

Re-developing Underdevelopment: An Agenda for New Histories of Capitalism in the Maritimes

Fred Burrill

Volume 48, Number 2, Fall 2019

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1067772ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Department of History at the University of New Brunswick

ISSN

0044-5851 (print)

1712-7432 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Burrill, F. (2019). Re-developing Underdevelopment: An Agenda for New Histories of Capitalism in the Maritimes. *Acadiensis*, 48(2), 179–189.

Re-developing Underdevelopment: An Agenda for New Histories of Capitalism in the Maritimes

THINKING AND WRITING ABOUT MARITIME HISTORY has always been intensely personal for me.¹ Although I have made my adult life in a different province, (largely) in a different language, and do my main academic work on an unrelated topic, there remains an integral part of me conditioned by having grown up in Upper Musquodoboit, Nova Scotia. Much of this, I suppose, is similar to what any of us feels when we look back: a childhood home lost, formative relationships broken up, old friends now gone. As bell hooks has written, “We are born and have our being in a place of memory.”² But another part is a result of having experienced my early political awakenings in a household steeped in the radical regionalism of the 1980s, my central analyses shaped by that *New Maritimes*³ generation that adapted core-periphery frameworks to the regional context while denouncing the exploitation of the transient, Maritime “light infantry of capital.”⁴ This formulation, and therefore mine, was all about “our people,” “our culture,” and our “colonization” by Montreal, Ottawa, Boston, Toronto, and, later, the multinational corporations of the Alberta tar sands.⁵

1 Throughout this piece, despite bringing in a few examples from Newfoundland and Labrador, I generally refer to the Maritime Provinces rather than use the broader “Atlantic Canada” moniker. This is a reflection of the regionalist frame in which I grew up and also my motivation to not occlude the particularities of the Newfoundland context within discussions rooted in a quite different experience. I would like to thank Valérie Simard, Gary Burrill, Debbie Perrott, Brandon Webb, Matthew Penney, and Steven High for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this piece as well as the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback.

2 bell hooks, *Belonging: A Culture of Place* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 5.

3 My father, Gary Burrill, edited this radical, regional magazine from 1981-1988. Its pages are filled with the writings of many of Atlantic Canada’s finest historians.

4 Gary Burrill, *Away: Maritimers in Massachusetts, Ontario and Alberta: An Oral History of Leaving Home* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1992), 7. See also Ian McKay and Scott Milsom, eds., *Towards a New Maritimes* (Charlottetown: Ragweed, 1992) and Gary Burrill and Ian McKay, eds., *People, Resources and Power: Critical Perspectives on Underdevelopment and Primary Industries in the Atlantic Region* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1987).

5 See Burrill, *Away*, 5-8.

Regional historiography has since evolved. Feminist histories of the interactions between state and civil society, new avenues of investigation into slavery and racism, and scholarship on colonialism and Indigenous resistance have complicated our understandings of power.⁶ Successive recent waves of transnational studies and environmental history have raised important questions about the ongoing relevance of regional frameworks.⁷ And, on the economic front, historians of rural capitalism and of fisheries have contributed works that call the underdevelopment approach into question on a number of levels.⁸

My own understanding of the region has, of course, also shifted, shaped by these historiographical discussions and by the experience of grassroots political organizing in the very different urban context of Montreal. All the same, however, my sense is that the demise of the underdevelopment framework has left a gap yet to be filled in the articulation of systematic investigations into the nature and workings of capitalism in the Maritimes. In what follows I aim to

-
- 6 Janet Guilford and Suzanne Morton, *Making Up the State: Women in Atlantic Canada in the 20th Century* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 2010); Judith Fingard and Janet Guilford, eds., *Mothers of the Municipality: Women, Work, and Social Policy in Post-1945 Halifax* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); Harvey Amani Whitfield, *North to Bondage: Loyalist Slavery in the Maritimes* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016); Ken Donovan, "Slavery and Freedom in Atlantic Canada's African Diaspora: Introduction," *Acadiensis* 43, no. 1 (Winter/Spring 2014): 199-15; Daniel Paul, *We Were Not the Savages: A Mi'kmaq Perspective on the Collision Between European and Native American Civilizations* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2000); William C. Wicken, *The Colonization of Mi'kmaq Memory and History, 1794-1928: The King v. Gabriel Sylliboy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).
 - 7 See Ian McKay, "A Note on 'Region' in Writing the History of Atlantic Canada," *Acadiensis* 29, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 89-101; Jerry Bannister, "Atlantic Canada in an Atlantic World? Northeastern North America in the Long 18th Century," *Acadiensis* 43, no. 2 (Summer/Autumn 2014): 3-30; Elizabeth Mancke, *The Fault Lines of Empire: Political Differentiation in Massachusetts and Nova Scotia, CA. 1760-1830* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Claire Campbell and Robert Summerby-Murray, eds., *Land & Sea: Environmental History in Atlantic Canada* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 2013); Jacob Remes, *Disaster Citizenship: Survivors, Solidarity, and Power in the Progressive Era* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013); Stephen Hornsby and John G. Reid, eds., *New England and the Maritime Provinces: Connections and Comparisons* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005); Gregory Kennedy, *Something of a Peasant Paradise? Comparing Rural Societies in Acadie and the Loudunais, 1604-1755* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014); and Jean-François Mouhot, *Les réfugiés acadiens en France, 1758-1785: l'impossible réintégration?* (Québec, Septentrion, 2009). On evolving regionalisms in Canada, see Andrew Nurse, "Rethinking the Canadian Archipelago: Research Trajectories in Region, Identity, and Diversity in Canada," Report Prepared at the Request of Canadian Heritage, 2002, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew_Nurse/publication/228798068_Rethinking_the_Canadian_Archipelago_Research_trajectories_in_region_identity_and_diversity_in_Canada/links/54b6c05e0cf2e68eb27f0200.pdf.
 - 8 Daniel Samson, *The Spirit of Industry and Improvement: Liberal Government and Rural-Industrial Society, Nova Scotia, 1790-1862* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008); Béatrice Craig, *Backwoods Consumers and Homespun Capitalists: The Rise of Market Culture in Eastern Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); Sean Cadigan, *Hope and Deception in Conception Bay: Merchant-Settler Relations in Newfoundland, 1785-1855* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995).

critically re-engage with this scholarship, seeking to determine which, if any, of its central questions still hold promise for understanding the history of the region and attempting to imagine what a “new history of capitalism” might look like in this context.⁹

For much of the latter half of the 20th century, various versions of the narrative of Maritime economic underdevelopment exercised a virtual stranglehold over the study of the region’s position in the country. Post-Second World War Maritime-born scholars experiencing the indignity of regional stereotypes in universities in central and western Canada and the frustrations at home of an alphabet soup of successive, incomplete federal government regional development programs¹⁰ helped develop an alternative regionalist narrative – a story of political machinations in far-off Ottawa systematically disadvantaging regional interests and of a central Canadian historiography littered with falsehoods of patronage-ridden regional conservatism and inevitable decline after a “Golden Age” of wind and sail in the mid-19th century.¹¹

The narrative of underdevelopment particularly influenced the rapidly growing number of labour historians of Atlantic Canada in the 1970s and 1980s as well as the solidification of Atlantic Canada Studies as a field. These scholars constructed a Golden Age narrative of their own, focusing on the brief window of regional industrialization and labour strength between the 1890s’ “Second

9 On the emergence of a “new history of capitalism” literature, see Seth Rockman, “What Makes the History of Capitalism Newsworthy?” *Journal of the Early Republic* 34, no. 3 (Fall 2013): 439–66. As Bryan Palmer has pointed out, this analytical pathway has “registered weakly” thus far in the Canadian context; see Palmer, “Canada and the United States,” in *Handbook: The Global History of Work*, ed. Karen Hofmeester and Marcel van der Linden (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2018), 124n42. There are also grounds for criticism. Though as Jeffrey Sklansky notes in “The Elusive Sovereign: New Intellectual and Social Histories of Capitalism,” *Modern Intellectual History* 9, no. 1 (April 2012): 234, this “new history of capitalism” has a “subtle shift in the storyline from proletarianization to commercialization” – allowing for a more diverse, less teleologic understanding of capital accumulation and processes of financialization – there is also a dangerous tendency toward an obfuscation of the processes of class formation and struggle. Here I use “new history of capitalism” as a sort of shorthand for the desire to understand material relations of power in a way that does not dismiss the central insights of social history but that nonetheless widens the scope to understand hitherto understudied terrain.

10 For a good guide to these various programs, see Donald J. Savoie, *Visiting Grandchildren: Economic Development in the Maritimes* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006).

11 E.R. Forbes, *The Maritime Rights Movement, 1919–1927: A Study in Canadian Regionalism* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill–Queen’s University Press, 1979); E.R. Forbes, *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20th Century Maritimes* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1989); E.R. Forbes and D.A. Muise, eds. *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993); David Frank, “Introduction,” in T.W. Acheson, David Frank, and James D. Frost, *Industrialization and Underdevelopment in the Maritimes, 1880–1930* (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1985), x–ix.

Industrial Revolution” and the deindustrialization of the 1920s. The contrast between the Progressive dynamism of the beginning of the 20th century and the disastrous consequences of regional takeover by Central Canadian capital were particularly stark in this version of the region’s past, as historians painted a picture of modernity betrayed: “In the 1910s,” wrote Ian McKay, “Maritimers had seen their region as one of advanced and advancing capitalism; its central problems were those of industrial societies the world over. But in the 1920s, the region would be seen anew, as industries collapsed, as workers and their radical leaders were obliged to emigrate in large numbers, and as a conservative regionalism came to replace what had been a progressive ‘common sense’.”¹² More than a simple historiographical trend, the underdevelopment narrative gave expression to a generational rejection of previously dominant cultural tropes as anti-poverty activists like my parents sought to throw off “the illusion of boringness” in favour of a “narrative of regional experience as the basis of which the Maritimes could become politically engageable”¹³ – a kind of local anti-imperialism reflecting the broader left-nationalist trends sweeping the country.¹⁴

The dominant focus on an incredibly small window of urban industrialization left scholars of the region trapped in a defense of regional modernity that tended to flatten out difference. Regional history textbooks oriented around categories of “pre-Industrial” and “Industrial Revolution,” labour strikes, and the contradictions of the post-war compromise created a sort of illusion of unifying forces shaping a common history and regional destiny. They precluded serious studies of segregation and apartheid in the region and, with some exceptions, of any prolonged consideration of socially reproductive labour.¹⁵ The result was a kind of Braudelian confusion between

12 Ian McKay, “The 1910s: The Stillborn Triumph of Progressive Reform,” in Forbes and Muise, *Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*, 228; see also David Frank, “The 1920: Class and Region, Resistance and Accommodation,” in Forbes and Muise, *Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*, 233–271; Frank, “The Cape Breton Coal Industry and the Rise and Fall of the British Empire Steel Corporation,” *Acadiensis* 7, no. 1 (Autumn 1977): 3–34; and Greg Kealey, Ian McKay, and Nolan Reilly, “Canada’s ‘Eastern Question’: A Reader’s Guide to Regional Underdevelopment,” *Canadian Dimension* 13, no. 2 (July 1978): 37–40. McKay’s seminal *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994) remains the most important effort in tracking the hegemonic advance of this new regional identity.

13 Gary Burrill, personal communication with author, 17 December 2018.

14 See Burrill and McKay, *People, Resources and Power*.

15 For a good example of these categories at work, see David Frank and Gregory S. Kealey, eds., *Labour and Working Class History in Atlantic Canada: A Reader* (St. John’s: Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1995).

the *événementiel* and the *conjoncturel* – understanding small historical ripples in the local experience of the broader capitalist system as determinative rather than indicative of broader patterns at work.¹⁶

Still, this “Maritime Marxist school . . . was the first extended and collective scholarly effort in Canada to link capitalist development to labour and other social movements in one region,”¹⁷ and its replacement with the multiplicity of “subject-positions, epistemologies and methodologies” outlined by Ian McKay at the turn of the 21st century has complicated attempts to understand capitalism in the region.¹⁸ I want then here to return to two central focuses of the underdevelopment school – historical patterns of dispossession and extraction and the contradictory manifestations of these struggles played out in the state – and to think through how we might go about re-examining these important subjects with fresh eyes.

As Seth Rockman has argued, one of the particularities of the “new history of capitalism” literature in the American context is its denaturalization of market relations, and, in turn, of previously dominant periodizations and spatial concepts and of earlier focuses of “transitions” from one mode of production to another.¹⁹ In our context such a project would require a reconsideration of the Atlantic region’s experience in the “long eighteenth century,” critiquing and moving through the remaining tropes of merchant capital’s “Golden Age” and paying attention instead to the ways in which the foundations of Atlantic Canadian society and therefore capitalist production were forged in the crucible of what Jerry Bannister has termed the “Forty Years War” (1744-1784) of European imperial competition over Indigenous territory in northeastern North America – a period of consolidation within the world capitalist system in which settler states like those of British North America were gradually shifting into a semi-peripheral position within the world economy.²⁰

16 See Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th Century, Volume III: The Perspective of the World* (London: Collins, 1984), 71-88.

17 James Sacouman and Henry Veltmeyer, “Introduction,” in *From the net to the Net: Atlantic Canada and the Global Economy*, ed. James Sacouman and Henry Veltmeyer (Aurora, ON: Garamond Press, 2005), 10.

18 McKay, “Note on ‘Region,’” 90.

19 Rockman, “What Makes the History of Capitalism Newsworthy?” 442-4.

20 Bannister, “Atlantic Canada in an Atlantic World?”; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System III: The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730s-1840s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011). See also Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years’ War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001).

Starting anew from this point would also entail a radical re-engagement with the impact of imperial racial hierarchies on the emerging political economy of the region. Historians Harvey Amani Whitfield and Ken Donovan and archaeologists Catherine Cottreau-Robbins and Heather MacLeod-Leslie, for instance, have worked hard in recent years to pierce the “Free North” myth of Canadian multiculturalism, establishing the importance of chattel slavery not only to French and pre-Revolution Planter settler schemes but also its integral place in Loyalist society after 1783. Whitfield, in particular, draws a picture of a world in which multi-occupational enslaved people lived in close quarters with their masters and were a non-negligible part of building the Loyalist economy. In a time of great flux and judicial uncertainty, the line between free Black Loyalists and the enslaved was porous and people of African descent were often subject to re-enslavement and sale. Whitfield also recovers significant enslaved energy in bringing an end to the practice of slavery, citing their running away and filing of court cases as the stuff around which White abolitionists and sympathetic judges built their opposition. In continuity with his earlier work, he demonstrates that the end of slavery saw the rise of virulent systemic racism, as cheap, free Black labour eventually became more economically feasible than chattel slavery.²¹

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, a new history of capitalism might profitably move beyond the tragedy-of-Confederation narrative by also looking to evolving patterns of domestic and reproductive labour as well as increasingly intense colonial dispossession.²² As Maritime feminist historiography has established, while the “separate spheres” ideology and the emergence of maternal feminism might seem to be indicative of a certain period of progressive capitalist modernity, these conceptual categories obscure as much as they reveal about the actual workings of a sharpening, if messy, class system and the central role of domestic labour within the Atlantic economy.²³ On the

21 Whitfield, *North to Bondage*; Donovan, “Slavery and Freedom in Atlantic Canada’s African Diaspora.”

22 See Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation* (New York: Autonomedia, 2014).

23 For the “modernity” take, see E.R. Forbes, “Battles in Another War: Edith Archibald and the Halifax Feminist Movement” and Forbes, “The Ideas of Carol Bacchi and the Suffragists of Halifax,” in *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20th Century Maritimes* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 67–99. For feminist historiography more generally, see Janet Guilford and Suzanne Morton, *Separate Spheres: Women’s Worlds in the 19th-Century Maritimes* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1994); Suzanne Morton, “Separate Spheres in a Separate World: African Nova Scotian Women in Late-19th-Century Halifax County,” *Acadiensis* 22, no. 2 (Spring 1993): 61–83; Suzanne Morton, *Ideal Surroundings: Domestic Life in a Working-Class Suburb in the 1920s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995); and Ted Rutland, “Where

dispossession front, historians like Daniel Paul, William Wicken, and Peter Twohig have amply demonstrated that the industrialization of places like Sydney, Cape Breton, was predicated on the removal and control of a Mi'kmaw population in a particularly fragile economic and social state.²⁴

Crucially, on the question of deindustrialization, a new history of capitalism in the Maritimes would not need to entirely abandon frameworks that seek to understand core-periphery relations and to problematize resource extraction. But the axis needs to be expanded in order not only to understand East-West "relations of extraction" but also to look at productive links along global North-South supply chains and to re-centre environmental factors and engage in a more complex manner with the internal logic of primary resource economies.²⁵ Doing so would in turn allow historians of Maritime capitalism and labour to move beyond the field's tendency to focus on the urban, and therefore to get at the multitude of complex and contradictory connections between rural and urban modes of production driving the regional economy. Focusing on these factors might also profitably enable historians of the Maritimes to move beyond their to-date rather superficial analysis of the region's experience of the process of neoliberal globalization. While the underdevelopment framework generates helpful insights about the unequal nature of economic production within the Canadian federation, it allows for little complexity in understanding the Maritimes' contradictory, hegemonic-yet-subordinate role within the broader system of global capitalism, leading to unfortunate comparisons of Eastern provinces to the oppressed nations of the Global South.²⁶

the little life unfolds': Women's Citizenship, Moral Regulation and the Production of Scale in Early Twentieth-Century Halifax," *Journal of Historical Geography* 42 (October 2013): 167-79.

- 24 See Daniel Paul, *We Were Not the Savages: A Mi'kmaq Perspective on the Collision Between European and Native American Civilizations* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2000); Wicken, *Colonization of Mi'kmaw Memory and History*; and Peter Twohig, "Colonial Care: Medical Attendance Among the Mi'kmaq in Nova Scotia," *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 13, no. 2 (1996): 333-53.
- 25 I have borrowed this term from Shirley Tillotson, "Relations of Extraction: Taxation and Women's Citizenship in the Maritimes, 1914-1955," *Acadiensis* 39, no. 1 (Winter/Spring 2010): 27-57. For one excellent and innovative recent approach, see Lachlan MacKinnon's "Deindustrialization on the Periphery: 1945-2001" (PhD diss. in history, Concordia University, 2016). MacKinnon's work argues for an analysis of Sydney Steel's shutdown that foregrounds the particular nature of Canadian capitalism, notably through a refurbished Innisian "staples trap" argument and a closely researched critique of corporate and then state ownership's failure to invest in the necessary diversification and expansion of productive facilities. MacKinnon's dissertation is a highly nuanced analysis of the longue durée of deindustrialization on the "resource periphery" – framed through regional political economy but rooted in workers' embodied experience and material and cultural negotiations of a shifting economic landscape.
- 26 For good examples, see Michael Clow, "Just More of the Same? Confederation and Globalization?" in Sacouman and Veltmeyer, *From the net to the Net: Atlantic Canada and the*

Another hallmark of the “new history of capitalism” literature is its *Marxish* focus on the “relationship between market, state, and society,” and its concomitant analysis of the links between governance, extraction, and financialization of capital.²⁷ There are many disparate threads floating around in the historiography of Maritime state formation and development: the state’s colonial roots,²⁸ its central role in the articulation of the Canadian liberal order and systems of industrial legality,²⁹ its gendered character and its location as a site of struggle and a social formation under active construction by professionalizing women,³⁰ its place within a broader Canadian hegemonic struggle over the plight of the regions and the nature of federalism,³¹ its evolving responsibility as steward and arbiter of disputes over land use and policy,³² and its often-failed role as a high modernist motor of industrial economic development.³³

Ian McKay, for his part, has posited that “A new history of politics – focused on political theory, ideological development and state-formation – is reshaping our understanding of the Canadian experience; and the Atlantic Region will likely play a central role in this research programme.”³⁴ A broad history of state formation and economic development in the Maritimes would necessarily need to ground itself in Elizabeth Mancke-type analysis of the colonial roots of governance in the region, analyzing the ways in which its integration into a powerful 19th-century Atlantic World imperial governance

Global Economy, 25–50 and Joan McFarland, “Call Centres in New Brunswick: Maquiladoras of the North?” *Canadian Woman Studies* 21, no. 4 (Spring/Summer 2002): 65–70.

27 Rockman, “What Makes the History of Capitalism Newsworthy?” 447, 454–6.

28 Mancke, *Fault Lines of Empire*.

19 See Michael Earle, ed., *Workers and the State in Twentieth Century Nova Scotia* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1989).

30 Guilford and Morton, *Making Up the State*. Another edited volume that speaks to women and the state is Fingard and Guilford, *Mothers of the Municipality*, while an article along the same lines is Tillotson, “Relations of Extraction.”

31 James P. Bickerton, *Nova Scotia, Ottawa, and the Politics of Regional Development* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

32 L. Anders Sandberg and Peter Clancy, *Against the Grain: Foresters and Politics in Nova Scotia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2000); Matthew Paul Brown, “The Political Economy and Public Administration of Rural Lands in Canada – New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Perspectives” (PhD diss. in political science, University of Toronto, 1982).

33 Dimitry Anastakis, “Building a ‘New Nova Scotia’: State Intervention, the Auto Industry, and the Case of Volvo in Halifax, 1963–1998,” *Acadiensis* 34, no. 1 (Autumn 2004): 3–30; Anastakis, “The Quest of the Volk(swagen): The Bricklin Car, Industrial Modernity, and New Brunswick,” *Acadiensis* 43, no. 1 (Winter/Spring 2014): 89–108; Tina Loo, “Africville and the Dynamics of State Power in Postwar Canada,” *Acadiensis* 39, no. 2 (Summer/Autumn 2010): 23–47; J.L. Kenny and A.G. Secord, “Engineering Modernity: Hydroelectric Development in New Brunswick, 1945–1970” *Acadiensis* 39, no. 1 (Summer/Autumn 2010): 3–26.

34 McKay, “Note on ‘Region,’” 101.

structure influenced the development of its political classes.³⁵ There is much to learn, here, I think, about Maritime political traditions of external dependency and authoritarian government practices. This would also necessarily involve an examination of a political culture oriented around access to and control of Crown resources, and the concomitant differing patterns of state formation in Maritime provinces according to the available supply of Crown land.³⁶ If we can for a moment quiet the ghost of E.R. Forbes, this may help us in turn to understand the importance of networks of political patronage in the democratic structures of the region. And lest we fall into the trap of thinking these patterns of competition over resource control are safely ensconced in the “colonial period,” we need to balance McKay’s observations about the region’s place in the architecture of the liberal order against the continued prevalence of often profoundly illiberal 18th-century patterns rooted in war, settlement, and struggles over resources.³⁷ As William Wicken points out, “In Nova Scotia [as compared to the Canadas], European settlers dispossessed families without the Crown attempting to protect the Mi’kmaq or to extinguish their title.”³⁸ The impacts of this approach continue to be felt.

In the later 19th and early 20th centuries, any attempt to understand anew state formation and development would need to extend this analysis while paying particular attention to the state as a locus of struggle of competing class and gender interests, and consider seriously the ongoing impact of colonial governance patterns in maintaining and enforcing racial segregation. This would involve not only deeper studies of industrial legality and the central

35 One helpful work in this vein is Carman Miller’s *A Knight in Politics: A Biography of Sir Frederick Borden* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2010).

36 See, for example, on the important differences in state policy on the forestry industry in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, L. Anders Sandberg, ed., *Trouble in the Woods: Forest Policy and Social Conflict in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1992). See also Bill Parenteau, “Looking Backward, Looking Ahead: History and Future of the New Brunswick Forestry Industries,” *Acadiensis* 42, no. 2 (Summer/Autumn 2013): 92–13. Historians of Atlantic Canadian rural worlds have also amply demonstrated that examining these differing patterns of competition and control undermines the teleological narrative of urban modernity, that capital and wage labour existed alongside of and always in conflict with “traditional” economic and collective processes; and that the region’s history is deeply rooted in a dynamic and complex rurality. See Daniel Samson, ed., *Contested Countryside: Rural Workers and Modern Society in Atlantic Canada, 1800–1950* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1994).

37 For the opposing view to McKay’s, see Bannister, “Atlantic Canada in an Atlantic World?” 29. Bill Parenteau’s work has contributed greatly to our sense of the ongoing exclusion and resistance of Indigenous communities in resource extraction around the region. See his “Care, Control and Supervision: Native People in the Canadian Atlantic Salmon Fishery, 1867–1900,” *Canadian Historical Review* 79, no. 1 (March 1998): 1–35 and James Kenney and Bill Parenteau, “Each year the Indians flexed their muscles a little more: The Maliseet Defence of Aboriginal Fishing Rights on the St. John River, 1945–1990,” *Canadian Historical Review* 95, no. 2 (June 2014): 187–216.

38 Wicken, *Colonization of Mi’kmaq Memory and History*, 102.

role of women in the messy process of “making up the state,” but also a re-engagement with the project begun by historians like William Wicken and Peter Twohig that emphasizes settler-Indigenous relations as a site for understanding the Maritime state’s development of techniques of governance and control.³⁹ It would also need to reckon with labour historiography’s establishment of a distinct Maritime tradition of social democracy and its impact on the overall politics of the region.⁴⁰

Finally, such an effort would need to engage with the broader history of capitalism in the region in order to begin to better understand the post-1945 emphasis on modernity and development in the political generation of Smallwood, Hatfield, and Stanfield. What was the particular balance of class forces – regionally, nationally, and transnationally – that made these modernizers so fervently pursue such obviously flawed industrial development schemes? This would require not only a re-engagement with the regional underdevelopment literature but also an attempt to generate an understanding of the *mentalité* of political and business elites in small, subnational polities trying to reckon with the fickle headwinds of global and national economic trends. I suspect that a better understanding of the Atlantic Canadian state and its actors in the 1960s and 1970s would help in the project of generating new insights into the regional experience of the rise of neoliberal globalization.

In short, the central insights of underdevelopment scholarship – that the fate of the Maritimes has always been tied up in a world-scale struggle over resources, and that this struggle has manifested itself in the political structures governing the region – still hold enormous promise for understanding our history. Multiple advances in understanding the nature of settler colonialism and racial apartheid in the region, feminist insights into the importance of the reproductive sphere in shifting class relations, and the impetus within the “new history of capitalism” literature toward destabilizing traditional shibboleths around periodization and resource production can help historians of the

39 Wicken, *Colonization of Mi’kmaq Memory and History*, 1–94; Twohig, “Colonial Care.”

40 Much of the literature on this tradition has of course been focused on industrial Cape Breton. In a marvelous turn of phrase, David Frank describes the legacy of coal miners’ struggles in Nova Scotia and its continued cultural relevance in the region: “They have shown a stubborn difficulty in accepting such simple economic propositions as the market regulation of wages and the survival of the fittest as appropriate social ethics. Instead, they have attached great significance to such old-fashioned ideas as justice, fairness, and cooperation in human affairs and the priority of labour as a source of value. From this perspective, their history is not so much a reservoir of traditionalism and conservatism as an accumulated supply of stored cultural energy”. See David Frank, *J.B. McLachlan: A Biography* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1999), 534.

Maritimes not only to better understand the nature and evolution of capitalism, but also to mount a case that regional history is not dead and perhaps even more important than ever.

FRED BURRILL

FRED BURRILL est étudiant au doctorat en histoire à l'Université Concordia et un des principaux membres affiliés au Centre d'histoire orale et de récits numérisés. Ses recherches primaires portent sur les mémoires collectives de la lutte et de l'expropriation liées à la désindustrialisation du quartier Saint-Henri, à Montréal.

FRED BURRILL is a doctoral candidate in history at Concordia University, and a core affiliate of the Centre for Oral History and Digital Storytelling. His primary research deals with collective memories of struggle and dispossession in the deindustrialized neighbourhood of Saint-Henri, Montréal.