in 1943. Here he continued his writing career until his death in Victoria in 1973.

Roe's initial interest in writing began with the buffalo of North America, an animal that had disappeared from the Northwest Plains a mere ten to twelve years before the Roe family settled in Alberta. The history of these large herds became a subject of study for Roe that eventually led him into further research on problems of Plains Indian/non-Indian culture contact. There are in print several articles and two large books on the buffalo and related subjects, and although a self-taught scholar, Roe has gained considerable recognition as a professional author.

1. Roe's heritage:

An examination of Roe's unpublished autobiographies reveals that his ancestry is of some importance to him. Firstly, Roe is proud of his English heritage to such a degree that he offers his apologies to non-Anglo-Saxon pioneers in "early Alberta" for what appears to be racial discrimination on his part ("C":1:1:6). He is especially proud of his father's ancestral connections with " . . . an Elizabethan merchant-prince, . . . a founder of the East India Company . . . " and that "Roes were sheriffs and/or Lord Mayors of London in 1560, 1568, 1582, 1592, 1597." Even so, Roe is not ashamed to admit that " . . . his branch of the family had come down in the world" ("C":1:15:139 and 141) and that his paternal ancestors had been addicted to alcohol. He credits his father's and his own total abstinence as probably due to this very fact ("C":2:1:4-5).

Secondly, Roe seems obsessed with the qualities of his maternal ancestors, and traces this line of his English ancestry through both grandparents for eight hundred years, " . . . back to the settlement of the Danelaw in King Alfred's time (A.D. 879)." They too, however, had suffered a decline of status " . . . to being farm labourers on lands which earlier ancestors had owned in common if not in severalty" ("C": 1:16:150-51). Roe claims that this inherited love of the land made his mother the born pioneer; the love of crowds and of cities made his father the student. "My mother embraced the new life with joyous eagerness; my father accepted it" ("C":1:15:138-40).

2. Early influences:

Roe's interest in Indian problems reveals an empathy with this

abused minority, an attitude whose development can be traced to the first half of his life history. Roe believes that it is during this early period that the standards of behaviour set by his parents and actual events in his own life served as influences in the development of his personality.

Roe holds his father and his father's principles in high regard; a father who " . . . would not play false, nor yet would wrongly win." On the contrary, Roe believes that in any doubtful deal, his father would rather have been a loser than a winner. Further, Roe states, " . . . I think my father would forgive unto seventy times seven. . . " . As for himself, Roe confesses that in the first instance he would emulate his father but in the second, in any serious issue, he could forgive only once and would never trust the person again ("C":2:1:3-4).

It is also because of his father that Roe believes that he has developed the capacity for tolerance of and respect for others and has, in the process, acquired self-possession. For example, his father continued to invite "lower class" actors and theatrical attaches to join the family for a home-cooked meal, even though this action was frowned upon by several church members on the assumption that " . . . one had to be careful not to be dragged down to their level . . . " (Roe "C":2:5:49). Roe states:

> I might say I drew from my father a complete indifference to the status of the other man, provided of course that I could show ground for my own position. . . . Nor do I think I have ever denied respect to the unpretentious nobody who knew what he was talking about. I owe too much to the forbearance of others to condone such conduct ("C":2:1:8).

Roe exhibits a consideration for and a sense of responsibility to others. He attributes this to the good example set by his parents who

practised the standards that they set for their children. To illustrate, in religious matters Roe states:

> our parents laid no yoke upon us which they would not bear themselves. Sunday School and into chapel, 9:30 until 12. Afternoon School 2:15 to 3:30. Evening Service 6:30 until 8 p.m. ("C":2:2:23-24).

In turn, Roe acknowledges that his parents also expected their children to behave responsibly and thoughtfully towards others. Thus when Roe was, in his estimation, unjustly dismissed from a low-paying job in the church, his mother still expected a certain standard of behaviour from her young son. Therefore when the retiring head, who had personally given Roe the position, requested that he train the new boy, Roe complied. Roe's efforts were wasted, however, for, after two days of instruction, the newcomer " . . . gave notice the first Saturday and departed on the second" (Roe "C":2:6:46).

Roe notes that a sense of responsibility to family members was the accepted norm. Thus, as his father made a home for both of Roe's maternal grandparents until his grandmother's death in 1890, in the same manner Roe shared his home with his mother until her death in 1928 (Roe "H":18) at an age approaching eighty-nine. Roe points out, however, that his father had the far greater economic burden for he not only had to provide for his two parents-in-law, but also had to raise three children of his own.[1] Further, while Roe retains fond memories of his grandfather who passed away in 1878, he remembers that his grandmother was very difficult to live with. Therefore Roe admires his father even more for willingly accepting such an onerous emotional burden.

It is evident from his autobiography ("C":1:15:137) that Roe is quite bitter toward the "laissez-faire" policy of late nineteenth

century England. He blames this policy and its lack of social conscience for the predicament his father found himself in as the sole support of his parents-in-law during their later years in life. His father was, understandably, in agreement with the social reform policies of the Gladstonian faction in England, and taught this "social history" to his children (Roe "C":2:15:149).

That Roe embraces these same principles can be seen from his reaction to the conditions of the poor in Liverpool, England, in his description of a visit that he made there with his mother in 1913 ("C":2:31:324) at the age of thirty-four. By 1929, on another visit to Liverpool with his wife, Roe could remark that

> . . . once people got out on to the main thoroughfares it was virtually impossible to tell what class of homes they had come from. The Gradgrinds may talk about the pernicious influence of the Welfare State in "sapping the national character;" but anything which helped to abolish that hideous spectacle of 1913 deserves the approbation of all good citizens ("C":2:31:325).

This respectful concern for persons on a different social level than himself is also apparent in his discussions of personal contacts that he had with the Plains Indian of the Alberta area. Judging from his autobiographies, however, his experiences in meeting with the native people were quite limited. In fact Roe mentions only four occasions when he came into close contact with them. The first was in October, 1897 ("C":1:29:321-24); the second in 1898 ("C":2:18:182); the third a few years later ("C":1:29:325-26); and the fourth <u>circa</u> 1927 ("C":1:29:320 and 323). Also accusations by Ewers (2:1955:376) that Roe ignored the Indian informant in his work appear to be true to some degree. Yet this was not from any lack of real concern for the

Indian on Roe's part. Rather it is because Roe carried out a type of library research that did not involve living informants. Further, because Roe's work is not a purely ethnological exercise, it seems likely that Roe did not see the native Indian as an object of study in his own right, but rather as an historical actor in relationship to the horse and the buffalo. In any case, Roe's only contact with the native Indians of the area in 1927 occurred after he became seriously interested in the Indian/non-Indian culture contact problem. This instance is, however, particularly valuable in assessing Roe's attitude toward persons from a different social milieu. Roe notes that on this occasion he found himself unintentionally present at a treaty money payment, a transaction in which Indian resentment of onlookers and "intrusive cameras" was very apparent. Roe states that "the thought would not be quelled that these people were the original owners of this land farther back than we have any knowledge; and that they had been deposed and disinherited by the good old rule, the simple plan, that they may take who have the power and they may keep who can!" ("C":1:29:320).

These, then, are some of the factors in Roe's early life that point to his later interest in and empathy with mistreated minorities, whether they are members of his own society or members of the Indian society which he studies. Roe, himself, states that

> like most Englishmen of my generation at least, I have scarcely been aware of race or colour. . . . I have been in some minority or other all my life; and I have generally felt contented ("C":2:1:8 and 30:322).

Certainly his empathy is a prime factor in his writings. Thus any evidence that will destroy the picture held by " . . . millions of

people on this continent" of "the innate worthlessness and wickedness of the Indian [as] . . . a fixed and familiar and almost unshakable credo . . . " (Roe "F":1:March 24, 1959) becomes of special interest to Roe.

3. Roe's professional career:

By the time of his middle years, Roe entertained definite views on the interpretations of Plains Indian culture contact as offered in the existing literature. These views began to develop as early as 1925 when Roe involved himself in serious research that led to publication in 1951 of his first book-length work, The North American Buffalo. He completed the manuscript of this book at least as early as 1942, for this is the year in which Roe offered it for publication to officials of the Rockefeller Foundation while their guest at a 'Cultural Convention on the North-West Plains Area' in Lincoln, Nebraska (Roe "C":2:33:353). Their subsequent rejection of Roe's manuscript was only one among other rejections that preceded its acceptance by the University of Toronto Press in 1949 for publication in 1951.

Although Roe is a self-taught scholar, he gained academic recognition for this first large work of 957 pages when the University of Alberta awarded him an honorary LL.D. in October of the year of its publication. Later The Indian and the Horse, published in 1955 by the University of Oklahoma Press as No. 41 in their Civilization of the American Indian series, gained Roe a further honour. In 1963 this second book was included with fourteen other University of Oklahoma Press publications that were chosen to become part of a selected total

of 1,780 books destined for the White House Library (Lottinville, Director, University of Oklahoma Press: October 4, 1963 in Roe "E": 12-6).

Roe's work also earned him a place in the Royal Society of Canada when he was elected a Fellow of the Society in 1960. His nominees were Dr. G. F. G. Stanley, the Canadian historian at Mount Allison University, N. B., and Dr. F. E. L. Priestly of the University of Toronto.

Roe managed to publish and receive academic recognition for his two major works after his retirement in Victoria, B. C. in 1943 and before his death in April of 1973 at the age of ninety-four. It was also during his retirement that Roe prepared his third manuscript on culture contact problems, namely, "Not Guilty! The true story of the Indian and the buffalo." This manuscript has not been published to date.

Dr. Stanley has written a short résumé of Roe's accomplishments and comments upon Roe's credo for a full life, namely, a mixture of work and study.

> It was a way of life he followed for many of his ninety-four years. The time spent in his study--most of it after the age of sixty-five--resulted in the publication of two major books and twenty-five articles [2] (1974:65).

Also, during his lifetime, these studies gave Roe the opportunity of meeting with such scholars as Francis Haines, Thomas Seton, Frank Webb, and William Rowan, the Professor of Zoology at the University of Alberta (Stanley 1974:62-65).

NOTES

[1]There were three boys, of whom Roe was the youngest. The middle brother was left behind in England when the family emigrated. This brother came out later with his wife, eventually suffered a fatal accident, and Roe married the widow. Roe married a second time after his first wife's death *circa* 1942 (*Edmonton Journal*, October 25, 1951 in Roe "H":13).

[2]This number would appear to conflict with the "at least thirty-three articles" mentioned elsewhere in this thesis. There are thirty-three articles listed in the *Finding Aid* in the Roe Collection. Departmental personnel of Special Collections were not entirely certain that they had located all of them, however.

PART II

History of Culture Contact

In dealing with the causes and subsequent events that end with the destruction of traditional Plains Indian culture by the 1880s, Roe examines the history of the buffalo and the horse and their relationship with the Indian both east and west of the Mississippi River. Roe concentrates upon those events that occur west of the Mississippi in the area of the Great Plains.

For the purpose of this thesis, concern with what occurred west of the Mississippi in the area of the Great Plains is also of major interest. Therefore Roe's treatment of the areas east of the Mississippi are given very little attention.

A. Background History: The Great Plains—An Introduction

Roe believes that the buffalo was of greater importance to the Plains Indian than the horse ("C":8:5:28). He also believes that whether the Indian or the buffalo arrived on the Plains first is of little consequence ("C":8:5:27). What does matter is that on the Plains the Indian followed a nomadic lifestyle when he chose the buffalo as his chief source of subsistence. This nomadic way of life became a necessity, Roe maintains, and several of his reviewers agree with him, because the buffalo herds were very erratic in their movements. Roe offers substantial evidence to support this hypothesis and declares that regular migration patterns, for which Hornaday and others argue, were not characteristic of these animals (1970:571 and 594-95 and 1955:197 and 201). Further, with the advent of the horse, this nomadic lifestyle provided an excellent training ground for the mounted Indian.

Although Roe states that the horse was of secondary importance in the life of the Plains Indian, nonetheless he asserts that this animal was vital to Plains Indian cultural practices by the nineteenth century. Roe believes, however, that initially, rather than promoting any major physical change in Plains Indian lifestyle, the horse served to intensify those patterns of existence that were already established (1955:281).[1] Only in the ideological sphere was there any evidence of novelty. There was the actual joy of riding that, Roe states, offers the freedom of flight and a sense of exhilaration not to be experienced otherwise. Further, Roe argues, the horse gave the Plains Indian woman a new status not previously available to her.

Before the coming of the horse, every woman had to walk and most had to help the Plains Indian dog transport the group's possessions. Now with the greater carrying capacity of the horse, those women in possession of such an animal were not only freed from these onerous tasks, but also ownership of such a prestigious animal gave these same women a sense of superiority over their less fortunate neighbours (Roe 1955:325-31).

By the latter half of the nineteenth century, Roe states, the Plains Indian's effective use of the horse both militarily and in the hunt posed a threat to non-Indian populations. It was then that members of the latter group gave active consideration to subduing this mounted deterrent to their continued expansion into western lands. The argument among military and government circles of the period was that by eliminating the buffalo, the Indians' major source of food and materials, the Plains Indian would be forced to live on reserves and thus become more tractable. Further, he would no longer have need of the horse in pursuit of an animal that no longer existed. This would effectively eliminate the threat of the mounted Indian and thus ensure the safety of members of the Euroamerican society involved in western expansion and settlement. Why the Plains Indian became the loser in this struggle between members of the two cultures is a major theme pursued by Roe and one of major importance to this thesis as well.

1. <u>The buffalo and the Indian</u>:

Haines (1976:15) states that during pre-contact times the Plains were not continuously inhabited by man; that, in fact, " . . . there is strong evidence to show that in A.D. 1200 there were no Indians

anywhere on the Great Plains." Similarly Shaler (1900 [1891]), whom Roe calls " . . . an investigator of the first rank" (1970:27), claims that the buffalo had not always covered the Plains.

> " . . . Probably down to some time after the year 1000, the American bison or buffalo appears to have been absent from all the region east of the Mississippi. . . . There had been an earlier and less plentiful species of bison in the country; but he appears to have disappeared many thousands of years ago, perhaps before the coming of man to this continent" (in Roe 1970:27).

Therefore the Plains buffalo probably developed " . . . ' . . . in some region far to the west of the Mississippi, whence it gradually spread to the eastward' . . . " (Shaler in Roe 1970:27).

The traditions of various Indian tribes appear to bear out this assumption. For example, the Comanche of the Central Plains have a tradition of following the buffalo from the setting sun (Marcy 1854 in Roe 1970:276), while Mandan and Sioux, displaced from the east, say that buffalo were there before man arrived (Roe 1970:276n.). In any case, Roe prefers to leave the question of Indian and buffalo arrival times to more learned men. He states that proof

> . . . must be left to anthropological scholars, more competent than myself. . . . I should hesitate to venture upon the hazardous task of vindicating Indian traditions at large concerning buffalo . . . (1970:276).

Of more importance to Roe and this paper is the history of the Indian and the buffalo after the arrival of the European invader. Also, because this animal was already established east of the Mississippi River when European settlers arrived, date of arrival of the buffalo becomes unimportant. Further, although the numbers of the buffalo in the east were not as great as on the Plains, to the Europeans of the eighteenth century who had not yet seen the vast herds to the west,

there seemed to be too many buffalo (Roe 1970:256), for they disrupted the settlement of the new lands. For example, it is noted by Fortescue Cuming (1809 in Roe 1970:233) that " . . . the facility of gaining [meat] . . . prevented the progress of agriculture . . . " in Kentucky up to 1794. Further, the buffalo proved to be a nuisance when land was farmed. It is recorded by Kenton (1930) that buffalo destroyed two acres of corn in 1776 and Roe proposes that this was only one such instance (1970:235).

While the various authors hypothesize, contrary to what Roe believes, that the buffalo extermination west of the Mississippi can be attributed in whole or in part to the Plains Indian, there is no such disagreement among authors analyzing the same situation east of the Mississippi. In this area of the country, the blame for buffalo destruction, circa 1820 (Roe 1970:233), appears to rest with the European intruder.

> It was the work of the early settlers themselves; the Indians are never mentioned [in the literature] among the causes. . . . The legend of the "wasteful" Indian, the reckless and insensate destroyer of his own food, the dissipator of the resources of half a continent, hadn't yet been invented . . . (Roe "C":8:9:87-88).

Thus it was only after settlers entered the Great Plains area that the anti-Indian sentiment with respect to the Plains Tribes raised the question of who exterminated the buffalo during the years 1870-1874 for the southern herd and 1880-1883 for the northern herd (Roe 1955: 191).

2. The non-Indian invasion:

To provide a geographical orientation for Roe's discussion of Plains Indian deculturation, the history of land appropriation on the

Great Plains by the Euroamerican is outlined. In this respect, the settlement of this vast area can be termed an invasion in that the Euroamerican secured land from the Amerindian by methods that are now questioned by many scholars. Much of the land was acquired through the redefining of territory. This was especially true in cases where originally an area would be set aside for the Indian because the land was considered to be worthless but then, at a later date, the land would prove to be of value to the Euroamerican. One such controversy over land concerned the area of the Great Plains and the purchase of Louisiana from the French.

The Louisiana Purchase of 1803 gained a vast new territory west of the Mississippi for the United States. Out of this area all or parts of thirteen present-day states were eventually carved. Nine of these thirteen states comprise the greater part of the Great Plains. Thus all or part of Montana, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, and Oklahoma were once included in the huge land area known as Louisiana.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, however, this great tract of land was believed to be a worthless desert. This is evidenced by written records both before and after the Louisiana Purchase. "The fiction . . . was founded by the first explorers, was confirmed by scientific investigators and military reports, and was popularized by travelers and newspapers" (Webb 1931:153). The area was thought to be of use only to Indians. Thus, when an ever-expanding Euroamerican population east of the Mississippi demanded more and more land, several eastern tribes, such as the Creek and Cherokee of the

southeastern Atlantic states, were forcibly removed under the Indian Removal Act of 1830 into part of this less desirable area in the west. By 1840 more eastern tribes had been removed to Indian Territory established west of the Missouri-Arkansas line. Here the Indian was to remain unmolested and free to continue a lifestyle looked upon with disdain by the non-Indian element (Satz 1976:19cf, 130 and 222).

This idea of a worthless desert running through the center of a vast territory appeared to be a reality in the first half of the nineteenth century. Potential settlers passed over the area to try their fortunes in the rich land of the western part of the mid-continent. Then, post 1849, several events occurred that proved the fallacy of non-Indian evaluation of the Great Plains area as being useless for Euroamerican settlement.

Firstly, the 1849 discovery of gold in California greatly increased the numbers of persons of European descent crossing the desert. What began as a trickle at the start of the 1840s became a flood by the end of the decade. During the 1860s, however, the Civil War temporarily drew attention away from the problem of Indian occupation of the Plains.

> . . . The country was too pre-occupied with the slavery issue to worry much about the Indians. It was not until the Civil War had ended and over seven million acres of Western land were being sold annually that the nation recognized that a permanent solution of Indian problems could not be much longer postponed (Priest 1975 [1942] :5).

Thus it was after the Civil War period of 1860-1865 that the Great Plains became more and more desirable for the Euroamerican.

The first large-scale exploitation of the Plains by the Euro-american was with cattle, an industry that had its beginnings in 1848.

It was in this year that the United States obtained lands in the southwest from Mexico. This area included Texas which, by the late 1840s, harboured many herds of wild cattle, an animal that had multiplied from domestic stock left behind when the Spanish settlers fled the country after the end of the Spanish-American war. Then, when it was discovered in the early 1860s that cattle could survive in the colder temperatures farther north on the Great Plains, these wild cattle were rounded up and driven by northern routes to eastern markets. Eventually this pursuit of wealth available in Texas cattle formed the nucleus of cattle ranching on the northwest range (Webb 1931:225).

Agricultural progress westward had also been effectively stopped by the Great American Desert in the first six decades of the nineteenth century. By the 1870s, however, the American manufacture and use of the European windmill for water and the invention of barbed wire for cheap fencing allowed the 160 acre farm to become profitable for the first time over a large part of the Great Plains area (Webb 1931:339 and 318). [2]

It was also in the decade of the 1870s that the majority of the great railway lines were built across the Great Plains. These lines were conceived primarily to join the fertile east with the fertile west for they were started at a time when it was believed that they could not pay their way across the barren non-profit central areas of the United States. This situation was to change, however, after the cattle and agricultural industries developed. In the meantime, the railways did disrupt the great buffalo herds. For example, the Union

Pacific Railway, finished by 1869, divided the buffalo at the Platte River into the northern and southern herds (Roe 1970:360-61 and 428 and Hornaday 1971:492).

With this intensive interest in the development of the Great Plains by the Euroamerican rancher and settler, government land was rapidly being depleted at the expense of land availability for Indian re-settlement. While there was still land left for the Indian in the Indian Territory south of Kansas, it was much reduced compared with the area available at the time of the Indian Removal Act of 1830. Thus attempts to enforce restrictions, passed under The Trade and Intercourse Act of 1834, to prevent non-Indian settlement of lands to the west of the Mississippi, failed to stop the rush of settlers of European descent during the 1860s and 1870s. In like manner the Sioux Reservation, established in the northern part of the Great Plains in 1868, was invaded by the non-Indian in 1874 when gold was discovered in the Black Hills. Ultimately the Sioux were to be the losers. "After a few futile attempts to halt the invasion, officials decided that the Indians must surrender the area" (Priest 1975 [1942]:73).

3. The horse and the Indian:

Thus by the 1870s the Indian was once again in the way of the invader but, unlike the situation earlier in the Atlantic states, there were few lands now available to facilitate Indian removal. Further, by the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Plains Indian was a formidable opponent because of the advent of the horse.

The horse, first introduced in the southern area by the Spanish in the mid-sixteenth century, had diffused northward so that by the mid-

eighteenth century it had been acquired by even the northernmost Plains tribes. In the meantime the gun, introduced to the Atlantic seaboard tribes early in the seventeenth century, had gradually diffused westward into and across the Plains. By the time of Indian resistance during the latter decades of the nineteenth century, both horse and gun were in the possession of the Plains Indian tribes (Secoy 1953:104-6 and Roe 1955:78).

Roe dismisses the gun, however, as the major factor in Indian resistance during this period. This is partly because the bow and arrow continued to be the superior weapon in the hands of the Plains Indian. In the approximate minute that it took to load a cap-and-ball muzzle-loader, the Indian could " . . . ride three hundred yards and discharge twenty arrows" (Roe 1955:193). On the other hand the horse, Roe believes, did provide the Plains Indian with an advantage. Compared to the United States Army man of the time, who was generally inexperienced and therefore incompetent, the mounted Indian was the better man. Even after discounting the Indian's superior knowledge of his own country, Roe states that use of the horse still made the Indian the more dangerous adversary (1955:192-93). Further, Roe believes that it was the horse that allowed the Indian to increase his proficiency in hunting the buffalo, the prime source of subsistence for these nomadic Plains tribes.

> . . . None of the great horsemen of the Old World--Tartar, Parthian, nor Arab--apparently made use of the horse as did the Plains Indians. None of these peoples procured their staple everyday subsistence in as direct a manner as did our aborigines after this important acquisition (1955:189).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4. Buffalo extermination:

This combination of warrior and hunter was so successful that after the mid-nineteenth century United States Plains settlers, eastern government officials, and military personnel all demanded that something be done to subdue the Plains tribes. This time, however, not only was new land unavailable for Indian removal from the trouble areas, Indian reserves were also proving less than satisfactory as a solution so long as the Indian had the horse and followed the buffalo. Thus when it was realized, during the latter part of the nineteenth century, that the Plains Indian would be difficult to conquer so long as buffalo existed, non-Indian attitudes in dealing with the Indian problem changed (Roe 1955:194). It was believed that if buffalo were not so easily available, the Plains Indians would be forced to accept life on the reserves. Therefore a policy, often voiced but never legislated, of exterminating the buffalo prevailed during the 1870s and early 1880s among officials of the Euroamerican government and military circles. The new railways carried the white hide hunter and the buffalo butcher, to Roe the agents used for the slaughter, to the Great Plains while " . . . politicians and army men made no secret of wanting the buffalo destroyed" (Roe 1955:194-95 and 1970:357-58, 477, 810). As for the public, they were ill-informed as few authors of the period defended the Indian and those that did were largely ignored (Roe 1970:7-10).

Therefore Roe agrees with Hornaday (1889) that after 1830 the "systematic destruction" of the buffalo began. The demand for buffalo hides by members of the invading population was the initial stimulus for this destruction; the building of the railways during the 1870s provided easy access to the west for the buffalo hunter which increased

the slaughter; and the policy set by the government and military officials and the anti-Indian sentiment of the period allowed the almost total extermination of the buffalo in the early years of the 1880s. What the horse Indians had failed to do over a period of two hundred years, the Euroamerican had accomplished in little more than fifty (Roe 1955:191).

NOTES

[1]Roe is referring to conditions among the Plains Indians at the time of the acquisition of the horse, not to a period of later trade expansion because of the white trader. To Roe "this is much like crediting George Stephenson with the giant diesel locomotives of today" (1955:378).

[2]The process of dry farming, as opposed to irrigation, that demanded heavy machinery and huge areas of dry, hard, flat land had to await the invention of heavy machinery and the development of special plants.

PART III

Roe's Published Work

While history provides the background for Roe's defense of the Plains Indian, his interpretation of events during the latter half of the nineteenth century is critical. Thus what is important about Roe's work is the emphasis that he gives to certain aspects of the factual record. Roe does not discuss the broken treaties nor does he list the massacres that occurred on both sides. His is a cultural ecological approach to the problem in which he sees not only the disruptive influence of Euro-american intrusion on Plains Indian lifestyle, but also the deliberate moves made by certain members of that non-Indian society to ensure the success of such disruption. There were errors made on both sides and Roe acknowledges this.

A. Roe's Interpretation of Events on the Great Plains, 1850-1890:

While Roe discusses the factual history and characteristics of first the buffalo and then the horse and their relationship with the Plains Indian in his two published books, he also considers the events of the last half of the nineteenth century in the light of their effect on Plains Indian survival as a viable culture. He agrees with other writers such as Denhardt (1947) that the mounted Indian with his quiver of arrows held superiority over the single-shot arquebus of the Spaniard. When Denhardt maintains, however, that " . . . 'the savages held the Great Plains until repeating rifles and revolvers were introduced' . . . " Roe disagrees. To Roe " . . . 'the savages held the Great Plains' until they were left economically helpless by the extermination of their mainstay, the buffalo" (1955:65-66).

If Roe's hypothesis is to be considered, it becomes of prime importance to ascertain exactly what Roe believes about the extermination of the buffalo and why. It is apparent from his two major publications that his evidence not only places the blame for buffalo extermination on certain members of the non-Indian society, but also offers several valid reasons why the Indian should be exonerated.

1. A history of Roe's interest in the buffalo, the horse, and the Plains Indian:

Before discussing Roe's arguments for Euroamerican responsibility in the matter of buffalo extermination, it is of interest to look at the reasons why Roe wrote about this subject. Thus the events that initially led him into an in-depth study of the relationship between the buffalo, the mounted Indian, and the culture contact situation are examined.

a) The North American Buffalo (1951 and 1970):

Roe's work on this book covered a period of approximately fifteen years (1970:v) between 1925 to 1940 (Anon. in Edmonton Journal, 1951 in Roe "H":13). His research began with an exercise of an academic nature.

Early in the nineteenth century, certain scholars in England were searching for confirmation of their proposition that English roads began as animal paths by attempting to determine if the new American roads developing in the west followed recent buffalo trails of the area. For example, Rogers (Roe 1929:301) points out that in England the

> . . . principal English roads date from the times in which primitive races settled in this country, [only] if they were not the tracks of wild animals before man adopted and used them. So, in the far west of the United States, the buffalo track . . . [might still be traced as evidence for or against the argument].

Roe, as a member of the English Place Name Society, was asked by that society to look for such supportive evidence. In reply he " . . . summarized a few of the logical, historical and topographical objections" to the proposition in his paper, published in Antiquity (1929), entitled "The 'Wild Animal Path' Origin of Ancient Roads" (1970:119n.). In addition, his personal experience as a resident in buffalo territory provided him with little evidence that well-worn buffalo trails ever existed. Thus, having arrived in Alberta a mere twelve years after the disappearance of the buffalo, Roe states that it is incredible that

> . . . in that relatively short time, such a maze of tracks, supposedly dating in many cases from prehistoric eras--and quite as probably so in Central Alberta, . . . could

> have vanished so utterly from the land. Cultivation . . . did not then operate to any material extent; . . . [while] ranching . . . (very little then in the Red Deer Canyon country) could only serve to perpetuate and intensify such ancient tracks (1929:302-3).

Further, in the early 1890s, there were no 'made' roads to hide these supposedly well established buffalo trails. In fact Roe concludes that the animals " . . . spread out and feed as they go" and regular buffalo migrations belong to myth, not reality [1] (1929:303 and 309).

It was this research into the feasibility of the buffalo-trail origin of Western American roads that quickened Roe's interest in the animal for its own sake and in its place in the ecological history of the Great Plains. Roe states that it was the " . . . vast mass of historical evidence available concerning the buffalo, . . . its diverse and contradictory character, coming from witnesses of broadly equal inherent credibility . . . (1970:v), . . . supplemented by thirty-four years' [1894-1928] observation in what was once the heart of the Canadian buffalo country, . . . which led me to probe somewhat deeper into the subject (1929:300). Thus Roe turned from the subject of trails to a " . . . general history of the buffalo, to which a large mass of my collected material was equally relevant, and virtually all of it already critically documented" ("C":2:32:339). Roe was able to conclude that no seriously documented history of the buffalo had yet been written. "Statements of the most definitive character still rested upon such 'authority' as the camp-fire gossip of Western folk-lore, [and came] . . . from a dogmatic type whose extravagances were proverbial . . . " ("C":2:32:340). In addition, his work gained Roe the attention and encouragement of Dr. Cameron, Chief Librarian of the Alberta University

Library, who advised him that if he had truly discovered serious discrepancies in the historical record, and regardless of the academic standing of any author, it was Roe's responsibility to make such discovery accessible to the public (Roe "C":2:32:343). All of these factors provided stimuli for Roe to continue his research on the buffalo and held Cameron's continued interest in his work.

Roe first incorporated his findings in an article entitled "The Extermination of the Buffalo in Western Canada" (1934). When this article was successful, he continued with his research for and preparation of his first book-length manuscript.

b) The Indian and the Horse (1955):

Roe's other major publication, The Indian and the Horse, is also an amplification of an earlier article. This paper, "From Dogs to Horses Among the Western Indian Tribes" (1939) was written from material that Roe incidentally recorded on the horse while he was gathering information on the buffalo. Further, when this information on the horse, namely, its acquisition by and influence upon the Plains Indian, was well received, Roe began to think of expanding his material to book length (Roe "C":2:35:365).

Once again Roe's research revealed that, as with the buffalo, there had not been any extensive study made of the horse. Thus although there were, "in relation to the appearance and influence of the historic horse among the Plains tribes, . . . many excellent monographs written, dealing with individual tribes" (Roe 1955:ix), no overall comparative study had yet been published pre-1939 other than that by Wissler, namely, "The Influence of the Horse in the Development of Plains Culture" in the American Anthropologist (1914). In fact Roe states that

it was encouragement from Wissler in the form of a private letter dated February 26, 1940, that was partly responsible for his decision to expand his 1939 article into book form (1955:ix).

As with The North American Buffalo, this second book not only deals with the history of a specific animal, but also with its influence in the life of the Plains Indian from the pre-contact period, through post-contact times to circa 1890. What, if anything, did Roe contribute anthropologically to the subject of culture contact problems?

2. Roe's contribution to culture contact problems:

One way to assess Roe's contribution to culture contact problems is by a comparative study of his published material. Because Roe believes that it was the extermination of the buffalo that brought about the collapse of the Plains Indian way of life, the progression of his treatment of this subject as it pertains to both Indian and non-Indian will be analysed.

a) The Plains Indian and the extermination of the buffalo:

In a 1934 article entitled "The Extermination of the Buffalo in Western Canada" Roe does not accuse the Plains Indian of exterminating the buffalo. Rather he comes to their defense in response to a statement by Hornaday that " . . . 'people who are so utterly senseless as to wantonly destroy their own source of food, as the Indians have done, certainly deserve to starve . . . ' . . . " (in Roe 1934:21n.; see also Roe 1970:484n. and 632) by declaring that

> it is almost impossible to transcribe such passages calmly, half a century afterward. Who would suppose after reading the above that a white skin-hunter had ever been so much as heard of on the American continent? (1934:21; see also Roe 1970:485).

By the time of his 1951 publication, Roe defends the Plains Indian on ideological grounds. He explains how difficult it was for the Indian to understand the possibility of buffalo extermination. He quotes Hughes that "they had a legend that the buffalo came originally from a hole in the ground in the centre of a lake in the north, and that on the advent of the white man they had re-entered it and would ultimately re-emerge" (1970:480). [2] Further, Roe demonstrates that there is "abundant historical support" for stating " . . . that the Indians at large did not judge of the probabilities of buffalo survival as a species in mass, pro or con, by the white man's criteria of vital statistics" (1970:643).

Roe continues to defend the Plains Indian in his 1955 publication and once more emphasizes that the concept of waste was foreign to the Indian mind. Thus in both of his major publications Roe states that the Plains Indian held the belief that all buffalo were given by Manitou and would, therefore, always be available even though buffalo numbers might fluctuate from year to year. Further, the Plains Indian believed that he had no control over or effect upon buffalo population. In this way Roe exonerates the Plains Indian on ideological grounds regardless of whether or not he could be held responsible for the extermination of the buffalo. Roe states further that even had the Plains Indian been conscious of waste through overkill, he would probably not have practised conservation for he would have seen the impracticality of leaving the buffalo for the non-Indian to slaughter (1951:643-46; 1955:351 and 192).

The Plains Indian has been accused of practising needless

slaughter. Therefore Roe examines what he believes are the psychological reasons for the total slaughter of buffalo captured by Indians using surround and pound methods. Roe states that every animal so imprisoned had to be slain not only for the practical reason of preventing injury to Indians entering the surround or pound while some animals still lived, but also because the Indian believed that any buffalo allowed to escape would warn their "fellows" of the danger (1951:648; 1955:351-52). Future attempts to corral such animals would then fail, and this situation would have, in turn, aggravated the ever-present problem faced by the Plains Indians of obtaining enough buffalo for their year round survival.

Roe considers, in both publications, whether the Plains Indians would have exterminated the buffalo had Indian territory not been invaded by the Euroamerican. He states that, indeed, several attempts have been made by various authors to show that this would have been the case (Roe 1970:498ff). In his 1951 publication, Roe dismisses this hypothesis quite simply by looking at the probable pre-contact situation with regard to buffalo. Firstly he points out that Seton (1910), whom he considers to be a "competent student," (1970:118), believes that " . . . 'in early days the Buffalo held their own well against the Indians with their primitive weapons' . . . " (Roe 1970:493; see also 503n.). Secondly, Roe agrees with Seton " . . . that up to circa 1750 the buffalo were increasing to the point of actual overcrowding" (Roe 1970:118).

Similarly Roe examines evidence on pre-contact Plains Indian projected population counts in both publications. For example, he

states in both books that during the two centuries before 1830 and the advent of the Euroamerican to the Great Plains, there were a greater number of Plains Indians depending upon and therefore hunting the buffalo, yet the buffalo were not exterminated. Thus, during the years 1680 to 1830, "... the Indians were more free to slay as they would; and we may bear in mind that prior to the terrible epidemics of 1781, 1837, and 1870—which do not exhaust the list—there were more of them to do it [3] (1955:191; see also 1951:742-803).

The numbers of buffalo captured by the Plains Indian are discussed in both publications. For example, Roe illustrates that even though the Indian of the pre-contact period followed the practice of total kill, the preliminary corralling of wild buffalo, accomplished by cutting out a small herd and then surrounding or driving the animals into a confined space or pound, either natural or artificial, was not always successful (1951:633; 1955:343-46, 359-60). Then, after horses were acquired by the Indian, certain equines were selected to become "buffalo runners," that is, horses trained to carry the hunter and run beside the buffalo in the hunt. This development allowed for the selective slaughter of buffalo rather than for slaughter 'en masse' by the former surround and drive methods of the group hunt. Also, because the "buffalo runner" made the hunting of buffalo a more individualistic undertaking, certain Indians or "soldiers" were given the authority to decide when and where the kill was to be made. These soldiers also ensured that individuals did not 'jump the gun' and thus premature stampeding of the herd was avoided. Therefore, although buffalo hunting by the Plains Indian became more efficient, these controls did decrease

the incidence of indiscriminate slaughter (Roe 1951:374-75 and 658; 1955:339 and 356-58).

On the other hand Roe does not believe that the Plains Indian of the post-contact period exterminated the buffalo even when encouraged by the Euroamerican to hunt for gain. Roe maintains that the Plains Indian practice of using the "buffalo runner" prevented the slaughter that occurred under non-Indian methods of hunting. For example, the "still hunt" method of killing buffalo, so favoured by the white hide hunter and buffalo butcher, was seldom, if ever, employed by the Plains Indian. This "still hunt" was a particularly devastating method of buffalo hunting wherein the single hunter concealed himself within firing distance of a herd and then proceeded to drop the animals one by one. The buffalo, caught in this type of hunt, could not see the danger and therefore did nothing to escape. They generally stood there until all their number were slaughtered (Roe 1951:401, 412-13, 420n., and 629-30; 1955:361). Further, contrary to what is often assumed, every Indian did not possess an efficient hunting rifle during the years of the extermination. To begin with, the bow and arrow continued to provide the Indian with more success in the hunt than did the inefficient "trade guns" of the period. Secondly, the deadly long-range breech-loader did not reach the Indian in sufficient number to allow for any persistent Indian contribution to buffalo extermination with this weapon (Roe 1951:503, 868-69 and 432; 1955:193 and 357).

Roe also declares that statistics on Plains Indian extermination of the buffalo are often greatly exaggerated. "Certainly, if slaughter by Indians even approached the figures suggested by some scholars,

Indian wastefulness in the worst sense would be virtually indisputable" (1970:501). Therefore, Roe continues, if authors such as Allen (1845) are correct in maintaining that the Indians slaughtered four million and more buffalo per annum, " . . . the race must inevitably have disappeared" (1970:506n.). To illustrate, with a buffalo population of around forty million inhabiting the fifteen hundred thousand square miles of the Great Plains and allowing for a natural increase of five per cent per annum as given by Seton, (1910 and 1929) (Roe 1970:492-93), the buffalo would have faced extinction before the 1870s even without Euroamerican participation in the kill. Also these figures represent the total kill, and do not take into consideration the fact that because it was the female of the species that was favoured by man, both Indian and white, replacement counts are seriously affected. On the other hand, Roe accepts Sibley's projection as published in Allen (1876) (Roe 1970:501) of two hundred fifty thousand to five hundred thousand buffalo killed per year by the Plains Indian. This figure, given in 1854, is more credible to Roe because Sibley " . . . was a plainsman and an accepted authority on other phases of buffalo history" (Roe 1970:502). Even so, in the final analysis, Roe concludes that " . . . no attempt at precise computation, even after the utmost critical caution has been exercised, can be regarded as definitive" (1970:520).

Finally, in absolving the Indian of any guilt in deliberately or unconsciously exterminating his ready source of subsistence, Roe places the blame in both books directly upon a change of policy advocated unofficially by certain members of the non-Indian community.

Roe states that Euroamerican tolerance of a diminishing yet formidable Indian population changed, after 1862, to a deliberate policy of exterminating the buffalo in order to quell effective Indian resistance (1951:367 and Appendix "H" 804-16; 1955:194 and 195).

b) The Euroamerican and the extermination of the buffalo:

In Roe's 1934 article "The Extermination of the Buffalo in Western Canada," he gathers enough evidence to show that certain members of the non-Indian society were responsible for the extermination of the buffalo. Also Roe demonstrates that, as Euroamerican demand for hides increased over the years, it was a particular member of the non-Indian society, that is, the white hide hunter, who slaughtered the buffalo in great numbers (1934:13-15; see also 1970: 473-75). This hunter killed indiscriminately and without thought for the future, for it was the short-term economic gain that was this man's overwhelming obsession.

Roe incorporates this 1934 article into The North American Buffalo (1970:467-88 and 829-41), and includes additional material that represents a crucial development in his argument on who was responsible for the extermination of the buffalo. Thus in his 1951 publication he especially explores the role played by United States government and military authorities in bringing about buffalo destruction. Therefore, while such references to United States official implication in buffalo extermination are absent from the 1934 article, [4] by the time of his expanded version in 1951, this matter of United States policy is of such concern to him that he devotes a whole thirteen page appendix to "Buffalo, Indian, and Legislation" (1970 [also in 1951 edition]:804-16).

The major part of this appendix is taken directly from Hornaday's "Congressional Legislation for the Protection of the Bison" (1889:513-21). Whereas Hornaday used this section in his book as a " . . . plea for game preservation . . . " (Roe 1970:804), Roe sees the same legislation as a device that would have protected the Indian. Failure to pass such legislation is, to Roe, a deliberate move on the part of legislators to condone the slaughter because of the prevalent view of " . . . 'the impossibility of civilizing the Indian while the buffalo remained' . . . " (Secretary of the Interior in Roe 1970:805 and 808). Further Roe states that "evidence appears to indicate that [such] influences were at work behind the scenes which Hornaday very probably did not suspect; or I cannot but think that so courageously outspoken a critic of an official policy would have mentioned them" (1970:808).

It is this 'do-nothing' policy of the " . . . outstanding military [white] chiefs in Indian warfare" that, Roe maintains, places responsibility for buffalo extermination on the non-Indian society. He does exonerate the American people of any guilt in the matter, however, for Roe believes that such policies were usually carried out before they were communicated to the general populace. Further, even when foreknowledge was made available to the public, the real situation was seldom disclosed. " . . . More often than not the sources of information whence alone the ordinary man could obtain the 'authenticated' evidence by which he must approve or condemn, were poisoned" (Roe 1970: 815-16).

In an overall comparison of Roe's two major publications, it can be said that <u>The North American Buffalo</u> does place more emphasis upon

United States government non-intervention and Euroamerican complicity with regard to buffalo extermination. One feature that does stand out is the repetition of material that occurs in Roe's work. This is of importance, for this problem of repetition is a major reason given for rejection of his later manuscript "Not Guilty!". [5]

For the historian, the naturalist, the biologist, and the anthropologist, however, the two books do differ considerably in content as each one deals with a different animal. Therefore the first book concentrates upon the history and characteristics of the buffalo and its use by and influence upon the Plains Indian and the second provides similar information for the horse.

NOTES

[1]In the years ahead Roe continues to affirm his position with respect to the irregularity of buffalo migrations. In doing so, he disagrees with Archer Butler Hulbert who, in his The Historic Highways of America (1902-1905), appeared to furnish evidence with his " . . . sweeping postulates on the buffalo-trail origin of the American road-routes at large . . . " (Roe 1970:119).

[2]Roe refers to Father Lacombe by Hughes, 1911:304 in Denny, The Law Marches West, 1874-1905:147, 152, 202, (ed). W. B. Cameron, 1938. Other similar references are in Roe 1970:643-47.

[3]Pre-contact Indian population counts keep changing. Mooney's estimate for all of North America was 1,100,000 and Kroeber's was 1,000,000. Dobyns revises these figures to 10,000,000-12,000,000 for the area north of the Rio Grande (Jennings 1976:17, 19, 30).

[4]It may be argued that this is because the article is on Canadian extermination of buffalo. Yet Roe refers to the Unites States hide hunter, United States extermination, southern slaughter (1934:1, 14, 21 and 1970:467 and 473). Nor does Roe attempt any comparison between Canadian and United States legislation although he discusses the Canadian ordinance of 1877 that forbade "wanton destruction of buffalo at any season," an ordinance that had to be repealed in 1878 because of the destitution of the Canadian Plains Indian (Roe 1934:15-16 and 1970: 476).

[5]This matter of repetition will be discussed further in PART V of this thesis under Roe's Unpublished Manuscript. . . .

PART IV

An Assessment of Roe's Work

PART IV is mainly concerned with assessing the quality of Roe's published work and any influence that it may have had with professional scholars and with the public. Beginning with the year 1929 and an article entitled "The 'Wild Animal Path' Origin of Ancient Roads," published in Antiquity, and ending with 1970 and "The Sod House" in the Alberta Historical Review, Roe contributed at least thirty-three articles to Canadian and British journals and periodicals. Many of these articles deal with the buffalo, the horse, and the Plains Indian. Nonetheless, it is his two published books that are his most important work and are the most likely subjects for review. Therefore, The North American Buffalo and The Indian and the Horse will be examined in some detail through reviews from both the academic and non-academic fields. In this exercise, special attention will be paid to any evidence of Roe's influence with regard to his defense of the Indian.

A. Reviews: The North American Buffalo (1951 and 1970)

Of all the reviews on The North American Buffalo that may have seen print, forty-six [1] reviews of the 1951 edition and five reviews of the 1970 edition are available in the Roe Collection in the University of Victoria, Special Collections Division of the McPherson Library (Roe "H":1951:1-51 and 1970:83). This is a collection presumably clipped and pasted by Roe in a hard cover green scrapbook of eighty pages now filed as Series "H" in the Roe Collection. At least some of these reviews had been sent to Roe by his publisher, for example, eight are mentioned as being enclosed with a letter to Roe dated May 13, 1952 from Helen Boehler of the University of Toronto Press (Roe "E":13-1).

An independent survey of bibliographies, review digests, several historical, anthropological, and sociological journals and periodicals revealed that only two of the reviews thus located were not in the Roe Collection. Both of these were found in historical journals and both gave a positive evaluation of Roe's work. These two reviews bring the total number available for study to fifty-three.

To assess reviewer reaction to Roe's first book, these fifty-three reviews on The North American Buffalo were examined under four categories designed to measure Roe's influence in both academic and non-academic fields. These four categories are:

1. Roe's academic approach:

> Specific references by reviewers that tie Roe's work to particular academic disciplines are noted. This study illustrates the extent of Roe's influence historically, anthropologically, ecologically, and biologically and in that order.

2. Roe's Indian work:

This study serves to illustrate specifically his possible influence in the area of Indian/non-Indian culture contact interpretations.

3. Roe's Canadian content:

This study measures Roe's influence as a Canadian author and contributor to Canadian history.

4. Roe's writing expertise:

This study examines Roe's style and what type of audience, namely, academic or general, would be likely to read and make use of his work.

1. Roe's academic approach:

The majority of the reviews state that Roe's book contributes to the field of history. Their authors note that Roe's work is primarily of interest to historians, is historically oriented, or they regard Roe as a historian. W. L. Morton in The Canadian Historical Review (December, 1951 in Roe "H":22) explains what he means by a history of the buffalo.

> . . . The North American Buffalo takes rank at once as a major authority on the history of the buffalo. It is, however, an authority of a particular kind. . . . The volume is an examination of the historical literature on the buffalo; it is not a natural history of the species in its wild state; nor does it prove to be a record of the buffalo's role in North American history. It is, in short, a critical and, above all, a revisionist study of the literature and the sources, a prolegomenon to the history of the buffalo.

Other reviewers express similar reactions. Thus Kivett in Nebraska History (December, 1952 in Roe "H":44) explains that "although the subtitle might suggest a zoological approach to the problem, it is more that of a historical study." Leopold in Geographical Review (1953 in Roe "H":46) points out that

> Roe's approach to buffalo ecology is strictly historical. Each aspect is treated by quotation from source after source.

Other reviewers, however, emphasize the historical relationship of the buffalo with man. Bishko in Virginia Quarterly Review (Summer 1952 in Roe "H":30) states that "Mr. Roe, a self-made Canadian scholar of great competence and refreshing insight, here successfully undertakes to chart the true course of buffalo history in its relations with the Indian and European cultures of present-day United States and Canada."

Some reviewers see this interest in buffalo history as representative of the naturalist or natural historian. For example, "this book, of primary interest to naturalists . . . and zoologists, is written by someone who can claim to be neither, for its author is an historian" claims Rowan in Journal of Mammology (February, 1952 in Roe "H":35). Bonenfant in La Revue de l'Université (February, 1952 in Roe "H":39) believes that Roe " . . . exhausts the subject and will be profitably consulted, all over the world, by those who are interested in America and natural history."

Of secondary interest to reviewers, judging by frequency of reference, is the ethnological and related content. All of these reviews are written by members of the academic field. Thus Professor J. M. Dales in the University of Toronto Quarterly (April 1952 in Roe "H":32) credits Roe with providing valuable anthropological content in addition to the historical. He states that students of political or social history or

> . . . even (in some phases) the anthropological or ethnological student . . . [need no longer] rely upon the "authoritative" dicta of (Hornaday's) obsolete monograph. . . . For these gains we are indebted to Dr. Roe.

Another reviewer believes that Roe's book is even more anthropologically oriented. Colin Matheson, writing in the Journal of Animal Ecology (1953 in Roe "H":50), states that "the book is indeed largely an anthropological study as well as a study of an ungulate species." Finally, two other reviewers point to specific passages in Roe's work that are of interest to scholars within the general discipline of anthropology. John C. Ewers in the American Anthropologist (1952 in Roe "H":26) refers to Roe's chapter "The influence of the buffalo environment upon Indian mentality" and states that it should be of special interest to "archeologists and ethnologists, [who] , concerned with cultural problems of Wissler's classic 'bison area' in their research and teaching, will find this chapter stimulating;" while Reed in American Antiquity (January 1952 in "H":11, 24, 47) points out that "the thirty-four appendices include, among many interesting topics, 'Buffalo ritualism in Indian life,' 'Indian stone rings and pound sites,' and other ethnological incidentals."

Ecology, defined with respect to the buffalo and its relation " . . . to the ecology of the Great Plains . . . " (Burlingame in Montana Magazine of History, January 1952 in Roe "H":23), is recognized in the reviews as the next most important subject dealt with by Roe. Darling in Ecology (1952 in Roe "H":34) is particularly interested in " . . . to what extent the buffalo advanced the regions of prairie." Certainly, Darling points out, Roe believes that the Indians deliberate use of fire

> . . . extended the areas of prairie--and consequently of the buffalo itself. . . . There can be little doubt that the conjunction of buffalo and Indian in the culture found on the plains was the formidable factor. The culture was symbiotic.

Ecology of the distant past, or paleoecology, is also a subject of considerable comment by reviewers. Thus Roe's book is not only considered important for present-day ecologists, but also for paleo-ecologists. For example, Leopold in the Geographical Review (1953 in Roe "H":46) states that

> the paleoecologist is led to wonder about the mechanism of mutual adjustment between buffalo population and grazing range. [Therefore] . . . the book stimulates thinking . . . and range ecology recommends it to a reading audience much larger than the specialist in mammology.

McKinley, however, in Defenders of Wildlife News (July-August 1972 in Roe "H":83) in his review of the 1970 edition of Roe's book, criticizes Roe's contribution to paleoecology. McKinley believes that " . . . Roe has evidently little understanding either of primitive mentality or primitive ecology and has not heard of recent theories of 'Pleistocene Overkill' . . . " . Nonetheless, in company with Leopold, McKinley commends Roe's work on the subject of human ecology as it pertains to the Plains Indian both in past and present times. Thus Leopold in the Geographical Review (1953 in Roe "H":46) states that "the thirty-four appendices occupy some two hundred pages and might well stand alone; they include a discussion of nearly everything related to the buffalo, and particularly the human ecology of the Indian." McKinley in Defenders of Wildlife News (July-August 1972 in Roe "H":83) believes that the fact

> that the survivors of those alleged Pleistocene exterminators behaved differently (as Roe would have us believe) may be a sober warning to all of us to change our life styles while there is still ecological maneuvering room. After all, the Paleo-Indian is now as extinct as his presumed victims, while Mr. Roe thinks modern Indians have learned some harsh ecological truths.

Finally, because conservation is the subject of much modern day interest, it should be noted how one non-academic publication comments on the book. This particular review states that The North American Buffalo is of importance not only to people of the present but also to people of the future. "No doubt, the story of the buffalo has lessons for this and later generations—among others, lessons of conservation and adaptability (Anon. in The Free Press Weekly, Winnipeg, August 1, 1951 in Roe "H":31).

In the area of archaeology, Roe's comments on the archaeological evidence for defining what Reed in American Antiquity (January 1952 in Roe "H":11, 24, 47) identifies as the range of the buffalo receive the most attention. In addition, this section is given some negative evaluation. Thus three reviewers, writing in 1951 and 1952 (Roe "H": 24, 30, 40), point to archaeological finds that extend the area into the Southwest beyond Roe's stated boundaries. It is an error of research that Roe acknowledges and corrects in his 1970 edition. One of these reviewers, however, does comment more positively on Roe's work on the range of the buffalo as offered in the 1951 edition of his book. Thus Riddell in American Antiquity (March 1952 in Roe "H":40) states that while "knowledge of the maximum recent range of the buffalo is of importance . . . Mr. Roe must be complimented . . . for the service he has rendered the numerous archaeologists who will find his study of prime importance when undertaking work in areas within the recent range of these large animals." Finally a review of the 1970 edition questions Roe on his treatment of fossil evidence in both editions. "Appendix LL ("Fossil vestiges of extinct 'superbison' found in Saskatchewan," pp. 923-924) seems out of place, owing to the cursory manner in which the

fossil record of Bison was covered in the first edition and the wealth of unmentioned published material on the subject since that time" (Jones for Museum of Natural History, Kansas, May 1971 in Roe "H":83).

In addition to history, anthropology, and ecology, the three major subjects referred to in the reviews, there is brief mention of each of the following, namely, biology, geography, sociology, zoology, ethnozoology, zoogeography, geology, taxonomy, and economics. Of these nine subjects, Roe's work relating to the field of biology elicits the next greatest response from Roe's reviewers. Of prime interest is the interpretation by two Canadian reviewers, namely, Rowan and Glover, of the biological evidence presented by Roe on the buffalo. For example the first reviewer, while not recognizing Roe as a biologist, states that, nonetheless, Roe's work in this field is of major importance. "As unquestionably the most nearly complete work of reference on the biology of the bison yet conceived, . . . it should at least be in every public library on the continent" (Rowan in Journal of Mammology, February 1952 in Roe "H":35). Glover in Saskatchewan History (1952 in Roe "H":27) [2] and The Beaver (June 1952 in Roe "H":33), however, disagrees with Roe on certain matters concerning the biology of the buffalo. For example, Glover claims that Roe is in error in making certain statements with regard to the length of biological dependency of the buffalo calf upon its mother's milk and to time of first breed of the growing adolescent. Further, these errors in turn affect Roe's estimation of the number of buffalo killed on a yearly basis at any given time.

Glover maintains that the suckling period for calves, and therefore

the period of dependency upon the adult female buffalo, extends beyond the end of October, the maximum length of suckling time allowed by Roe, to at least the end of December and probably beyond. Thus Glover's argument is that with the prime time for hunting buffalo occuring in the fall, combined with the preferred killing of the female of the species, Glover's longer estimate for calf dependence upon the mother's milk would result in more instances of motherless calves dying from starvation. This, in turn, would represent an overall greater loss of buffalo during the fall kill. Further, Glover argues, buffalo do not breed until the third or fourth year of life as opposed to Roe's estimate of first breed after two years. This difference of a possible year in time of breed would also affect population counts of buffalo at any point in history (Roe "H":27 and 33). Therefore Glover maintains that Roe has erred in his estimate of numbers of buffalo destroyed per year.

There are other reviewers who believe that Roe's contribution to biology is more positive. Even so, most do not assess Roe's work in detail. For example A. DeVos in Forestry Chronicle (July 1953 in Roe "H":49), while categorizing Roe primarily as a historian, also acknowledges his work in the biological field. DeVos states that "certainly a biologist could not have interpreted the available data any better than Mr. Roe."

Finally, although most of Roe's reviewers accept The North American Buffalo as primarily a historically based text, many see the book from a multi-disciplinary point of view. As one academic reviewer expresses it, "the book should be an especially desirable acquisition for institutional libraries, for its contents include much information of interest and

value to a wide range of readers—sociologists, economists, and anthropologists, as well as biologists and historians" (Errington in Quarterly Review of Biology, March 1953 in Roe "H":48).

2. Roe's Indian work:

As discussed above under Roe's academic approach, Roe is chiefly acclaimed as an authority on the history of the buffalo. As discussed under ecology, however, the book is also regarded as a history of the extent of Indian dependency upon this large mammal.

Roe points out that the Indian, equipped with the horse, could continue to follow a nomadic lifestyle so long as buffalo existed. Thus the Indian as a mounted nomad was independent and posed a threat to the Euroamericans invading the Great Plains. This was especially true during the latter part of the nineteenth century (1955:192-93).

To counteract such effective resistance by the Plains Indian, Roe claims that the Euroamerican government and the military unofficially supported a policy for extermination of the buffalo. Roe's evidence in support of this claim and his interpretation of subsequent events are well received by those reviewers who discuss this aspect of Roe's work. For example Rowan writing in the Edmonton Journal (September 1, 1951 in Roe "H":8) agrees with Roe that the Euroamerican government did nothing " . . . substantial to allay the massacre which brought the Indian daily nearer starvation and penury . . . " . Similarly Kivett in Nebraska History (December 1952 in Roe "H":44) is willing to accept evidence offered by Roe that "certain army officers" followed a policy of buffalo extermination for the purpose of defeating the Indian. Kivett further agrees with Roe that "certain members of Congress" aided

the military by refusing to allow legislation to be passed that would have protected the buffalo. Other authors see this part of Roe's work as valuable in itself. For example Errington in Quarterly Review of Biology (March 1953 in Roe "H":48) is quite firm in his statement that for him " . . . some of the most distinctive contributions are the author's discussions . . . of the impact on Indians and their sustaining resources by conscienceless white invaders."

Roe was certainly not the first author to give evidence for both government and military complicity in buffalo extermination. What is important then is that several of his reviewers agree with his interpretation of the evidence, and further, that there are no dissenting arguments proposed.

3. Roe's Canadian content:

As a self-taught Canadian author, Roe deals with a culture contact problem that appears to be confined to the United States as opposed to Canada. Reasons for this, according to Roe, vary from the fact that settlement of the west occurred earlier in the United States, due in part to the Hudson's Bay Company's opposition to settlers in western Canada, to importation of the Northwest Mounted Police into the Canadian western area by 1874. Blackfoot Indian hostility also prevented the possible export, until after 1870, of buffalo goods from Canada to trading centres in the western United States, thereby lessening Euroamerican interest in Canadian buffalo (Roe 1970:467-68). Had all things been equal, Roe believes that there would have been little difference between Canadian and American handling of the racial situation on the western Plains, however. Thus in his first book, when

commenting upon "the immense numbers destroyed in so short a time," Roe states that he believes that " . . . had the flow of population turned towards Canada, the human history would have been little different" (1970:423). Further, Roe does not absolve Canadians of guilt for their racist treatment of Indian populations generally. In his unpublished manuscript "Not Guilty!" Roe discusses the problem.

> I have never at any time attempted to maintain that Canada had no share in this situation. Due in my opinion to politico-psychological causes not in the least connected with any supposedly superior "national temperament" or the like; actually to differences ~~in~~ [sic] governing the settlement of French and British Canada successively, there has never been any "pistol packing" era of active mass-brutalities north of Lat. 49°. But in respect of official and departmental callousness and stupidities, Canada has little reason for any pharasaical vain-gloryings. Such at least is the opinion of her aboriginal populations; in all probability few are better judges ("C":8:Preface).

Thus, because of the aforementioned circumstances of history, it follows that Roe would have more subject material relating to the United States than to Canada. Notwithstanding, several reviewers commend Roe on the Canadian content of his first book. For example according to R. P. of the Winnipeg Tribune (July 11, 1951 in Roe "H": 6), this is the first time prominent treatment of Canadian material has been given " . . . in relation to material from other sources." In this respect as well Bonenfant in La Revue de l'Université Laval, Quebec and Coulson in Canadian Library Association Bulletin (February and May 1952 in Roe "H":39 and 26) give specific credit to Roe's discussion of the buffalo itself for that animal is " . . . deeply bound up with the history of Western Canada" and " . . . the history of Western Canada is inseparable from that of the buffalo."

Even more recognition of Roe's Canadian content is given by Rowan,

a Professor of Zoology at the University of Alberta and a personal friend of Roe. Writing in the Journal of Mammology (February 1952 in Roe "H": 35) Rowan makes note of Roe's chapter XII entitled "Historical habitat of buffalo in Canada" dealing with the "remoter portions of Canada." He also discusses Roe's later chapters dealing with both the Red River hunt in Canada (1820-1857), a twice yearly hunt for buffalo that took place every June and October, and the final extermination of the buffalo in Western Canada.

The Red River hunt is, indeed, a Canadian event of some importance in any historical account of the buffalo. This hunt was first carried out on a large scale in 1820 when fire overran the Plains in the Red River area of southern Manitoba, forcing buffalo westward beyond the previously easy reach of the individual white settler of the area. Thus Roe claims that it was these same settlers' need for buffalo that helped to bring the group hunt by Métis and Indians into being (1970:370 and 387). In addition, there were the demands for buffalo made by the short-lived Hudson's Bay 'Buffalo Wool Company' set up in 1821 for the Red River colony, a company which, Roe proposes, may have initiated the twice yearly hunts (Roe 1970:370-71).

It is recorded that buffalo were scarce again around the Pembina, Manitoba area in the years 1821-1823. Roe believes that by this time, such scarcities were not due to the irregular movements of the buffalo (1970:370n., 370-71). Then in 1825 Ross (Roe 1970:370n.) states that a great storm drove the buffalo beyond the hunters' reach once more. All of these factors served to drive the buffalo ever westward until by 1857 the Red River area no longer supported these twice yearly hunts for buffalo (Roe 1970:368-71 and 382).

Both Allen (1876) and Hornaday (1889) place the blame for the extinction of the buffalo in the area of southern Manitoba and Saskatchewan upon the Métis and Indian hunters involved in the Red River hunt (Roe 1970:373 and 412). In defense of these native peoples, and in answer to these accusations by Allen and Hornaday, Roe maintains that it was not a needless slaughter. All peoples of the area made good use of the kill. They subsisted on buffalo for over half a century. Further Roe points out that even Hornaday absolves the Métis and Indian hunter of the 'sin' of using the deadly "still hunt" [3] method of killing buffalo, a method " . . . adopted later by other hunters who did not even pretend to kill buffalo for subsistence" (1970:412).

The final extermination of the buffalo in western Canada " . . . actually preceded the final slaughter in the United States" because Métis, Indians, and American soldiers effectively kept buffalo south of the border during the early 1880s. [4] Thus starvation among Canadian Indians, dependent upon an animal that had been hunted out and not replaced, actually occurred earlier here than among tribes in the north central United States (Roe 1970:467).

It is Canadian content such as discussed above that leads Rowan to conclude that The North American Buffalo " . . . is an encyclopaedic book of reference that will doubtless become a classic and will be in demand the world over, wherever there are naturalists, or historians interested in Canadian events" (Anon. in Edmonton Journal, September 1, 1951 in Roe "H":8). Further, these are reasons why Roe is accepted as a Canadian scholar and authority by reviewers in both the academic and non-academic fields. [5]

It is of interest to see just where and in what form Roe's work is

reviewed. Thus it is noted that reviews appear in both newspaper and journal publications. In comparing these two media, it is found that all but two of the newspapers, as opposed to the journals, are published in Canada. Further, all of the newspapers are published earlier than the journals with most newspapers dated before January 1952 at which time the journal reviews begin. Therefore Roe's initial exposure is Canadian and, in particular, western Canadian.

With reviews appearing in several journals during 1952 and 1953 in Canada, England, France, and especially the United States, Roe's book later receives wider notice. The states of Montana, Nebraska, Iowa, Texas, Minnesota, and Virginia are all represented by subsequent reviews in the United States. This trend is continued for the five reviews of the 1970 edition, for the majority of these are also American.

4. Roe's writing expertise:

Both academic and non-academic reviewers assess The North American Buffalo on its readability. Several consider the book rather difficult to read. One reason given is that the book with its numerous " . . . quotations, references and statistics . . . is not likely to commend itself to the average reader . . . " (J. M. in the Daily Colonist, August 5, 1951 in Roe "H":4). Darling in Ecology (1952) states that "Roe's book is not easy going . . . some of it is tiresome" while Leopold in Geographical Review (1952) and Bonenfant in La Revue de l'Université Laval (February 1952) both state that the book is not easy to read (Roe "H":34, 46, 39). On the positive side Coulson in the Canadian Library Association Bulletin (May 1952 in Roe "H":26) claims "while it is long (957 pages), the pace never lags and it is highly readable throughout" while R. P. in the Winnipeg Tribune (July 28, 1951

in Roe "H":6), finds that Roe's treatment of the " . . . mythical and fanciful literature about the buffalo . . . contributes hugely to the fascination of the book, for it often reveals human nature quite as vividly as it does buffalo nature." The New Trail, Edmonton (Anon. Summer of 1951 in Roe "H":10) declares that " . . . Roe has shown very happy judgment, blending a lively, readable style with the care and precision of the discriminating historian." Finally Goodwin (1952:391) maintains that it is "both interesting and informative" for the average man who is interested in the bison.

As to the text itself, several reviewers (for example, Roe "H": 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 19, 22, 23, 24, 28, 37, 47, 83) comment on the fine scholarship and thoroughness of the work. Such adjectives as definitive, authoritative, encyclopaedic are often used to describe their reaction. Morton, however, in The Canadian Historical Review (December 1951 in Roe "H":22) states that Roe's study is often too "cautious and unemphatic" giving the impression that the work is less than "definitive." Even so he points out that nothing can be truly definitive and that Roe, himself, would not claim to be the final authority.

Several academic reviewers deplore the absence of maps in the 1951 edition. For example Professor Rowan writing in the Journal of Mammalogy (February 1952 in Roe "H":35) states that "a book that deals with an entire continent, and is loaded with geographical references, is surely incomplete without maps." Further this lack is only partially corrected in the 1970 edition for the map offered, entitled The Range of the Buffalo in North America, lacks outlines of states and provinces, making it difficult to correlate some of these geographical references.

Roe is also criticized for his lack of summation throughout the book.

In this respect, two academic reviewers express such an opinion. Thus Burton in Nature (1952 in Roe "H":41) states that "Dr. F. G. Roe's text reads like a legal judgment, an objective recital of all the available evidence, with little sign of the possible verdict until, towards the end . . . he gives a few pages of concluding summary." Another reviewer, Luna B. Leopold in the Geographical Review (1953 in Roe "H":46), maintains that "the book is not easy reading. One serious fault is the lack of summary statements at the ends of the chapters."

Professor Rowan of the University of Alberta is even more critical. He states in the Edmonton Journal (September 1, 1951 in Roe "H":8) that Roe " . . . gives the pros and cons of every argument in considerable detail and retains an open mind, but one occasionally wishes that he were more emphatic in expressing his own opinions for, after all, he is the authority, not the reader."

On the other hand, three reviewers from the non-academic field believe that this lack of summaries is an asset. For example J. M. in the Daily Colonist (August 5, 1951 in Roe "H":4) states that " . . . the object of his work is not so much to present conclusions as to state facts. . . . [He] leaves the reader to take his choice." Similarly J. P. Berry writing to "The Journal Letter Box" in the Edmonton Journal (August 18, 1951 in Roe "H":7) states that "before giving his own opinion on any question Mr. Roe masses the evidence of centuries, so that the reader may be able to judge for himself." Finally Anon. in The New Trail (Summer 1951 in Roe "H":10) uses a like argument. " . . . Although Roe offers his own opinions, he is quite willing to let the reader develop his own if he prefers."

B. Reviews: The Indian and the Horse (1955)

Almost all of the first half of this publication is concerned with the history of the acquisition of the horse by the Indian while the latter section is concerned with the effects of this acquisition and the relationship that the mounted Indian had with the buffalo. Reviews that deal with the subject matter of the second half of Roe's work will receive the most attention, and in particular, any anthropological references.

As with The North American Buffalo above, the success or failure of Roe's second book is assessed through a study of academic and non-academic reviews. There are sixty-three reviews available in the Roe Collection (Roe "H":53-80). In addition, an independent survey located three reviews that were not available and of these three only one is negative, namely, a review by William E. Bittle of the University of Oklahoma, written for the American Anthropologist (1956: 192-93). The total of sixty-six reviews are examined using the same four categories assigned for the first book.

1. Roe's academic approach:

In direct contrast to reviewers of The North American Buffalo, most of whom offer their opinion as to which academic discipline they believe that Roe's work is applicable to, only slightly more than half of the reviewers for The Indian and the Horse state their opinion so clearly. Of those that do, the majority see this second book as being either of historical interest or acknowledge Roe as an historian. For example A. O'Bryant in the Wichita Eagle (1955 in Roe "H":58) states that " . . . in his study of the horse, the author has produced a lot of history about the Indian and the West." Again, " . . . a scholarly,

documentary work . . . and the history of the American Indian's association with that animal" is C. Willard's assessment in The Augusta Chronicle (June 26, 1955 in Roe "H":62).

This type of response from Roe's reviewers appears to differ from the response elicited by Roe's book about the buffalo. While certain of the reviewers of the first book stressed that the historical content in Roe's work refers to the animal itself, most reviewers for this second book believe that the history of the horse and the history of the Indian are inseparable. For example Drury in the Vancouver Sun (September 3, 1955 in Roe "H":69) states that "the history of the horse . . . becomes also the story of the North American Indian and his cultural development." Nevertheless, eight non-academic reviewers do state that the history of the horse as given will appeal to horselovers.

There is, however, no recognition from Roe's reviewers that this second book makes any contribution to natural history. This is, presumably, because the horse arrived in America with the European invader as a domesticated animal whereas the buffalo is indigenous to the continent and was not a domesticate. A natural history of the horse, therefore, would be more appropriate to Europe and Asia than America.

Four other reviewers, largely from the academic field, assess this work from an anthropological/archaeological point of view. "The culture of the tribes, particularly the place of the horse among them, has intrigued the anthropologists and historians . . . " (Wyman in American Historical Review, January 1956 in Roe "H":71).

> To the historians and anthropologists . . . the subject of the coming of the horse to the buffalo country, and the resulting cultural revolution, is a fascinating field of

> study. . . . Now Mr. Roe has combined all their findings in a single work . . . (Haines in Pacific Historical Review, November 1955 in Roe "H":70).

In addition Knox in The Nashville Banner (May 6, 1955 in Roe "H":59) believes that the book should interest most anthropologists and that its value to any reader lies in its taking " . . . a long look back over the horizons of the past." Finally Kivett of the Nebraska State Historical Society (no publication source, no date in Roe "H":54) notes that Roe carries on " . . . a discussion of Plains archeology based largely on work by Strong, Wedel and others in Nebraska and the Central Plains." In this respect, however, Kivett expresses regret that in attempting to interpret hunting habits by bone and species count, Roe did not have access to unpublished archaeological data such as is now available. He particularly mentions the new data obtained from animal bones that define the hunting habits of Missouri Valley Indian groups. Finally, reviews such as that in Saturday Review (Anon. July 16, 1955 in Roe "H":64) imply that Roe contributes to anthropology when stating that Roe " . . . describes the effect of the horse upon the Indian civilization and culture."

Other subject fields are inferred as well. Roe's many references to the influence of the horse in the ecology of the Great Plains are not labelled as ecology but are commented upon. Similarly Roe's work on the ideology of the Plains Indian, particularly with reference to the advent of the horse, is mentioned but not always referred to as ideology. Finally, Roe's discussion of the origin and history of the pinto, or spotted, pony is sometimes considered an exercise in biology.

2. Roe's Indian work:

The premise that the horse served as an intensifier of Indian traits already present such as nomadism, hunting prowess, and ability in warfare is of major concern to reviewers. A general overview is given by Hutchinson in the San Francisco Chronicle (August 28, 1955 in Roe "H":67). He notes that

> this thread is the judgment first handed down by Clark Wissler: "as an intensifier of original Plains traits, the horse presents its strongest claim." Mr. Roe has so buttressed this premise with substantive facts that it should stand unchallenged in future.

Other reviewers comment on specific points discussed by Roe. These fall within the general subject area of the influence of the horse upon the Plains Indian. Thus Williams (no publication source, no date in Roe "H":76) agrees with Roe that the tipi is the sign of the nomad and not the horse nor the dog as Strong and Wissler propose. Another reviewer in Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colorado (Anon. July 24, 1955 in Roe "H":64) shows interest in Roe's claim that the horse did not make a nomad of the Plains Indian. Rather

> the Indian had been nomadic before; the horse just made traveling easier. The horse also made the Indian a better huntsman, a farther-ranging trader and a more awesome warrior.

Roe's comments on the Indian as a mounted hunter and warrior are discussed by two reviewers. Firstly D. R. (no publication source, no date in Roe "H":54) questions Roe's proposition that the mounted horseman, being selective, slaughtered less buffalo than in the pre-horse period of drives and surrounds. D. R. argues that, although the hypothesis is probably true, consideration has to be given to the fact that because the post-horse period allowed for more buffalo being found

when they were needed, this would result in a larger annual kill. Secondly, in reference to the mounted Indian as a warrior, R. F. in the Kansas City Star (June 25, 1955 in Roe "H":60) claims that Roe " . . . also finds evidence pointing to the superiority as an individual fighting man of the mounted Indian over his familiar nineteenth-century foe, the U.S. cavalryman." [6]

Further with respect to the subject of the influence of the horse in Plains Indian culture, Roe's belief that the horse served as an ideological tonic and spiritual uplift for the Plains Indian is the next most popular topic with reviewers. Kivett of the Nebraska State Historical Society (no publication source, no date in Roe "H":54) finds Roe's summation on this subject worth repeating in his review. He quotes from Roe as follows: " . . . 'in my view the most profound influences exerted by the coming of the horse into Indian life were in the spiritual realm!' . . . " Another reviewer, Wyman in American Historical Review (January 1956 in Roe "H":71) also quotes directly from Roe in his review, namely, that the " . . . 'sense of possession was psychological tonic itself' . . . " and gives his support to Roe's statement that possession of the horse lessened and, in some cases, eliminated the need for women to perform heavy labour. Finally Wyman concurs with Roe that the horse was responsible for ". . . . widening the stage on which the Indian operated." MacEwan in Saskatchewan History (Spring 1957 in Roe "H":79) not only agrees with this last observation, but also adds that the horse was " . . . an ever-present source of fresh meat when an emergent food shortage arose."

Interest in Roe's "psychological tonic" hypothesis has led to

some interesting analogies. For example, two reviewers see the ideological impact of the horse as equivalent to the automobile and/or train and airplane in our society (Anon. in Fargo Forum, February 27, 1957 and Reeder in St. Louis Post Dispatch, June 1, 1955 in Roe "H": 78 and 60) while Barton in the Witchita Daily Times (May 22, 1955 in Roe "H":59) compares the increased mobility of the nineteenth century Plains Indian and his horse to the oil-rich twentieth century Plains Indian grandson and his Cadillac. In the same colourful vein, Hutchinson in the San Francisco Chronicle (August 28, 1955 in Roe "H": 67) states that "at some properly distant date, after interminable prowling in the kitchen-middens of the Twentieth Century, a careful scholar may produce a tome, say 'The White Man and the Atom,' that will do what here is done for an earlier culture that experienced the same deadly parallel of technology." These reviews may seem fanciful. Nonetheless this could be one instance where, because of their dramatic overtones, there is the possibility that Roe's influence might reach the 'man in the street' promoting an understanding of the impact of the horse upon Plains Indian culture.

One point of disagreement between Roe and his reviewers concerns recognition of the horse as the perpetrator of a "revolution" in Indian culture. Thus Haines in the Pacific Historical Review (November 1955) and an anonymous reviewer writing in Frontier (May 1955) both state that the coming of the horse resulted in a great revolution in Indian culture (Roe "H":70 and 58). Roe, however, views the dog and not the horse as the catalyst. "My own conclusion is that the development of the (domesticated) dog in their life was the beginning of the

Great Revolution" (Roe "C":8:7:53).

One interesting puzzle dealt with by Roe in his second book concerns the famous pinto pony that developed on the Plains, a type that the Indian preferred to train as "buffalo runners." Roe insists that this pony could be the product of prenatal influence, and argues for this somewhat illogical hypothesis even when faced with the much more believable one that the pinto pony is the product of natural selection. Certainly once the pinto appeared, it was encouraged to multiply, for the Plains Indian preferred this horse to any other breed.

Surprisingly, few reviewers take Roe to task over his non-scientific argument for the origin of the pinto pony. One anonymous reviewer (no publication source, no date) even sees Roe's position as a fascinating one, while Grant in The Beaver (Spring 1957) believes that it would be an interesting problem for horsemen along with Roe's "accounts and theories concerning the original importations" (Roe "H": 76 and 77). Finally Cooley in the Richmond Times Dispatch (July 31, 1955 in Roe "H":66) sees the problem as a "curious side-note."

There is, however, some negative response to Roe's argument with regard to the pinto pony. Thus Haines in the Pacific Historical Review (November 1955) thinks that it might obscure somewhat "Roe's solid core of achievement," while MacEwan in Saskatchewan History (Spring 1957) states that this part of Roe's work is "not as convincing" (Roe "H":70 and 79). Finally the negative review by Bittle (1956:193) particularly attacks Roe on this matter. He ends his severely critical remarks by stating that "a short review cannot, by any means, elaborate on the

total irresponsibility of this section on coloration" (Bittle 1956: 193).

3. Roe's Canadian content:

Unlike the reviews for The North American Buffalo which are predominantly Canadian, the reviews for The Indian and the Horse are predominantly American. Initial exposure via the press includes cities in the following states, namely, Oregon, California, Colorado, Kansas, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Georgia, and the provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba. Later reviews in United States journals add the states of Montana, Minnesota, and Florida and those in Canadian journals add the province of Saskatchewan.

As to the Canadian content being singled out as it was for the first book, there are only two reviews which make any such distinction. One is by Hutchinson in the San Francisco Chronicle (August 28, 1955 in Roe "H":67) where he states that "Mr. Roe has done the first major job on the horse-culture of the Canadian tribes and has integrated this segment into the more widely studied horse-culture of the Southwestern and Columbia Basin tribes." The other reference to Canadian content is by Williams (no publication source, no date in Roe "H":76). He notes that Roe " . . . traces the advance of the horse as far north as Edmonton, Canada . . . " . In general, however, reviewers treat the subject material of The Indian and the Horse as applicable to all of North America. Such phrases as the following are used rather than any division along Canadian and American lines.

"Indians of the West" and "Far West" (Roe "H":79, 71);
" . . . western history or western Indian culture" (Roe "H": 64, 70);
"North American history" (Roe "H":63);
"Western America" (Roe "H":68);
"Western plains" (Roe "H":66);
"horse in North America" (Roe "H":65);
" . . . principal horse-using tribes of the North American continent" (Roe "H":73);
"North American Indian" (Roe "H":69);
"tribes of North America" (Roe "H":65, 66).

At least three reviewers refer to Roe as a Canadian. Fenley in the Dallas Times Herald (July 17, 1955 in Roe "H":65) states that he " . . . came to Canada in 1894, and has worked as a farmer, ranch hand, and locomotive engineer in the Canadian West while Edgerton in Minnesota History (June 1956 in Roe "H":73) refers to "Mr. Roe, the Canadian farmer, ranch hand, and locomotive engineer turned scholar. . . " . Finally a review in Fargo Forum (Anon. February 27, 1957 in Roe "H":78) refers to the "Canadian Roe, author of 'The North American Buffalo' (1951) . . . " . This is very little recognition of Roe's Canadian background compared to the many times his Canadian heritage is referred to in reviews for The North American Buffalo.

4. Roe's writing expertise:

As with The North American Buffalo, reviewers of The Indian and the Horse criticize Roe's writing style. The most severe criticism, from both the academic and non-academic fields, is aimed at its readability. Even though these reviewers regard Roe's work as scholarly, definitive, authoritative, or the best reference available (Roe "H": 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 74, 79), they also consider the book to be heavily footnoted and statistical, and therefore dull, boring, tedious, and laborious to read (Roe "H":55, 57, 59, 60, 62,

67, 70, 74, 79). In other words, the " . . . book is great history. It is pedantic prose" (Hutchinson in San Francisco Chronicle, August 28, 1955 in Roe "H":67). Similarly Brooks in The American Statesman (1955 in Roe "H":55) puts the case simply. "For reference, yes, if you're interested in horses. For reading, no." Haines in the Pacific Historical Review (November 1955 in Roe "H":70) gives his summation in more depth. He states that to readers in the field of western history or western Indian culture

> . . . the plethora of facts and citations will prove of great value. For the same reason the work is less interesting to a casual reader who lacks background in the subject field.

There are, however, dissenters who oppose this view, even though they are fewer in number. For example in the Avalanche-Journal, Texas (May 8, 1955 in Roe "H":58), an anonymous reviewer states that The Indian and the Horse " . . . possesses a next [sic] that is easy-reading and informative to the student and the layman alike" while an anonymous reviewer in True West (September-October 1955 in Roe "H":66) considers "that it is . . . quite readable . . . due to the author's skill in presenting the facts and folklore gleaned from numerous other writers including Dobie, Wissler, Haines, Denhardt and Graham."

As with The North American Buffalo, reviewers are also concerned with the difficulty that they encounter in ascertaining Roe's position. This problem is particularly noted by two western scholars:

> many of the chapters read well and present satisfactory summaries of the items presented therein, but a few lack this important feature. Hence the reader is left in doubt and wonders just what conclusion the author had in mind (Haines in Pacific Historical Review, November 1955 in Roe "H":70);

> all in all, the author quotes so widely from other authorities that the reader may find it difficult at times to know exactly what the writer's own views are (MacEwan in Saskatchewan History, Spring 1957 in Roe "H":79).

C. Reviews: A Comparative Analysis

Firstly, a comparison is made between reviews and reviewers assessing Roe's two publications. This study illustrates the similarities and differences between the two books with respect to academic versus non-academic response, reviewer assessment of their educational value, and their geographical exposure. Secondly, because there was a certain rivalry between Professor John C. Ewers and Roe, the history of and reasons for this professional competition are examined.

1) Reviews and reviewers:

The ratio of academic to non-academic reviews varies between Roe's two books. By actual count, approximately two-thirds of the total number of reviews that deal with The North American Buffalo are academic as opposed to approximately one-third of the total number of reviews that deal with The Indian and the Horse. Therefore it appears that there has been more interest shown by the public in the relationship of the horse and the Indian rather than of the buffalo and the Indian. It must be remembered, however, that The Indian and the Horse is an American published book that has reached a far larger audience. It is also half the size of The North American Buffalo and, therefore, must not have appeared as formidable to the potential non-academic reader.

The reviewers also see Roe's work from different perspectives. Thus, while academic reviewers deplore the lack of summaries and Roe's failure to declare his position more clearly, it is the non-academic

reviewer who appreciates the opportunity to decide such things for himself. This is probably because the academic has some knowledge of the subject that Roe is writing about, and wishes to compare his own opinions with those offered by Roe. The layman is more likely to approach his first reading of Roe's material with less academic interest.

Both books are recognized primarily for their historical content. In this respect, Roe's major influence is in providing a dependable and almost exhaustive reference source for historical material published on the buffalo and horse of the Great Plains. For example, one reviewer writes that The North American Buffalo is " . . . a critical survey of the existing buffalo literature rather than of the buffalo itself" (Rowan in the Edmonton Journal, September 1, 1951 in Roe "H":8), while a non-academic comments that it is "invaluable for reference [and] it might well be called the Encyclopedia Bisonicus" (J. M. in Daily Colonist, August 5, 1951 in Roe "H":4). While these are both western Canadian reviewers, there are two others from the United States and England respectively who comment similarly: " . . . it is a model for any scientific investigation requiring use and interpretation of early writings and records" (Frankforter in the Scientific Monthly, March 1952 in Roe "H":34 and 36), and " . . . [it will] remain the standard reference work on the subject for a very long time" (Hindle in Antiquity, December 1953 in Roe "H":51).

In reviews of The Indian and the Horse, the same type of reaction appears, namely, that this is a reference book of high quality. "It is safe to say that from here on out, Roe must be cited as the first

reference in any study of the Indian-horse complex" (Hutchinson in San Francisco Chronicle, August 28, 1955 in Roe "H":67). "As a reference book, this is a "must" for everyone working in the field of western history or western Indian culture" (Haines in Pacific Historical Review, November 1955, in Roe "H":70).

Anthropological content, referred to as such largely by academic reviewers, and especially so in the case of The North American Buffalo, is another important topic. One subject of anthropological interest, that is, the Plains Indian, is dealt with extensively in both books. Therefore, both books stress that acquisition of the horse was the intensifier of Indian practices already present while the buffalo hunt was the initiator of and subsequent reason for the maintenance of the nomadic lifestyle among the Plains Indians. Yet when reference to Indian content in both books is compared, it is found that reviewers for Roe's second book acknowledge such topical material more often than do reviewers for his first book. Thus reviewers for The North American Buffalo are generally more interested in buffalo history and buffalo statistics than in Roe's Indian chapters, while reviewers for The Indian and the Horse are more interested in references to the Plains Indian. For example, reviewers of his second book acknowledge Roe's work on the effect of the horse upon the Indian technologically, ideologically, and spiritually rather than his extensive study of the acquisition of the horse by the Plains Indian. Even though Roe argues convincingly that acquisition of the horse was not due to strays from early Spanish explorers as some previous authors believed, but was due to the Spanish practice, especially at the missions, of using Indians

as "vaqueros" or cowboys thereby allowing them to become familiar with this new and frightening animal (1955:183-85), this subject is of much less importance to these reviewers.

In relation to problems of Indian/non-Indian culture contact, however, Roe presents more evidence in The North American Buffalo than in The Indian and the Horse to support his hypothesis that government non-intervention, especially in the United States, was responsible for the extermination of the buffalo. This particular subject, as part of the Indian content of the first book, also receives the most positive response from those who review his Indian material in this publication.

Point of origin for each publication appears to have had an influence upon the type of reviewer response to Roe's work. Thus reviews for The Indian and the Horse, a book published in the United States by the University of Oklahoma Press, are predominantly American as opposed to reviews for The North American Buffalo, a book published in Canada by the University of Toronto Press, which are predominantly Canadian.

In looking at the reviews for his first book, it can be seen that Roe receives considerable coverage from Alberta based publications. This is the geographical area where Roe was considered to be a "native son." Conversely, from a study of the reviews available, there is no acknowledgement by these same Alberta based publications for Roe's The Indian and the Horse. This is quite probably a reflection on the Canadian origin of the first book. A subject of more consequence however, with regard to recognition of The North American Buffalo by Albertans, is that the people of this province were made aware of this first book

when the University of Alberta bestowed an honorary LL.D. on Roe in the same year (1951) that the book was published. Further, this book has a larger Canadian-oriented content, the greater part of which involves the province of Alberta. This can be contrasted with Roe's second book, the content of which seems to involve North America as a unit.

It can be accepted, then, that the first book is Roe's Canadian book. He not only gains more recognition as a Canadian scholar, he is also given more Canadian exposure for The North American Buffalo. Further, both books serve as major reference sources for scholars interested in the history of the buffalo, the horse, and the Plains Indian. As such, they will have less appeal for the public, a conclusion supported by the majority of the reviewers who deal with this particular aspect. Finally, even though Roe's influence is largely in the area of documentation, his interest in the effect upon the Plains Indian caught in the culture contact situation is also acknowledged.

2. Roe and Ewers:

As mentioned in the Introduction (page 4n.), a rivalry existed between Roe and Professor John C. Ewers. Their disagreements are particularly apparent in a controversy that involves the horse. Thus in his second book published in 1955, Roe attacks some of the statements that Ewers makes in his article "Were the Blackfoot Rich in Horses?" published in the American Anthropologist of 1943. In rebuttal, Ewers defends himself by writing a lengthy review of The Indian and the Horse for publication in Ethnohistory (2:1955:376-79). This review is not in the Roe Collection but was located independently. As it can be assumed that Roe must have been aware of its existence, it is interesting to

speculate whether its exclusion from his collection of reviews was an oversight on Roe's part or whether its exclusion was deliberate. Before the differences of opinion between these two scholars are examined, however, a short personal history of Ewers' professional career is offered as a contrast to Roe's self-taught expertise.

John C. Ewers was a student (1933-1934) at the Yale University Graduate School where Clark Wissler was responsible for Ewers' initial interest in the Blackfoot Indians. Early in 1941 Ewers became the first curator of the new Museum of the Plains Indians on the Blackfoot Reservation near Browning, Montana. After service in the military (1944-1946) he held the position of Assistant Curator of Ethnology at the Smithsonian Institution in the United States National Museum, and later became the Director of its new Museum of History and Technology. Still later, as Senior Ethnologist in the Office of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution, circa 1969, Ewers

> . . . is universally acknowledged to be one of the nation's foremost ethnologists. . . . He has written more than a dozen books and monographs and more than a hundred articles on the American Indian, the western fur trade, and the early artists who interpreted the Indians (Utley Review 1969:219).

Finally, in addition to his own work, Ewers was also responsible for editing several books on the Upper Missouri tribes.

As Curator of the Smithsonian, Ewers furnished several pictures for The Indian and the Horse (Eldridge October 28, 1954 in Roe "E": 12-4). Thus he knew of the existence of Roe's second book before it appeared in print. It was after this book was published that Ewers wrote the aforementioned rather lengthy and somewhat negative review

of Roe's work in Ethnohistory (2:1955:376-79); a review that is, in part, in answer to Roe's criticism of his 1943 article.

Initially, Roe attacks Ewers (1943) in Chapter 15 of The Indian and the Horse, entitled "Indian 'Wealth in Horses' " (1955:282-315), for concluding that the Blackfoot were poor in horses. Ewers in his review in Ethnohistory (2:1955:379) continues to insist that the Blackfoot were, indeed, poor in horses, having only an average of ten per lodge for the Piegan and five per lodge for the Blackfoot and Blood. He further discloses that he restates his case in his new book, The Horse in Blackfoot Indian Culture (1955), published in the same month as Roe's work.

The argument, it would appear, is really dependent upon what is meant by "wealth." The minimum requirement of fifteen horses per lodge with an average family of five is used by Ewers (1943:607). Thus the Crow with fifteen horses per lodge are average while the Flathead and Nez Percé with fifty are wealthy (Ewers 1943:603). For Haines, fifteen horses per family of five is representative of a wealthy tribe. Such tribes were the southern Comanche, the Crow along the Yellowstone, and the Nez Percé of the Columbia Basin (Haines 1976: 114). To Roe, wealth in horses is attributed to any tribe that the literature does not designate "poor." Thus for the Blackfoot he was not able to find, in documentary sources from 1754 onward, " . . . a single reference to this supposed condition in the Blackfoot" (1955: 315).

Ewers (1943:604-6) believes that severe winters brought disaster to Blackfoot horse herds. He mentions particularly the winters of

1842 and 1876 in Blackfoot country and, for comparison, he makes use of the more complete Dakota Indian winter count records for the Teton Dakota for the years 1826-1827, 1852-1853, 1865-1866, and 1880-1881. He also believes that losses would have been heavier in Alberta where snows were generally deeper than south of the International Boundary (Ewers 1943:605). In reference to Ewers last statement, Roe (1955:303) states that this is not necessarily so, as Alberta winters are often "mild" compared to those in the Dakota area. This is because, according to Roe, Dakota territory lies east of Alberta and he presents evidence to show that areas of the Great Plains located to the east experience more severe winters than do those areas located west. Roe also states that, because severe winters occur "every four or five years," they come too often to be considered an unusual phenomenon and thus Roe discounts them " . . . as a probable cause of really serious depletion" (1955:303). In any case, Roe states, the hardy Indian horse was little affected. Further, Roe gives evidence for maximizing their probable survival by showing that the Blackfoot did not neglect their horses as, for example, the Assiniboin of Saskatchewan did (1955:305).

As to the prevalence of disease among Indian horses, referred to by Ewers (1943:606), Roe states that there is very little information on this matter in the source material and what there is is open to question. For example, he questions evidence offered by Hector of the Palliser Expeditions [1857-1860] who claims that Indian horses suffered from disease because of dry conditions that prevailed after a fire. This is contrary to Roe's personal experience which had taught him that disease struck during a wet period as, for example, the wet cycle of

1899-1903 when "swamp fever" struck his and other horse herds (1955: 294-99). Further, Roe continues, it was actually an extensive fire in 1904 that purified the lush growth produced by the preceding wet cycle, thus ridding the area of the disease (1955:297).

To sum up, while Ewers argues that " . . . at least four times in less than forty years (1842-1880), severe winters and disease took heavy toil [sic] of Blackfoot horse herds . . . " (1943:607), Roe still bases his counter argument chiefly upon the fact that there is no documentary evidence for stating that the Blackfoot were "poor" in horses (1955:315).

In his review Ewers (2:1955:376-77) also questions Roe's critical remarks about the unreliability of native informants, for Ewers had to some extent depended upon such native sources. Ewers points out that Roe makes use of information obtained in just such a manner when he quotes scholars like Kidd, Wissler, Jenness, and Lowie. Roe, however, appears to hold the position that pertinent information so gathered must be screened. He refers to Grinnell's stated opinion (1915) that the Indian " . . . is one of the world's acutest observers of the moment. But he is not a generalizer; . . . " and, Roe adds, " . . . still less is he the annalistic scribe" (1955:288). Ewers further accuses Roe of wasting valuable research opportunities by not recording Indian views during the time that Roe was a resident in Alberta and Saskatchewan. It should be remembered, however, that Roe was originally interested in the history of the buffalo and not the Indian. Of even more importance is the fact that these were years in which Roe was very much occupied with earning his living at a demanding vocation from which

he did not retire until 1943, a date two years after his first manuscript was completed. In addition, so far as Indians were concerned, his major objective was to prove that government policy, especially that of the United States, favoured the extermination of the buffalo as a means of controlling Indians, who were the equal of the white man so long as the buffalo and horse existed for Indian sustenance and defense respectively (Kraenzel 1955:75-76; Roe "C":2:33:350).

Although there are several other criticisms of Roe's work that are offered by Ewers, most are not directly relevant to this thesis. Even so, there is one additional accusation by Ewers that is worthy of discussion. In the same review in which he attacks The Indian and the Horse, Ewers asserts that Roe must not have had access to an adequate library (2:1955:377). In order to assess this criticism, statements made by Roe with regard to his access to source material were examined. In his autobiography, Roe recalls that he exhausted the public libraries very early and that he then turned to the University of Alberta library where he received generous help both from that institution and through inter-library loan. Later, he considered himself fortunate in being granted access to the private library of Dr. A. C. Rutherford of Edmonton, the former Alberta premier. This library contained " . . . many very valuable original editions" yet he was allowed to take out any book that he required with no set limit on length of loan or on number of books so borrowed. Roe states that such flexibility of access to resource material overcame many of the problems of time and place that he encountered because his work with the railroad demanded that he travel from one locality to another most

of the time. Further, a review of The North American Buffalo in the Edmonton Journal (Anon. October 25, 1951 in Roe "H":13) notes that Roe makes the observation that this private library of 200 volumes " . . . contained material not found elsewhere between Toronto and the west coast." In conclusion, it would seem feasible to assume that lack of resource material for Roe's two published books is not a problem. Quite the contrary would appear to be the case.

NOTES

[1]Of the fifty-three reviews of the first edition, there are seven reprints, leaving a total of forty-six. To illustrate, a review by J.M. or James Morton appeared as follows:

J.M.	July 29, 1951	Sunday Times (Roe "H":5);
J.M.	Aug. 5, 1951	Daily Colonist (Roe "H":4);
James Morton	Aug. 18, 1951	Vancouver News-Herald (Roe "H":7);
J. Morton	Aug. 18, 1951	Vancouver Sun (Roe "H":9).

Of passing interest in regard to this particular review, it is noted that the description of the buffalo changes in that the Times states

" . . . migration of these stupid and ugly animals north and south like birds, . . . ";

the Daily Colonist, " . . . migrations of the buffalo north and south like birds, . . . ";

the Vancouver News-Herald, " . . . migration of these somewhat stupid animale [sic] . . . ";

and the Vancouver Sun, " . . . of these stupid and ugly animals . . . ".

[2]Glover states in his review that because Roe's book is so good, its errors will do more harm. Therefore he believes that his lengthy criticism is important. Glover continues: " . . . it should be most encouraging to the non-professional reader as evidence of how well the amateur can hold his own in so professional a field as history has become today."

[3]For explanation of the "still hunt" see page 36 above.

[4]Roe claims that this was a policy implemented by the United States Government to starve out Sitting Bull and his Sioux people who had fled with him to Canada in 1877 after the Indian victory over General Custer at the Little Bighorn in 1876 (Roe 1970:475 and 477).

[5]See also Bishko in Virginia Quarterly Review, 1952 in Roe "H":30; The Observer in Family Herald and Weekly Star, February 28, 1952 in Roe "H":24; Canadian National Magazine, December 1951 in Roe "H":20; Graham in The Leader Post, Regina, November 3, 1951 in Roe "H":19; Time, October 29, 1951 in Roe "H":13; Goodwin in Natural History November 1952:391.

[6]It is of interest here to note that one anonymous reviewer writing in The Detroit News (April 10, 1955 in Roe "H":54) would appear to be in error when he maintains that Roe largely ignores the effect of the mounted Indian upon white settlement and the cavalry "sent to quell them."

PART V

ROE'S UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPT: "NOT GUILTY! The true story of the Indian and the buffalo"

Roe's premise that the military and legislative leaders, and not the Indians or the white buffalo butchers, were responsible for the extermination of the buffalo became the main subject of an unpublished manuscript Roe first entitled "The Indian and the Buffalo." Later, after its rejection by the University of Oklahoma Press, Roe retitled the manuscript "Not Guilty! The true story of the Indian and the buffalo." This is still unpublished.

Because this work was rejected at the very period in time when there was a renewed interest in culture contact problems, reasons why it was not published are examined. This is done through a study of correspondence between Roe and the publishers to whom he offered "Not Guilty!"

A. Reasons Why the Manuscript Was Never Published:

Roe completed "Not Guilty!" circa 1956, and began negotiations for its publication with the University of Oklahoma Press through Savoie Lottinville, its Director (Roe "C":2:35:370). It was during these negotiations that the original title for the manuscript, "The Indian and the Buffalo," was agreed to by this press. Correspondence from Lottinville, dated October 1957 and July 17, 1959, refers to the title as acceptable for their Civilization of the American Indian series (Roe "F":1 and "F":2), partly because, if published, it would follow Roe's other book title, The Indian and the Horse, published as No. 41 of the series (Lottinville, December 30, 1958 in Roe "E":12:5). After some five years of correspondence between Roe and the Oklahoma Press, the manuscript was returned by this publisher at Roe's insistence. Roe then forwarded it to other publishers but always with the same result. It is still in unpublished form in the Roe Collection.

1. The University of Oklahoma Press: Savoie Lottinville, Director

Initial reaction to Roe's manuscript by readers for this press was that it is too repetitive of facts and themes already presented by him in his previously published book on the buffalo (Lottinville, April 10, 1957 in Roe "E":12-5). In other words, it is "too close a parallel" to The North American Buffalo (Lottinville, December 30, 1958 in Roe "E":12-5). In this same correspondence of December 30, 1958, Lottinville states further that because a "painstaking historian" had been working on the final slaughter of the buffalo as well, " . . . much greater socio-economic, cultural, historico-anthropological depth is the proper trick . . . " . Also much editing and revising would be

necessary to make it popular with the public, and Roe was asked to rework his manuscript using "a fresh, narrative approach."

In answer to the criticism offered by readers of his manuscript on the subject of repetition, Roe repeatedly insists ("F":1:May 30, 1957; October, 1957; March 24, 1959) that he has prepared his new manuscript for members of the public. These are readers who, he believes, would not be interested in his more academically oriented work on the buffalo even if they were to be exposed to its content. Thus Roe asserts that

> . . . except on the assumption that the prospective readers of this proposed book are already close and saturated readers of the North American Buffalo, "repetition" becomes meaningless ("F":1:March 24, 1959).

With regard to Lottinville's criticism that "greater socio-economic, cultural, historico-anthropological depth" is needed to imbue a competitive quality to his work, Roe maintains that this type of content involves the very essay-discussion style of which he is accused, not the running narrative style Lottinville has asked of him ("F":1: March 24, 1959). As to this narrative style, Roe believes that Lottinville's suggestion is at variance with Roe's usual format. For example, Lottinville believes that the main body of the manuscript should be written as a historical narrative, not " . . . a tilting at historical misinterpretations" (December 30, 1958 in Roe "E":12-5). In reply, Roe maintains that the defense of the Indian has been left to too few scholars. There is plenty of factual evidence that there have been historical misinterpretations and that

> the time is coming when the case will be taken in hand by cold-blooded critics who will be governed by the evidence and by no other considerations. There is a grand opportunity for some courageous publishing house to lead this sooner or later inevitable change of attitude ("F":1: March 24, 1959).

In conclusion, Roe is adamant in not submitting his manuscript to extensive changes. In his own words, he is not going to "emasculate the thing." Lottinville, Roe suggests, is familiar with Roe's style and his method of presenting facts from having published The Indian and the Horse. He further declares that Lottinville must accept the manuscript or allow Roe to send it elsewhere ("F":1:March 24, 1959).

This letter seemed to satisfy Lottinville, for a two year contract for the publication of Roe's manuscript was drawn up between the two parties in July of 1959 (Roe "F":2). Difficulties continued to plague publication plans for "The Indian and the Buffalo," however. By the end of the first year of the contract, there were budgetary problems for the press itself that held up progress (Lottinville, May 20, 1960 in Roe "E":12-6). Later in the following year, the potential cost of revising the manuscript combined with Lottinville's illness (Lottinville, April 5, 1961 and April 24, 1961 in Roe "E":12-6) further complicated plans for publication of "The Indian and the Buffalo." By this time the two year contract had almost expired, yet one of the major difficulties for Lottinville was the cost of the extensive revision that he still deemed to be necessary. This was especially exasperating to Roe for, as noted above, he had clearly stated, before signing the contract for publication of his manuscript, that he would not agree to extensive changes.

Thus by the spring of 1961, negotiations for final publication of Roe's manuscript began to break down. It was at this late date that Lottinville admitted to Roe that he and his assistant had finally gone " . . . over it [the manuscript] in close-ordered form . . . " and found that the manuscript did, indeed, need extensive revision. Thus

Lottinville was perhaps indicating that he had not read the manuscript until after the contract had been signed (April 24, 1961 in Roe "E": 12-6) and after Roe had declared that he did not favour changing the content to any great degree. Yet even after finally reading the manuscript and knowing that he would have to win Roe's consent to make the many revisions that he considered important, Lottinville had allowed "The Indian and the Buffalo" to be advertised in the Fall Books for 1960 (Roe "F":3:July 13, 1968), a publication that reviewed manuscripts that were to be published the following year. By August 2, 1961, and a month past the end of the contract date, Lottinville (Roe "E":12-6) was still confirming that the cost of revising the manuscript would be exorbitant and added that "the book, as it now stands, does not have one-tenth of the merit of your The Indian and the Horse, which . . . we very extensively reworked . . . " . Further, Lottinville continued, in its present form the manuscript is

> . . . in so many of its parts . . . a tract, not a work of history. There is no market for tracts today, and history will survive best upon objective statement of facts, letting opinion be formed from those facts, by the reader, by the historian, by almost anyone (August 2, 1961 in Roe "E": 12-6).

In his bitter reply to Lottinville dated August 14, 1961, Roe argues that the pre-publication revisions to his 1955 work were neither extensive nor pertinent to the content, many being only required changes in style of citing references. As to the matter of objective facts in his new manuscript, Roe had based his upon evidence accessible to anyone; hence "tract" for Lottinville must " . . . imply that the author of a 'history' must have no opinions of his own" ("F":2:August 14, 1961).

It was at this same point in time that Roe, feeling pressured by the lack of constructive action, had his lawyer (Roe "F":3:July 13, 1968) take legal measures to have his manuscript returned to him. Even while in the process of returning the manuscript to Roe, however, Lottinville was still insisting that Roe could work the manuscript into shape for publication by the University of Oklahoma Press. Lottinville still believed that Roe had the ability to do "objective history" if he would only stop "crossing swords with people" (August 22, 1961 in Roe "E":12-6).

2. Texas University Press and other publishers:

The University of Oklahoma Press had kept Roe's manuscript out of circulation for approximately five years. There is no evidence to indicate that Roe offered it for publication again until July 13, 1968 (Roe "F":3) when he sent it to M. L. Hurtig, Edmonton, Alberta. Roe does mention, however, that he was writing page 75 on October 18, 1965 ("C":8:8:75n.). This may indicate that he was reworking the text before sending it out to other publishers.

In offering his manuscript once more, Roe was not hesitant about advising potential publishers that it had already been rejected by the University of Oklahoma Press. Roe still did not, however, accept the advice offered by this press that his manuscript was in need of lengthy revision. Rather Roe states, in correspondence with his potential publishers, that he believes that when the announcement by the Oklahoma Press of his manuscript's impending publication appeared in Fall Books, 1960, the readers turned on Lottinville to exclaim " . . . 'What! After our critical verdict you're still going to print Roe's book' . . . " ("F":3:July 13, 1968), and that ended the matter.

Between the time of M. L. Hurtig's rejection (July 24, 1968 in Roe "E":7) due to "heavy commitments" and its rejection by Macmillan's some time after October 12, 1971 (Roe "E":7) Roe sent his manuscript to three other possible publishers. Of these, the most lengthy appraisal of "The Indian and the Buffalo" was given by Frank J. Wardlaw [1] of the Texas University Press. Wardlaw's chief argument is that the manuscript is too long, especially in these days of high publishing costs. As to repetition, Wardlaw objects not only from the standpoint of manuscript material appearing in Roe's former publications, but also because material is repeated within the manuscript itself. Wardlaw states that there are so many identical facts "selectivity" is needed. Further, the obvious is repeated too often and the writing is too verbose. Finally, Wardlaw points out that there is too much space given to a discussion of geographical areas where no buffalo existed. Yet, in spite of all these criticisms, this reader concludes that "the author writes well" (Roe "E" in "F": 3:December 14, 1968).

3. Dr. George F. G. Stanley: Professor of Canadian Studies

Dr. Stanley, a personal friend of Roe's, carried on a correspondence with Roe during 1971 that is worthy of mention. Stanley also finds that "Not Guilty!" is too long and too repetitive of Roe's previous work. Stanley believes that it needs a twenty per cent editing to make it attractive to the public if, indeed, this is the prospective audience (Roe "E":9:February 5, 1971). Stanley's offer to help in this respect, however, was delayed when Stanley became ill in the summer of 1971 (Roe "E":9:September 17, 1971).

This, combined with Roe's admission that at the age of ninety-three "I do not feel that I can work on it again" ("F":4:September 13, 1971), marks almost the end of Roe's attempts to have "Not Guilty!" published. At Stanley's suggestion, however, Roe did send it one more time to another publisher, Macmillan's of Toronto (Roe "F":4: October 4, 1971 and "E":7:October 12, 1971), only to receive their rejection in return.

B. An Evaluation:

Roe readily admits that his manuscript "Not Guilty!" contains material already published by him. Certainly the relationship of the buffalo, nomadism, and the tipi are repeated in his newer manuscript as are the practical and ideological reasons why Roe believes that the Plains Indians were not guilty of exterminating the buffalo. Non-Indian policy for such extermination, its causes, history, and effects are again discussed in "Not Guilty!".

The reason given by Roe that because he is writing for a different, non-academic audience, the matter of repetition is not serious, has some basis. "Not Guilty!" is less statistically oriented, and has fewer footnotes for the reader to cope with. A narrative style that should appeal to the public is lacking however. Rather, the content of the manuscript is offered to the reader in a mixed, perhaps even confused, fashion. For example, material relating to pre-contact conditions that would seem to be suitable for the beginning of his book, such as pre-contact Plains Indian view of the land, history of the buffalo, Plains Indian methods for buffalo capture, the difficulties presented by the irregularity of buffalo

movements, and the overall pre-horse food economy of the Plains Indian, is not discussed as a unit but is spread in a hit and miss fashion over Chapters 3, 7, 9, 10, 20, and 22.

As to lengthiness, verbosity, and belabouring the point, the general consensus that Roe commits all three 'sins' would seem to be a fair evaluation of this particular work. Thus the criticism offered Roe by Wardlaw (Roe "F":3:December 14, 1968) is certainly worth considering. For example, Wardlaw states that Roe's chapter entitled "Would the Indian alone have exterminated the buffalo?" is largely redundant because Roe has already established in the previous chapter that the Plains Indian could not have exterminated this animal.

In regard to Roe's continued determination to ignore these three problems stated above, it should be pointed out that Roe may have been misled by the good reviews given The Indian and the Horse, a work whose manuscript also received negative criticism from its readers. Two of these readers had advised the University of Oklahoma Press not to publish "The Indian and the Horse" while a third reader had reservations about the manuscript's possible success if it were to be published (Lottinville, July 14, 1953 in Roe "E":12-2). With these facts concerning his second manuscript in mind, Roe writes Lottinville that

> the same class, as represented among your "publishers' readers", who now denounce "The Indian and the Buffalo," also denounced The Indian and the Horse MS. . . . [Nonetheless] this latter book has acquired me a "fine reputation" ("F":2:August 14, 1961).

Roe's statement would indeed appear to be true for The Indian and the Horse. This book enjoyed its fourth printing in 1974 (Roe Collection: Finding Aid).

Roe also had a like experience with his first manuscript. With regard to The North American Buffalo, Roe states that " . . . of six Readers who read my Buffalo MS. during some fourteen years prior to printing, only one endorsed it for printing" ("F":1:October 1957). Yet after publication Roe's first book was acclaimed by many of his reviewers. One of the major reasons for this positive reaction is that this work is regarded as an outstanding reference source. It would seem, then, that Roe's guideline for successful authorship, as given by him in The North American Buffalo, is correct. Roe states that " . . . the inclusion of as many contributions as possible on any given topic, particularly where they tended to combat some existing but dubiously supported belief . . . " (1970:10), is the best method. As noted above, however, two-thirds of the reviews for this first publication are written by academic scholars. Such a multitude of facts is not only redundant for, but of little interest to, the general reader. Thus lengthiness, verbosity, and belabouring the point are major drawbacks in any work prepared for the public at large, the very public for whom Roe has written "Not Guilty!".

Despite the negative reaction to the manuscript, "Not Guilty!" does have merit. For example, in its text Roe has expanded upon the theme that the concept of waste did not carry the same statistical meaning for members of the Indian community that it did for members of the non-Indian community. Thus Roe does offer several good reasons why the Indians were not morally responsible for the near-extermination of the buffalo. Roe allows the reader to relate to the possible different reactions experienced by Indian and non-Indian in accounting

for the decrease in buffalo numbers that coincided with the decimation of the Plains Indian due to the smallpox epidemic of 1781. Whereas the concerned Euroamerican, particularly of a later period, might view this decrease in buffalo as due to irregular migrations or overkill, the Plains Indian, according to Thompson (in Roe "C":8:11:125), would attribute this same decrease in buffalo to Manitou's cleverness in realizing that because His children were now fewer in number, He need provide fewer buffalo for their needs.

Finally it should be noted that, despite its faults, no one states directly that the manuscript is not worthy of publication. To sum up, Dr. Stanley expresses the whole problem most succinctly:

> . . . the main theme of the book is opportune. Opportune in the sense that there is a quite broad interest in Canada in the Indians and in the problems of conservation. Your clearing the Indians of culpability in the destruction of the buffalo is, I believe, a pertinent point. The story of the disappearance of the great herds of buffalo is equally pertinent. Both of these main themes will, I believe, attract a reasonably wide reading public. But not a public prepared to read a large volume or to work through lengthy quotations or a multiplicity of historical illustrations supporting your main thesis (February 5, 1971 in Roe "E": 9).

NOTES

[1]This reader report was signed F.J.W. and is presumed to be Frank Wardlaw.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary, the purpose of this paper is to examine the work of Frank Gilbert Roe dealing with Indian/non-Indian culture contact that led to the deculturation of the Plains Indian during the latter half of the nineteenth century. This use of Roe's material, both published and unpublished, provides a valuable point of reference that not only suggests Roe's place in anthropology but also provides a basis for demonstrating that members of the non-Indian community had experienced a change of attitude toward the Amerindian by the 1950s.

Roe's interest in the subject of Indian/non-Indian culture contact, and especially its deleterious effect upon the Plains Indian, is the result of two unrelated factors. Firstly, Roe's autobiographies demonstrate that his interest in minority groups developed as a result of parental influence, events, and experiences in his early life. Secondly, his investigations into the history of the buffalo led Roe into research on the problems faced by the Plains Indian caught in the culture contact situation. In this respect, Roe notes that he examined this subject for both sides of the United States/Canadian border.

From Roe's autobiographies it is seen that his respectful attitude toward the Plains Indian minority had nothing to do with the Amerindian as an object of ethnological study. Later in his work, Roe implies that he did not see his research on the buffalo, the horse, and the Plains Indian as being of an ethnological nature. For example, in referring to "Not Guilty!" Roe states that the manuscript is " . . . intended as a contribution toward remedying the social injustice of the North American continent toward the Indian" ("F":2:July 17, 1959).

Even though Roe did not present his material as an ethnology, his work is an exercise in cultural ecology. He examines the roles of the buffalo, the horse, and the Plains Indian and views the whole as a cultural ecological system that produced an efficient and meaningful subsistence for the Indian of the Great Plains. Further, Roe notes that the cultural ecological balance achieved produced the mounted Indian of the Plains, a horseman so efficient that United States officials believed that removal of this threat was necessary to facilitate Euroamerican settlement of the Great Plains.

It is, therefore, apparent that it was the arrival of persons who held a different world view that disrupted this cultural ecological balance. In this respect, Roe's work can be considered a contribution to ethnohistory. He traces the effect upon the Plains Indian of this confrontation with the non-Indian intruder and especially emphasizes the events that took place during the period 1850-1890. Therefore, in answer to charges that the Plains Indians brought about buffalo extinction, Roe absolves them of any guilt in destroying their own source of subsistence. Roe not only defends the Amerindian on ideological grounds, he also uses published statistics to show that such extermination by the Plains Indian was impossible.

Roe also absolves the Canadian Indian and Métis of responsibility for buffalo extermination in Western Canada. His first book in particular investigates this subject. For example, Roe's description of the Red River hunt is of major interest to ethnohistorians in that Roe not only explains the necessary and practical reasons for the Red River hunt but also refutes the evidence offered by Hornaday (1889)

and Allen (1876) that the Indian and Métis slaughtered buffalo needlessly.

In exonerating the Plains Indian, Roe places responsibility for this animal's near-extermination on those United States officials who did nothing to stop the massacre. In doing so, however, Roe is careful to place his denunciation of Euroamerican treatment of the Plains Indian in context by relating his criticisms to "the 'time-spirit' of nineteenth-century America-at-large" (1970:7). Further, when preparing "Not Guilty!" for publication about 1955, despite the change of attitude toward the Indian that he believed had occurred by the time he wrote The North American Buffalo (1951) Roe wonders whether certain contemporary authors are guilty of exhibiting an "anti-Indian animus." He attacks Ewers (1955) in this regard for neglecting the role of the white hide hunter and buffalo butcher in his work. What Roe fails to take into consideration is that Ewers' material is ethnographically oriented and more directly concerned with the life of the Blackfoot than with the Euroamerican intrusion and its consequences. On the other hand, Ewers accuses Roe of writing a poor ethnography by not making use of Indian informants when Roe's work is basically an ecological history of culture contact based on the usual ethnohistorical, that is, Euroamerican, sources.

The evidence Roe presents implicating Euroamerican officials in buffalo extermination is not new. For example, Roe's evidence in The North American Buffalo (1951 Appendix "H":804-16) entitled "Buffalo, Indian, and Legislation" is taken largely from Hornaday (1889). Hornaday, however, interprets this material as a movement for

buffalo conservation. Further, Roe notes that Hornaday did not use it as evidence that certain officials wished to prevent the passage of a bill to protect the buffalo nor that these same officials wished to ensure the continuation of buffalo destruction in order to subdue the Plains Indian.

Roe relates Hornaday's apparent lack of concern for the Plains Indian to the time period and excuses him by suggesting that he was not aware of influences that were " . . . at work behind the scenes" (1970:808). Roe also relieves members of the American public of responsibility for the destruction of the buffalo because he believes that they were either given official information that was "poisoned" or given none at all (1970:815-16).

A study of reviews confirms that attitudes toward the two interrelated subjects of buffalo extermination and Plains Indian cultural loss had indeed changed in both the academic and non-academic fields by the time of Roe's first book. Thus, among the many reviewers of Roe's 1951 and 1955 publications, not one disputes Roe's premise that responsibility for buffalo extinction and, therefore, the ultimate deculturation of the Plains Indian, lay with United States officials who encouraged the white hide hunter and buffalo butcher to continue the massacre of this ungulate. In fact, several reviewers of Roe's 1951 book, wherein he states his hypothesis at great length, commend Roe for his documentation.

In like manner, Roe's defense of the Plains Indian in the early 1950s did not receive the negative, even belligerent, response from academics and non-academics that such action occasioned in the time

period 1850-1890. This illustrates an acceptance by members of both the scholarly and general fields that the Plains Indian had received unjust treatment from the Euroamerican intruder during the latter years of the nineteenth century. Further, it is evident that because reviewers' response to the matter of buffalo extermination was greater for Roe's first book, this change of attitude was apparent as early as 1951 through 1953, the dates of the reviews, and before the revival of widespread public interest in the Indian caught in the culture contact situation. Apparently it is easier to deal with a highly emotional situation such as Plains Indian/non-Indian culture contact from a point in time three to four generations removed from the actual atrocities committed.

Roe's other major contribution in defense of the Plains Indian in the culture contact situation is in the area of ideology. In answering the question of why the Plains Indian did not ensure survival of the buffalo when it was in their best interests to do so, Roe presents evidence in both published books to affirm his hypothesis that the Plains Indian had no concept of waste because he believed that Manitou would always provide. This concept, Roe points out, was repeated in the press as late as December 6, 1933:

> buffalo have returned to Saskatchewan plains. . . . Old Indians . . . tell each other that prophecies of their old medicine men will come true (1970:813).

Such evidence, Roe believes, has to be considered. When it is, the Plains Indians cannot be held morally responsible for destroying the buffalo even if evidence could be given that they had.

Roe's ideological defense of the Plains Indian, however, did not

receive the attention from his reviewers that his evidence for implicating United States officials in the matter of buffalo extermination received. This lack of interest can be interpreted to mean that having accepted Roe's evidence for Euroamerican guilt in bringing about Plains Indian deculturation, ideological evidence exonerating the Plains Indian of guilt for something they did not do would be redundant.

The question of waste as well as the question of buffalo extermination is given even larger coverage in Roe's unpublished manuscript "Not Guilty!". If published, the book could have been in the public's hands in 1961 just at the beginning of renewed interest in the Indian. Some assessment of how "Not Guilty!" might have been received by the public can be made from correspondence between Roe, his potential publishers, and their readers. In this respect, the reasons given for rejecting Roe's manuscript are concerned with stylistic elements such as format, verbosity, lengthiness, and redundancy. None of Roe's critics quarrel with his defense of the Indian and his evidence for non-Indian destruction of the buffalo. Further, such publishers and their readers have to be in touch with what will be acceptable to the reading public. Therefore, this lack of critical comment with regard to Roe's hypothesis is perhaps an indication that they believed that the public would be willing to accept Roe's premise that the Plains Indian was wronged in the culture contact situation.

One criticism of Roe's writing style that is relevant to this thesis is the suggestion offered by the University of Oklahoma Press that his third manuscript is a "tract" and that it be rewritten as a

narrative with some attempt made to inject matters of human interest or of a more personal nature (Roe "E":12-5 with letter dated December 30, 1958). It appears that Roe found this style of writing more difficult to achieve than his usual method of conducting a painstaking and thorough review of previously published data. For example, an examination of his short unpublished work of fiction "Bad, Bad Boy" (Roe "C": 17) illustrates this problem, for it is woefully dull with overworked themes. His two autobiographical non-fiction manuscripts are somewhat more acceptable, especially to anyone interested in early Albertan history, but even in this work he tends to be repetitive, which disrupts the flow of ideas.

It can be said, then, that Roe's writing expertise lies in the area of documentation. In particular, his interpretations of historical events are always well supported with evidence that is largely taken from published material and is, therefore, available to the reader. Further, as Rowan points out in the Journal of Mammology (February 1952 in Roe "H":35), Roe " . . . approaches his subject with the mentality of a critic who has no axe to grind and can therefore look impartially at the writings of those who have posed as authorities." Rowan refers to Hornaday (1889) in particular in this regard.

It is Roe's very success with his first two well-documented works, both of which were published after their rejection by publishers' readers (Roe "F":1:October 1957 and 2:August 14, 1961), and his relative freedom from academic ties that prompted Roe to refuse to edit his third manuscript. Further, Roe's frustration, suffered as a result of Lottinville's in-depth study and subsequent severe criticism

of this manuscript after the contract for its publication had been signed, must be considered when judging Roe's continued refusal to accept constructive criticism. Finally, by the time Roe was convinced that these and other like suggestions were worthy of attention (largley because of Stanley's (1971) influence), he was too old for the task of revising his manuscript (Roe "F":4:September 13, 1971). Roe's answer to charges of repeating material from earlier books does have merit, however. As Roe maintains, it is logical to expect that the general reader will be more interested in this manuscript covering the culture contact situation than in his earlier academic works on the subject, with their many footnotes and source references.

One concludes, then, from an examination of reviews covering Roe's published books and from publisher and reader reports for "Not Guilty!", that Roe's subject material was not a matter of controversy. The central theme of Roe's work, that the extermination of the buffalo was brought about essentially by certain officials of the United States and that this circumstance resulted in Plains Indian deculturation, was acceptable in the early 1950s. Therefore a change in attitude toward the Indian/non-Indian culture contact problem had occurred since the period 1850-1890 and before the marked and widespread renewal of interest in the Indian during the 1960s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. General:

Allen, Joel A.
1876 The American Bisons, Living and Extinct. (Memoirs of the Museum of Comparative Zoology, IV, No. 10). Cambridge, Mass.

— 1877 "The Northern Range of the Bison," in American Naturalist, XI:624.

Bittle, William E.
1956 "Ethnology and Ethnography," in American Anthropologist 58:192-93.

Catlin, George
1851 [1841] Letters and Notes on the North American Indians. 8th ed. 2 vols. London.

Cuming, Fortescue
1902 [1810] Tour to the Western Country, 1807-1809. Vol. 4. Early Western Travels. Edited by R. G. Thwaites (q.v.). 32 vols. Cleveland.

Denhardt, Robert M.
1947 The Horse of the Americas. Norman, Oklahoma.

Denny, Sir Cecil E.
1938 The Law Marches West, 1874-1905. Edited by W. B. Cameron. Toronto.

Driver, Harold E.
1969 [1961] Indians of North America. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ewers, John C.
1943 "Were the Blackfoot Rich in Horses?" in American Anthropologist 45:602-610.

— 1955 "Reviews—The Indian and the Horse," in Ethnohistory 2:376-79.

— 1969 [1955] The Horse in Blackfoot Indian Culture: with comparative material from other western tribes. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin No. 159. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Goodwin, George G.
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in Natural History 61:391.

Grinnell, George B.
1915 The Fighting Cheyennes. New York

Haines, Francis
1976 The Plains Indians. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Hornaday, William T.
1889 "The Extermination of the American Bison, with a sketch of its discovery and life history," in Smithsonian Report, 1887 (Washington, 1889), Part II: 365-548.

— 1971 [1887] The Extermination of the American Bison, with a sketch of its discovery and life history. From report of National Museum. Seattle: Shorey Book Store.

Hughes, Katharine
1911 Father Lacombe, the Black-Coat Voyageur. Toronto.

Hulbert, Archer Butler
1902-1905 The Historic Highways of America. 16 vols. Cleveland.

Jackson, Helen Hunt
1965 [1881] A Century of Dishonor. New York: Harper & Row.

Jenness, Diamond
1932 The Indians of Canada. National Museum of Canada, Bulletin 15. Ottawa.

Jennings, Francis
1976 [1975] The Invasion of America: Indians, colonialism, and the cant of conquest. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc.

Kenton, Edna
1930 Simon Kenton, His Life and Period (1755-1836). New York.

Kraenzel, Carl Frederick
1955 The Great Plains--in Transition. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Marcy, Gen. Randolph B.
1854 Exploration of the Red River of Louisiana, in the Year 1852. Washington.

McDougall, Rev. Dr. John
1896 Saddle, Sled, and Snowshoe. Toronto.

Priest, Loring Benson
1975 [1942] Uncle Sam's Stepchildren: The reformation of United States Indian policy, 1865-1887. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Rogers, Joseph M.
1905 Thomas Hart Benton. Philadelphia.

Ross, Alexander
1855 Fur Hunters of the Far West. 2 vols. London.

Satz, Ronald N.
1976 American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Secoy, Frank Raymond
1953 Changing Military Patterns on the Great Plains: (17th century through early 19th century). New York: J. J. Augustin. Monograph of the American Ethnological Society. Edited by Esther S. Goldfrank 21.

Seton, Ernest Thompson
1910 Life-Histories of Northern Animals. 2 vols. New York.

— 1929 Lives of Game Animals. 4 vols. New York.

Shaler, N. S.
1900 [1891] Nature and Man in America. New York.

Stanley, George F. G.
1974 "Frank Gilbert Roe--1878-1973," in Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada. Series 4. 12:62-65.

Thompson, David
1916 Narrative of Explorations in Western America, 1784-1812. Edited by J. B. Tyrrell. Toronto: Champlain Society.

University of Victoria
1978 Index to Roe Collection--Finding Aid. McPherson Library, Special Collections: Victoria, B. C. Unpublished.

Utley, Robert M.
1969 "Reviews of Books," in Pacific Historical Review 38:219.

Webb, Walter Prescott
1931 The Great Plains. New York: Ginn and Company.

Wissler, Clark
1914 "The Influence of the Horse in the Development of Plains Culture," in American Anthropologist 16:1-25.

B. ROE, Frank Gilbert:

1. Published:

1929 "The 'Wild Animal Path' Origin of Ancient Roads," in Antiquity (England) 3:299-311.

1934 "The Extermination of the Buffalo in Western Canada," in Canadian Historical Review 1-23.

1939 "From Dogs to Horses Among the Western Indian Tribes," in Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada Series 3 Section II 33:209-275.

1951 The North American Buffalo: A critical study of the species in its wild state. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

1955 The Indian and the Horse. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

1970 The North American Buffalo: A critical study of the species in its wild state. 2d ed., rev. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

1978 April [1970] "The Sod House," in " . . . Be It Ever So Humble," in Westworld, page 54.

2. Unpublished Manuscripts:

Note: These can be found under Series "C" in the Roe Collection in Special Collections, McPherson Library, University of Victoria, Victoria, B. C.

"Alberta in the Early Eighteen-Nineties." Item "1". 403 pages.

"Bad, Bad Boy." Item "17". 93 pages.

"Not Guilty! The true story of the Indian and the buffalo." Item "8". 388 pages.

"That's How It Seemed To Be: An autobiographical essay." Item "2". 384 pages.

C. Reviews:

1. Series "H", Roe Collection: (file number noted)

Anonymous
n.d. "The Indian and the Horse," (no publisher listed). No. 76.

Anonymous
n.d. "The Indian and the Horse," in Antiquarian Bookman. No. 74.

Anonymous
1955 "The Indian and the Horse," in Arkansas Gazette, July 10. No. 65.

Anonymous
1955 "History Told of Redmen and Horses," in Avalanche-Journal, May 8. No. 58.

Anonymous
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in British Book News, July. No. 37.

Anonymous
1951 "College Awards Honorary Degree to Retired Locomotive Engineer," in Canadian National Magazine, December, p. 42. No. 20.

Anonymous
1971 "Roe, Frank Gilbert," in Choice, February. No. 83.

Anonymous
1955 "The Indian and the Horse," in Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 3. No. 65.

Anonymous
1955 "Whence Came They?" in "Books of the Day," in The Detroit News, April 10, p. 16E. No. 54.

Anonymous
1951 "Alberta Pioneer Took 15 Years to Write Book," in Edmonton Journal, Edmonton, Alberta, October 25. No. 13.

Anonymous
1951 "Scholarly Retired Railman to be Honored at University of Alberta," in Edmonton Journal, Edmonton, Alberta, July 11. No. 6.

Anonymous
1951 "Honor for Alberta Men," in Edmonton Journal, Edmonton, Alberta, October 17. No. 12.

Anonymous
1957 "How the Indians Got the Horse," in "A Book Review," in Fargo Forum, February 27. No. 78.

Anonymous
1951 "The Scholar Survives," in The Free Press Weekly, Winnipeg, Manitoba, August. No. 31.

Anonymous
1955 "The Indian and the Horse," in Frontier, May. No. 58.

Anonymous
1951 "Buffalo," in The Globe and Mail, Toronto, October. No. 9.

Anonymous
1955 "The Indian and the Horse," in Mississippi Valley Historical Review, September. No. 66.

Anonymous
1951 "Books of Our Own," in The New Trail, Edmonton: University of Alberta, Summer, p. 93. No. 10.

Anonymous
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in Family Herald and Weekly Star, February 28. No. 24.

Anonymous
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in Omaha World-Herald, May 3. No. 28.

Anonymous
1955 "The Indian and the Horse," in "New on Editor's Desk," in The Oregonian, April 17. No. 55.

Anonymous
1955 "A Scholarly Western Book," in Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colorado, July 24. No. 64.

Anonymous
1955 "Horses and Their Riders," in Saturday Review, July 16. No. 64.

Anonymous
1951 "Buffalo Man in Alberta," in Time, October 29. No. 13.

Anonymous
1955 "Indians," in "Western Books Roundup," in True West, September/October. No. 66.

Anonymous
1955 "Story of Indian and Pony Follows Book on North American Buffalo," in "Victoria Man Writes Second Frontier Book," in Victoria Times, June 18. No. 63.

Barton, Henry W. (Midwestern University)
1955 "Parallels Grandson's Cadillac," in "Horse Brought Mobility but no Change in Nature," in Wichita Daily Times, May 22, p. 3D. No. 59.

B. C.
1971 "Bison," in Fauna 2, March/April, p. 45. No. 83.

Berry, J. P.
1951 "Mr. Roe's Buffalo," in "The Journal Letter Box," in Edmonton Journal, Edmonton, Alberta, August 18. No. 7.

Bishko, Charles Julian (Refer to July 24, 1953 in Roe "E":2 for confirmation of author of this review)
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in Virginia Quarterly Review, Summer. No. 30.

Bonenfant, M. Jean-Charles
1952 "The North American Bison," in La Revue de l'Université Laval 2:6. Translated by Miss Shaw, Victoria, B. C., February. No. 39.

Brooks, Raymond
n.d. "The Indian and the Horse," in The American-Statesman, Austin, Texas. No. 55.

Burlingame, Merrill G.
1952 "Book Reviews," in Montana Magazine of History, January, p. 65. No. 23.

Burton, Maurice
1952 "History of the North American Buffalo," in Nature, December 6, p. 945. No. 41.

Cooley, Franklin D.
1955 "Two Phases of American Indians' Life," in Richmond Times Dispatch, July 31. No. 66.

Coulson, Frances (Calgary Public Library)
1952 "Alberta in Books," in Canadian Library Association Bulletin, May. No. 26.

Dales, Professor J. M. (McGill University)
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in University of Toronto Quarterly, April. No. 32.

Darling, F. Fraser
1952 "Ecology and History of the Bison," in "Reviews," in Ecology 33:2:307-308. No. 34.

De Vos, A.
1952 "News and Notes," in Forestry Chronicle, July, pp. 193-94. No. 49.

D. R.
n.d. "The Indian and the Horse," (no publication listed). No. 54.

Drury, K.
1955 "When Horses Arrived Indian Life Changed," in "Horses and the American Indian," in Vancouver Sun, September 3. No. 69.

Edgerton, Jay (Member editorial page staff on Minneapolis Star)
1956 "The Indian and the Horse," in Minnesota History, June. No. 73.

Errington, Paul L.
1953 "The North American Buffalo," in Quarterly Review of Biology. No. 48.

Ewers, John C.
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in American Anthropologist 54:266. No. 26.

Fenley, Albert (Member of composing room staff)
1955 "Pounding Hooves Upon the Plains," in Dallas Times Herald, July. No. 65.

Frankforter, W. D. (of Sanford Museum, Cherokee, Iowa)
1952 "Buffalo History," in "Book Reviews," in The Scientific Monthly, March. No. 36. (Located with No. 34 in error).

Glass, Byron P. (Zoology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater)
1971 "The North American Buffalo," in The Quarterly Review of Biology, June. No. 83.

Glover, Richard
1952 "Book Reviews," in Saskatchewan History, pp. 70-73. No. 27.

-- 1952 "Book Reviews," in The Beaver. No. 33.

Graham, Kathleen
1951 "The North American Buffalo," in The Leader-Post, Regina, Saskatchewan, November 3. No. 19.

Grant, Joy Bedson
1957 "The Indian and the Horse," in "Northern Books," in The Beaver, Spring. No. 77.

Haines, Francis (Oregon College of Education)
1955 "The Indians [sic] and the Horse," in "Reviews of Books," in Pacific Historical Review, November. pp. 404-405. No. 70.

Hindle, Edward
1953 "The North American Buffalo," in Antiquity (England) December, p. 251. No. 51.

Hutchinson, W. H.
1955 "What Spanish Horses Did to the American Indian," in San Francisco Chronicle, August 28. No. 67.

Jones, J. Knox, Jr. (Museum of Natural History, The University of Kansas, Lawrence)
1971 "The North American Buffalo," in Journal of Mammology, May. No. 83.

Kivett, Marvin F. (Nebraska State Historical Society)
1952 "The North American Buffalo," in Nebraska History 33:4:276, December. No. 44.

— 1955 "The Indian and the Horse," (no publication listed). No. 54.

Knox, Jack
1955 "Fascinating Trail of Indian and Horse," in The Nashville Banner, May 6, p. 33. No. 59.

Leopold, Luna B.
1953 "The North American Buffalo," in Geographical Review 43:1:137. No. 46.

M. (Morton), J.
1951 "Victoria Man Expert on Buffalo," in Daily Colonist, Victoria, B. C., August 5. No. 4. (Content repeated in Nos. 5, 7, and 9).

MacEwan, Grant
1957 "The Indian and the Horse," in Saskatchewan History, Spring, pp. 77-78. No. 79.

Matheson, Colin
1953 "The History of the Bison," in Journal of Animal Ecology 22:1:172-75. No. 50.

McKinley, Daniel
1972 "The North American Buffalo," in Defenders of Wildlife News, July/August. No. 83.

Shapiro, Harry L.
1953 "The North American Buffalo," in The American Indian 6:4:45, Summer. No. 47.

Steele, Wm. O.
1955 "New Beast," in The Chattanooga Times, June 12. No. 60.

Tinker, Edward Larocque
n.d. "The Indian and the Horse," in Resenas de Libros, New York: New York. No. 74.

Willard, Courtenay
1955 "How Indians of America Made Friends of Horses," in Augusta Chronicle, June 26. No. 62.

Williams, Frederick Allen
n.d. "The Indian and the Horse," (no publication listed). No. 76.

Wyman, Walker D. (Wisconsin State College, River Falls)
1956 "The Indian and the Horse," in American Historical Review 61:417, January. No. 71.

2. Series "H", Roe Collection (numerical index)

4. J. M. (James Morton) (See also Nos. 5, 7, and 9)
6. Anonymous
6. R. P.
7. Berry, J. P.
8. Rowan, William
9. Anonymous
10. Anonymous
11. Reed, Erik K. (See also Nos. 24 and 47)
12. Anonymous (Rowan quoted here)
13. Anonymous
13. Anonymous
18. Nicholson, Patrick
19. Graham, Kathleen
20. Anonymous
22. Morton, W. L.
23. Burlingame, Merrill G.
24. Anonymous
26. Coulson, Frances
26. Ewers, John C.
27. Glover, Richard
28. Anonymous
30. Bishko, Charles Julian
31. Anonymous
32. Dales, Professor J. M.

33. Glover, Richard

34. Darling, F. Fraser

35. Rowan, William

36. Frankforter, W. D. (misplaced in file and can be located in No. 34).

37. Anonymous

39. Bonenfant, M. Jean-Charles

40. Riddell, Francis

41. Burton, Maurice

44. Kivett, Marvin F.

46. Leopold, Luna B.

47. Shapiro, Harry L.

48. Errington, Paul L.

49. De Vos, A.

50. Matheson, Colin

51. Hindle, Edward

54. Anonymous

54. D. R.

54. Kivett, Marvin F.

55. Brooks, Raymond

55. Anonymous

57. Past, Ray

58. Anonymous

58. Anonymous

58. Oboler, Eli M.

58. O'Bryant, Arch

59. Barton, Henry W.

59. Knox, Jack

60. Reeder, Armand W.

60. R. F.

60. Steele, Wm. O.

62. Willard, Courtenay

63. Anonymous

64. Anonymous

64. Anonymous

65. Anonymous

65. Anonymous

65. Fenley, Albert

66. Cooley, Franklin D.

66. Anonymous

66. Anonymous

67. Hutchinson, W. H.

68. Phillips, Paul C.

69. Drury, K.

70. Haines, Francis

71. Wyman, Walker D.

73. Edgerton, Jay

74. Anonymous

74. Tinker, Edward Larocque

76. Anonymous

76. Williams, Frederick Allen

77. Grant, Joy Bedson

78. Anonymous

79. MacEwan, Grant

83. Anonymous

83. B. C.

83. Glass, Byron P.

83. Jones, J. Knox Jr.

83. McKinley, Daniel

D. Correspondence:

1. Incoming, Series "E", Roe Collection:

Boehler, Helen (University of Toronto Press)
1952 Folder 13-1 in file.
May 13 Re: eight reviews forwarded to Roe.

Eldridge, Dexter C. (University of Oklahoma Press)
1954 Folder 12-4 in file.
Oct 28 Pictures from John C. Ewers of the Smithsonian for Roe's The Indian and the Horse. About fifteen received; approximately ten used.

Hurtig, M. G. (Booksellers & Publishers, Edmonton, Alberta)
1968 Folder 7 in file.
July 24 Rejection of "Not Guilty!" as already "heavily committed" for 1969.

Lottinville, Savoie (Director, University of Oklahoma Press)
1953 Folder 12-2 in file.
July 14 Readers' Reports for The Indian and the Horse. Out of three, only one favours publication, and he does so with reservation.

Lottinville, Savoie (Director, University of Oklahoma Press) Continued

1957 Folder 12-5 in file.

Apr 10 Reader for "The Indian and the Buffalo," that is, "Not Guilty!", attacks repetitive material, lack of ethnological detail, lack of comprehensive treatment.

— 1958 Folder 12-5 in file.

Dec 30 Lottinville's suggestions with regard to revisions to "The Indian and the Buffalo," that is, "Not Guilty!", attacks repetition, tilting at historical misrepresentations, asks for narrative style, more socio-economic, cultural, historico-anthropological depth. (Roe replies in "F":1:March 24, 1959).

— 1960 Folder 12-6 in file.

May 20 Lottinville discusses budgetary problems holding up publication of Roe's "The Indian and the Buffalo," that is, "Not Guilty!".

— 1961 Folder 12-6 in file.

Apr 5? Lottinville discusses cost of revising Roe's "The Indian and the Buffalo," that is, "Not Guilty!".

— 1961 Folder 12-6 in file.

Apr 24 Lottinville discusses his illness holding up publication of Roe's "The Indian and the Buffalo," that is, "Not Guilty!". Also admits that he had just read it in "close-ordered form" as late as the spring of 1960 and agrees with readers that the manuscript needs extensive revision.

— 1961 Folder 12-6 in file.

Aug 2 Lottinville discusses further the revision costs; declares needs objective treatment of fact to change it from a "tract". (Roe replies in "F":2:August 14, 1961).

— 1961 Folder 12-6 in file.

Aug 22 Lottinville regrets returning Roe's manuscript. Declares that Roe can revise it for publication. Roe has to stop crossing swords with people.

— 1963 Folder 12-6 in file.

Oct 4 Lottinville pleased to advise Roe that his <u>The Indian and the Horse</u> has been selected for the White House Library.

Stanley, Dr. George F. G. (Mount Allison University, Sackville, N. B.).

1971 Folder 9 in file.

Feb 5 Roe's "Not Guilty!" needs about 20% editing; is somewhat repetitive; yet is opportune for these times. Suggests other publishers, including University of Toronto Press and Macmillan's. Failing acceptance, Stanley offers his help in editing Roe's material.

Stanley, Dr. George F. G. (Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B.), Continued

1971 Folder 9 in file.
Sept 17 Illness prevents his helping Roe. He hopes to in the summer of 1972.

Macmillan's of Canada (Toronto publisher)
1971 Folder 7 in file.
Oct 12 This publisher rejects Roe's manuscript. This is the last time Roe offers his manuscript to a publisher.

2. Outgoing, Series "F", Roe Collection:

Hurtig, M. G. (Booksellers and Publishers, Edmonton, Alberta)
1968 Folder 3 in file.
July 13 Roe offers "The Indian and the Buffalo," that is, "Not Guilty!", to this publisher. Roe discusses his rejection by the University of Oklahoma Press and why he had to hire a lawyer for return of his manuscript. Hurtig rejects in Roe "E":7:July 24, 1968.

Lottinville, Savoie (Director, University of Oklahoma Press)
1957 Folder 1 in file.
May 30 Roe replies to readers' comments sent by Lottinville April 10, 1957. Criticism of repetition of his earlier works meaningless for Roe is writing his new manuscript for a non-academic audience.

— 1957 Folder 1 in file.
Oct Another reply to readers re repetition, lack of ethnological detail, comprehensive treatment. Main arguments are that Roe is writing for the general reader and it is not an ethnology but an attempt to amend the popular (and derogatory) notion of the Indian and the buffalo. Roe feels that the title is misleading. Further, his defense of the Indian rests upon fact. Finally, of six readers for The North American Buffalo, over a period of fourteen years, only one " . . . endorsed it for printing". Yet this first book was a success.

— 1959 Folder 1 in file.
Mar 24 Roe answers Lottinville's suggestions for revisions to "The Indian and the Buffalo," that is, "Not Guilty!" in Lottinville's letter of December 30, 1958.

— 1959 Folder 2 in file.
July 17 Roe reminds Lottinville that they asked for the title to be "The Indian and the Buffalo." Roe's summary of his manuscript is enclosed.

Lottinville, Savoie (Director, University of Oklahoma Press), Continued

1961 Folder 2 in file.

Aug 14 Roe answers criticisms in Lottinville's letter of August 2, 1961 re The Indian and the Horse revisions; a "tract" versus "objective fact" for his third manuscript.

Macmillan's of Canada (Toronto publisher)

1971 Folder 4 in file.

Oct 4 Roe offers his manuscript retitled "Not Guilty!". Later this manuscript is rejected by this publisher.

Stanley, George F. G. (Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B.)

1971 Folder 4 in file.

Sept 13 Roe advises University of Toronto Press rejected "Not Guilty!". Roe will accept Stanley's collaboration. Roe does not feel that he can work on it again. He is also sending Stanley his autobiography as Stanley requested.

Wardlaw, Frank (Texas University Press, Austin, Texas)

1968 Folder 3 in file.

Dec 14 Roe offers "Not Guilty!" manuscript. Changed title from "The Indian and the Buffalo."

Note: Rejection of Roe's manuscript and reader report by F. J. W. which is presumed to be Frank Wardlaw. Problems noted in this reader report are:

a) repetition from previous books by Roe and within essay itself;
b) too verbose;
c) too lengthy.

APPENDIX

THE ROE COLLECTION

Roe's Unpublished Manuscripts: Series "C" in Roe Collection.

Series	Description
"C"	Typescripts and manuscripts, unpublished; thirty items individually boxed and each item divided and placed in numbered folders. Items 1, 2, 8, and 17 are used in the thesis.

The descriptions of the several items below are largely taken from the Finding Aid to the Roe Collection.

Item 1: "Alberta in the Early Eighteen-Nineties."

An autobiography, unpublished, of 403 pages filed in thirty-eight folders.

Item 2: "That's How It Seemed To Be: An autobiographical essay."

This autobiography is unpublished and has 384 pages filed in thirty-seven folders.

Item 3: "Off The Record." (4 drafts). (Final draft ? 329 pages).

Views the Indian sympathetically--mainly historical North America--little Indian pre-history.

Item 4: "The Indian and His Trails." 494 pages.

A primer on the North American Indian and his environment.

Item 5: "Buffalo Trails and Human Highways." 640 pages.

Indians not need to be taught survival by buffalo--theme similar to Item 4 above, [that is, Indians made their own trails].

Item 6: "The Indian Trail in Myth and History." 385 pages.

Similar form and theme to Items 4 and 5 above.
Dissimilar--Indian architect of trails, 1932-1970 reworked.

Item 7: "The Buffalo Trail." 256 pages.

Planned as integral part of The North American Buffalo.
Began with interest in Englisn roads.
Original concept of part as early as 1932 perhaps (see Chapter XXV, page 1, re Jenness: "The Indian Trail in Myth and History.").
Great spread of possible dating of these "Trail" typescripts.
At least one portion completed after move to Victoria, 1943 (see "The Buffalo Trail," Chapter V, footnote 6).

Item 8: "Not Guilty! The true story of the Indian and the buffalo." 388 pages.

Roe considered this manuscript one of his most important works. In this manuscript, Roe comes to the defense of the Indian in the matter of the extermination of the buffalo.

Item 10: "The 11:30 From Liverpool." (Fiction). 3 drafts. 397-548 pages.

Tom Harvey of the London Mercury in the Canadian Rockies for first hand information re railroad building in Canada.

Item 14: "The Kine of Cibola." (Fiction). 263 pages.

An Englishman stranded in North America. Florida to St. Lawrence to England. Indian customs and buffalo. Begins 1569. Supposedly taken down in 1604.

Item 15: "Libya." (A poem) Circa 168 pages.

Phonecians to World War II.
The "Forward" carries a good explication by the author.

Item 16: "Queen Bess." (Historical fiction). 377 pages.

Item 17: "Bad, Bad Boy." (Fiction). 93 pages.

NOTES:

The eight manuscripts referred to in the Introduction, page 5, are considered to be Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 14, 16, 17.

Items 5, 6, 7 are similar to Item 4.

Item 8 is "Not Guilty!".

Item 9 is "The Indian and the Buffalo," probably the original of Item 8.

Items 18 to 30 are short articles or parts of drafts of manuscripts.

REFERENCE CODE:

This code is for manuscripts 1, 2, 8, and 17 used in the thesis.
Roe "C":2:33:356 where "C" is the series; 2 the item; 33 the folder; 356 the page number.

Series	Description

"E" Incoming correspondence; one box containing folders 1 to 13-2 inclusive as follows:

Folders 1 to 11 contain miscellaneous items dated May 27, 1935 to September 16, 1972;

Folders 12-1 to 12-6 contain correspondence from the University of Oklahoma Press dated November 4, 1948 to June 10, 1967;

Folders 13-1 and 13-2 contain correspondence from the University of Toronto Press dated May 13, 1952 to February 7, 1973.

This series is used mainly to establish the reasons for rejection of Roe's manuscript "Not Guilty!" by several publishers from April 10, 1957 to February 7, 1973.

REFERENCE CODE used in thesis for above: Correspondent's name and date of writing followed by Roe "E":10 where "E" is the series and 10 is the folder.

"F" Outgoing correspondence; one box containing folders 1 to 4 inclusive as follows:

Folders 1 and 2 contain mainly correspondence from Roe to University of Oklahoma Press dated January 19, 1954 to August 14, 1961;

Folders 3 and 4 contain other correspondence from Roe dated October 24, 1963 to November 17, 1972.

This series is used mainly to establish Roe's reaction to rejection of his manuscript "Not Guilty!".

REFERENCE CODE used in thesis for above: Roe "F":4: September 13, 1971 where "F" is the series and 4 is the folder followed by the date Roe wrote the correspondence.

"H" This is a hard cover green scrapbook of 83 pages in which Roe has pasted clippings of reviews, both academic and non-academic, printed in newspapers and journals on The North American Buffalo (1951 and 1970) and The Indian and the Horse (1955).

This series provided the major source of information for PART IV, "An Assessment of Roe's Work," of this thesis.

REFERENCE CODE used in thesis for above: Reviewer's name, publication, and date followed by Roe "H":34 where "H" is the series and 34 is the number of the page in the scrapbook.

VITA

Surname: ALEXANDER Given Names: GRACE VERA

Place of Birth: BRACEBRIDGE, ONT. Date of Birth: June 19, 1924

Educational Institutions Attended, with Date of Entering and Leaving:

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B. C.	1970 to 1981
	___ to ___
	___ to ___
	___ to ___

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B.A.	1977	University of Victoria, Victoria, B. C.

Honors and Awards:

University of Victoria Fellowship, 1977/78 and 1978/79

Publications:

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis

AN EXAMINATION OF THE WORKS OF FRANK GILBERT ROE AND HIS INTERPRETATION OF THE CULTURE CONTACT PERIOD ON THE GREAT PLAINS 1850-1890.

Author [redacted]
(signature)

GRACE ALEXANDER

5 May 1981
(date)