

AMERICAN LAND TREATIES AND THE RED RIVER MÉTIS

Grant W. Grams, PhD.

Athabasca University

grantg@athabascau.ca

Historically the American treaty negotiation process has been overlooked as a factor influencing American and Red River Métis relations. The article uses settler, journalist, traveller, and government sources in the 1850s and 1860s to examine land treaties of the American government with Indigenous Nations and reveal their influence on the Métis and the Red River Settlement. This research maintains that the Métis and associated Indigenous Nations in the United States of America (USA) adversely influenced the Red River Métis' interactions with British North America (BNA). With the conclusion of American land settlements with Indigenous Nations, the Métis in the USA found that their land claims were largely ignored. The Métis in Pembina hoped for official USA recognition through land grants, which would acknowledge their contributions to the American northwest. This deliberate exemption influenced the Red River Métis to be cynical when dealings with the United Province of Canada (UPC), a British colony that unified Lower Canada (Ontario) and Upper Canada (Quebec) from 1841-1867. The UPC advocated for expansion into the interior of North America, acquiring the Red River Settlement was an important first step (Canada, 1845; Hogue, 2015; Hind, 1860).

In 1811 land agreements were concluded with various Indigenous Nations to establish the Selkirk Colony, the brainchild of Thomas Douglas (Lord Selkirk, 1771-1820). Two Indigenous Nations of the Algonquian language group populated the Selkirk Colony – the Cree and Saulteaux, with some Sioux and Stoney Indigenous Nations (Gainer, 1978). The original Selkirk Colony included parts of present day Manitoba, North Dakota, Saskatchewan, and Wisconsin. An important Métis (mainly offspring of French fur traders and Indigenous women) meeting place within the Selkirk Colony was at the junction of the Assiniboine and Red Rivers, this evolved into the Red River Settlement in what is today the western Canadian province of Manitoba, founded in 1870. The convergence of these two rivers had been a meeting place for Indigenous peoples, it was a logical gathering point for all local inhabitants regardless of background or affiliation. A secondary Métis settlement and trading station was located at Pembina, it developed further south in present day North Dakota, a mere three kilometres south of the modern Canadian-American border. Both the Pembina and the Red River Settlements were part of the original Selkirk Colony (Morris, 1991). Buffalo hunting expeditions often originated from Pembina, both Pembina and the Red River Settlement were transportation and economic hubs for the Métis (Macdougall & St-Onge, 2017). The Métis economy, political structure, and affiliations forged an identity with the fur trade being the most demanding and profitable enterprise (Innes, 2021). Their influence regionally and politically was based on farming, hunting, and dominance of the fur trade. Within the greater Selkirk colony, the Métis were important cultural mediators between various

Indigenous Nations and whites while playing an essential role in the fur trade (*Globe and Mail*, Sept. 3, 1864; Feb.17, 1866; Feb 16, 1869; March 31, 1869; May 3, 1869).

The Red River Settlement was administered by the Hudson Bay Company (HBC, a British trading company chartered in 1670 to trade furs with the Indigenous Nations of North America while controlling the entire North-West (Rupert's Land). The HBC was granted a trade monopoly over all territory draining into the Hudson Bay; it was an afterthought to extend administrative influence to settled lands. This bureaucratic process expanded to lands of residence such as the Red River Settlement at a glacial pace, often arbitrarily and unevenly (Pannekoek, 1978). The Red River Settlement was made up of four main communities – the British (included Selkirk settlers and UPC Canadians), French Métis (French and Indigenous peoples), Country born (Scottish and Indigenous peoples) and various Indigenous Nations. These communities contained people of Indigenous heritage that had given up their traditional lifestyle to varying degrees. Some Indigenous peoples in the Red River Settlement had become partially assimilated into the white man's world, while others persisted in retaining their Indigenous identities, culture, and kinship structures despite pressures of colonization and European styled settlement. Each of these ethnic settlements was distinct in origin and character. The population was diverse and divided by race, religion, and social class; Pembina had a similar ethnic background (Rich 1956; Doutre, 1880).

At Pembina the fate of American Chippewas were connected economically and socially with the Métis. They had a longer trading relationship than other Indigenous Nations resulting in more integration through marriages. One of the differences between the Pembina and Red River Métis was that in the Red River Settlement French men predominantly married Cree women, in Pembina it was the Chippewa. The offspring of white and Indigenous Nations and the lines of descent were not always direct revealing French or Anglophone lineages. There was also friction between the Chippewa and the Sioux, this bitterness was transferred to the Métis of French and Chippewa ancestry. The Sioux were the mutual enemy of both groups, making an alliance between the Chippewa and Métis desirable and logical, even though they competed for local resources such as the fur trade (Camp 1987; West 1967; Dusenberry, 1958).

All matters relating to the fur trade became complicated when the Convention of 1818 settled the border between BNA and the USA. James Carneige, 9th Earl of Southesk and a British explorer in North America noted “the new-fashioned custom of running boundary lines on parallels of latitude or longitude is very unsatisfactory; it seems far better to put rivers, lakes, and mountains, to their natural use of dividing territories, so that a real instead of a fictitious boundary is obtained” (Southesk, 1874). The boundary between BNA and the USA was formed along the 49th parallel, conceived out of convenience by British and American administrators and imposed on the Métis and the Indigenous Nations. Initially this border was in name only as the Métis, Indigenous Nations and fur traders freely travelled, traded, and hunted as neither nation controlled its side of the border, real control still lay with the local Indigenous Nations and the Métis. Historically there had been a natural migration movement between Pembina and the Red

River after the border had been established, but this 1818 agreement meant local sovereignty weakened (Swan, 2003; Henry, 1863), yet the Métis cherished the years without a border and lived as if they held sovereignty over the entire Red River Valley. After 1818 they still played an important role, but their influence was slowly being eroded over the following decades (Manitoba, 1984). Part of this decline was linked to American land settlements concluded with Indigenous Nations, because the Métis within the Red River Valley were largely exempted from land rights. The American administrations preferred to cede land to white settlers and transform Pembina from a fur trading outpost to the crux of a meaningful civilization (Unrau, 1990; Winks, 1998).

The Métis correctly perceived that the HBC had a distinctive (Anglican Church) bias and worked to thwart French-Catholic efforts north of the border, although a Catholic presence had been evident in the Selkirk Colony by the 1820s. This encouraged Métis in the Red River Settlement to migrate to Pembina. An American military presence in Pembina was established by August 1823, yet this was merely symbolic (Camp, 1987). There was a migration of Red River Métis from British administered territory to Pembina, because they were unhappy with the English and Protestant dominated HBC administration. The Métis migration caused concern for both the British and American authorities, but also for the local Indigenous peoples as they competed for the local game and resources (Camp, 1987).

In 1832 Congress founded the Commission of Indian Affairs to supersede previous administrative bodies dealing with Indigenous Nations in the USA. T. Ewing, an American Commissioner of Indian Affairs, commented on activities in Pembina and noted that an increased American presence would be beneficial. This would open the region to agricultural settlement and give the American government greater influence “upon the Red river of the North” and control BNA interactions with local Indigenous Nations. He noted that “the influence is now exercised over them [Indigenous peoples] by the agents of the Hudson Bay Company would be proportionally decreased” (Ewing, 1850). Within British territory, the HBC intended to open the interior to commerce, trade and settlement with the fur trade being of great importance. Unfortunately, some of their tactics were self-serving and short sighted (Henry, 1863; Henry, 1870). One example will serve as an illustration, in 1835 the HBC imposed a tariff of 7.5% on exports from, and imports to, the Red River – anger spread throughout the Red River Settlement, especially from the Métis. Protest meetings were convened in front of Fort Garry’s gates with laws were openly and routinely violated. For the Métis, the Greater Red River valley was their natural home and frontier, legislation introduced by British and American authorities were viewed as artificial, arbitrary, unneeded, and discriminatory (Payne, 2006). It was not until 1843 that real American influence was exerted in Pembina because of the fur trade. The full-time presence of the American military encouraged American settlers to move to Pembina, but this migration was viewed unfavourably by the Métis. Although there was increased commerce the presence of more traders and settlers curtailed their movements and autonomy (Camp, 1987).

In 1845 the UPC colonial administration also placed pressure on Indigenous Nations and viewed their presence on certain lands as problematic. UPC released a statement publicly expressing that “inducing the Indians, by offers of compensation, to remove quietly to more distant hunting grounds, or to confine themselves within more limited reserves, instead of leaving them and the white settlers exposed to the horrors of a protracted struggle for ownership.” The UPC administrators boldly stated that economic activities presently available on the land Natives had previously used “has been created solely by the presence and industry of the white settlers . . . Of the cultivation of the soil, they [Indigenous peoples] knew nothing” (Canada, 1845). Previously the Métis had been warned by the American government that they must observe the declared border between BNA and the USA. By 1845 the Red River Métis were given an ultimatum that they would only be allowed one more season to cross the international border and hunt in American territory. If they wished to hunt in American territory, they would have to reside south of the border permanently and become American citizens (Manitoba, 1984). The Métis cherished freedom, independence and mobility. Hunting across the border was common Métis practice, for example John West, an Anglican priest observed that Red River inhabitants “went to Pembina and the plains, for buffaloe {sic} meat in the Fall, are returning upon rafts, or in canoes formed by hollowing the large trunks of trees” (West, 1967). He believed that “the inhabitants of this distant and extreme point of the [Selkirk] colony, who were principally hunters, were living too near the supposed line of demarcation, between the British territories and the USA; and that it would be far better for them to remove down to the Forks [Red River Settlement]; where, if the industry of the colonists was more concentrated, it would tend more to their protection and prosperity” (West, 1967).

An American presence became more firmly entrenched in Pembina when Alexander Ramsey (1815-1903) became Minnesota’s Territorial Governor in June 1849, serving until May 1853; Minnesota became a state in May 1858. Ramsey served as the second Governor of Minnesota (January 1860 to July 1863) after statehood was achieved. As territorial Governor Ramsey wanted to open Minnesota to white settlement and forge treaties with the local Indigenous Nations. These agreements were to be made with the regional Indigenous Nations, but the Métis did not fit into Ramsey’s plans (Schultz, 1992). Although many American settlers and government officials believed reservations for Indigenous Nations would provide for them, these provisions did not quell their concerns (Bryant and Murch, 1864). This resulted in Indigenous Nations and Métis leaders in Minnesota being distrustful of state administrations (Hind, 1860). There were many uncertainties for “the Indians residing within the limits of Wisconsin” (Jackson, 1998).

Part of the reason for the Métis migration south was the efforts of Father Georges Antonine Belcourt (1803-1884), a Roman Catholic priest and missionary living in Pembina. Belcourt was born in Quebec and wanted to increase the French-Catholic presence in Pembina. In 1849 he estimated one thousand Métis resided in Pembina, with a total of five thousand living south of the BNA American border. This is in contradiction with an American army officer, who estimated that a total of two thousand Métis lived south of the BNA-American border. Belcourt reasoned that since the Red River and Pembina were the natural territory of the

Métis, Pembina would eventually entice some Métis to migrate there permanently (Gluek 1965; Ritterbusch, 1996). Eden Colville (1819-1893), Governor of Rupert's Land (1849-1852) wrote "several Métis were induced by Mr. [G.A.] Belcourt to abandon their farms in this settlement [Red River], and take up their abode within the American territory in the neighbourhood of Pembina, being informed by him [Belcourt] that they would come in for a share of the spoils paid by the American government to the Indians; but, they have been informed, to their grievous disappointment, that so far from coming in for a share of the spoils, they will be expected, as any other citizen, to pay for the lands they occupy" (Rich, 1956). Belcourt persuaded some Métis to relocate to Pembina as fulltime residents and settle on the land as farmers and end their migratory lifestyle. Additional Métis would solidify the French-Catholic outpost against future Protestant migration, both Belcourt and the Métis disliked the HBC administration. He asked for a permanent American military outpost to be placed in Pembina, and Indigenous Nations treaties be concluded to encourage them to end their migratory lifestyle (Schultz, 1992; Reardon, 1951; Huel, 1996).

In 1851 Ramsey personally travelled to parts of Minnesota including the southern portion of the Red River Valley to encourage white migration. His travels culminated in three treaties being signed with local Indigenous Nations (Babcock, 1962). Although some Métis functioned as translators and interpreters Ramsey refused to let them participate in land acquisitions with the Chippewa for the cession of the southern part of the Red River in the Pembina Treaty of September 20, 1851; Ramsey made a clear distinction between Métis and Indigenous Nations. Ramsey viewed the Métis presence in Pembina as unintentional, temporary, and haphazard as they were merely a migratory people; American authorities would not recognize them as a national group within specific land claims (Gluek, 1965; Deloria and DeMallie, 1999; Voegelin and Hickerson, 1977; Camp, 1987). Some Indigenous leaders were swayed by their Métis relatives to sign the Pembina Treaty because the Métis were expecting compensation from the American government, (Anderson, 2014; Folwell, 1969; Marble, 1860). With the signing of the treaty the Chippewas of Pembina and Red Lake believed their present situation and future concerns were addressed. Within this agreement \$25,800 was assigned to 141 Métis from a total of \$230,000. Ultimately the Pembina Treaty of 1851 was not passed by the American senate. The Métis falsely believed that the American government would sympathetically examine their land claims and make amicable steps. For the Métis north of the 49th parallel observing other Métis being excluded from land rights transcended borders and was troubling for the Red River Métis (Gluek, 1965; Deloria and DeMallie, 1999; Voegelin and Hickerson, 1997; Camp, 1987).

Alexander Ross, author, and fur trader referred to American Métis as "chiefly half-breeds from Red River; many without house, home, or allegiance to any government – wanderers at large, citizens of the wilderness." The terms of the Pembina Treaty of 1851 were a great disappointment to the Métis because they had struggled to support Pembina and would be believed they would be "recognized by the American government as the rightful owners of the disputed lands of Pembina" (Ross, 1856). Ross knew Métis claims were inconsequential to the American government;

if we may judge from the mode of concluding the present compact, the Americans are not very particular in forming their treaties with the Indians. Pembina was disputed ground. The Assiniboines, Crees of the plains, and the Saulteaux of the woods, all laid claim to it as their land; but the title of the last has always been the most disputed: yet, being found a spot, they were, without hesitation or inquiry, recognised as the lords paramount of the soil, and with them the treaty was concluded; nor were the principal Chippewa chiefs themselves present – they were distrustful and lukewarm – not willing to sell their lands, and therefore declined to attend. Regardless of this want of formality, however, the business went on, and the treaty was finally ratified by those of secondary rank who did attend (Ross, 1856).

The disappointment noted by Ross was also observed by others. John Wesley Bond, a local observer wrote that “several hundred half-breeds were also present and expected to participate in the making of the [Pembina] treaty and were exceedingly disappointed when informed that their claims would not be respected, and that the government only recognized the Indians as the rightful owners of the soil and intended to deal with them accordingly. The half-breeds had counted on the reception of a portion at least of the annuities as almost certain and had hoped for a consummation of a treaty” (Bond, 1853). Historian Ernie Wheeler-Voegelin repeated Ross’ assessment that the 1851 treaty was a grave disappointment for American Métis because as they incorrectly believed the American government would grant them land (Wheeler-Voegelin, 1997).

On July 23, 1851, the Treaty of Traverse de Sioux was signed between the Minnesota Sioux and the Ramsey government. The Treaty of Mendota was signed on August 5, 1851, between the American government and the Sioux in Minnesota. These treaties took land from the local Sioux in exchange for food, provisions or an agreed upon reservation (Meyer, 1967). Both treaties were rejected by the American Senate, it was not until the following decade that these lands were formally ceded to the American government, Métis land claims came to naught (Babcock, 1862). In September 1851, the Governor of Rupert’s Land Eden Colville noted that Minnesota Governor Ramsey “reports that he succeeded in making a treaty with the Saulteux [Sioux] or Chippewa Indians, by which they surrender their rights to the American Government to the land for 30 miles on each side of Red River from Pembina to the Sioux County, in consideration of receiving \$30,000 of the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, and an annuity of \$10,000 for, as I understand, twenty years.” (Rich, 1956). Although these three treaties were rejected there were consequences that went beyond the BNA-American border because it convinced the Red River Métis to distrust federal governments.

During previous treaty negotiations efforts were made by Indigenous Nations to help the Métis, but the American government was inflexible. American humanitarian and Indigenous peoples activist Helen Hunt Jackson commented;

Sioux chiefs had requested that a certain tract be set apart and bestowed upon the half-breeds of their nation. This was provided for in the ninth article of the treaty [Treaty of Prairie du Chien], but the [American] Government refused to give to the half breeds any title to this land, except “in the same manner as other Indians titles are held.” It was agreed, however, that the President might “assign to any of said half-breeds, to be held by him or them in fee-simple, any portion of said tract not exceeding a section of six hundred and forty acres to an individual.” . . .

The half-breeds had made almost unintermitting efforts to have these assignments made. But the Government has constantly refused to do so. The Indian Bureau [Bureau of Indian Affairs, founded in 1824] now assigns two reasons why this treaty stipulation was never fulfilled: 1st, that ‘the half-breeds, or most of them would be speculated upon by designing persons, and cheated out of their reservations;’ 2d, that, ‘on account of the quality of the lands, some would necessarily have much better reservations than others, which would engender dissatisfaction and heart-burning among themselves as well as against the United States. The Bureau felicitates itself that “the only title they now have to this land, therefore, is that by which other Indians hold their lands, viz., the occupant or usufruct right, and this they enjoy by the permission of the United States” (Jackson, 1890).

Although historian Alvin Gluek contended some money made its way into Métis hands, historian Martha Foster emphasized that the Métis did not actually take part in the negotiation process with Ramsey making a sharp division between Indigenous peoples and Métis. In negotiations in the Chippewa Treaty of 1854 (Treaty of La Point) a “half-blood” provision was listed. Some Pembina Métis families applied for and received land, but the American Department of the Interior re-interpreted their definition of entitlement adding a residency commitment. The law stated the Métis had to live continuously amongst the Indigenous Nations, this virtually eliminated Métis as a distinct group from receiving land. Often the Métis insisted on identifying themselves as a separate group and not as Indigenous peoples; if they had identified themselves as Indigenous peoples, they would have acquired land (Foster, 2006; Foster, 2003). American authorities laid out strict criteria to exclude non-residents from acquiring land, virtually eliminating the Métis (*The Weekly Minnesotian*, March 14, 1857; *New York Times* April 9, 1858).

The *New York Daily Times* noted “the influx of a white population consequent upon the establishment of a [Minnesota] Territorial Government- the increase of competition in the Indian trade, concurring with the gradual decrease of its products, and causes that lay beyond these, and that have been gradually but surely promoting the decline of the Western Fur-trade in general”. The increased pressure on local resources meant all non-whites lost out in the competition. This observation became a pertinent fear that transcended the Pembina settlement and permeated the Red River (*New York Daily Times*, Jan 5, 1857). Father Belcourt was invested in the economic and spiritual development of Pembina. Father Belcourt went to Washington in November 1854 to obtain land for the Métis through land treaties (Reardon, 1951), Washington

did not agree (Gluek, 1965; Warner, 1960). Although Belcourt aspired to have the Métis included in any land distribution agreements few provisions were provided for them. Belcourt was relocated in 1859, subsequently his work, vision and influence declined in Pembina, but his popularity remained after his departure. Although Belcourt had influenced some Métis to reside in Pembina, with his departure some returned to the Red River (Gluek, 1965; Deloria and DeMallie, 1999; Voegelin, and Hickerson, 1977; Reardon, 1951).

American Army Colonel R.B. Marcy witnessed “Indians hunters”, the great plains, frontier life, Indigenous peoples, and local wildlife disappearing by an “advance of civilization over the [North American] continent” (Marcy, 1866). Part of this erosion of Indigenous and Métis influence occurred in “the northern part of Minnesota, on both sides of the line dividing the United States from the British Possession, there is to be found a large population, consisting of mixed bloods [Métis].” Marcy observed Métis being excluded from land rights in Minnesota (Marcy, 1866). American journalist J.H. Beadle noticed the expansion of ‘white civilization’ “at Pembina, near the British line. Along the eastern border including the valleys of the Big Sioux and Red River” and advocated for more “white inhabitants” (Beadle, 1873). In 1856 Christopher C. Andrews, former soldier and settler in Minnesota noted “the territory north of Crow Wing (settlement near the junction of the Mississippi and Crow Wing rivers) is now open for settlers to a great distance, the Indian title having been extinguished. Two land districts have been established, which will be an inducement for fresh emigration.” This migration thwarted Métis independence and autonomy. Andrews was later elected to the Minnesota State Senate and encouraged white migration to Minnesota; he viewed the Red River Settlement as a natural extension of Minnesota (Andrews, 1857).

American journalist Manton Marble noted Sauk, Minnesota ca. 120 miles northwest of St. Paul, a location enroute for those traveling between St. Paul and Pembina (ca. 285 miles southeast of Sauk) as being inundated by white settlers. Any Métis making this trip to Pembina would have also noticed the region between Pembina and the Red River was for whites with Métis and Indigenous peoples concerns being dismissed (Marble, 1860). Francis A. Walker, former Commissioner of the American Bureau of Indian Affairs noted that the American government had “pursued a uniform course of extinguishing the Indian title” to their ancestral lands, which included the Métis (Walker, 1873). The American government wanted to exert sovereignty and raised questions of citizenship and legal ownership of Métis lands with some Americans looking down upon the “Mongrel French” (Trask, 1989; Genser, 1998). American authorities viewed all Métis in the Red River Valley as belligerent and well-organized; capable of carrying out disruptive economic activities. As the American presence in Pembina increased, so did the American attempts to control what the Métis viewed as their traditional places of hunting, trapping, and trading. The presence of more American settlers placed greater pressure on all Indigenous peoples as they moved westwards into historical Métis territories (Ingersoll, 2005).

For UPC expansionists and British imperialists the Red River was key to UPC expansion west, an essential hub of Métis life. British author Synge Millington Henry stated that “the Red River Settlement occupies the Central position of the North American Continent” (Henry, 1863). He speculated that, “thus the opening of the Red River Settlement leads, as a necessary

consequence, to unbroken intercourse with British Columbia, and the circuitous means of reaching it, that have been recommended at present, would not long be necessary after its creation into a colony under the [British] Crown. He also noted that after the Red River was annexed to the UPC “the advantages that Minnesota now possesses would be transferred to the new colony” (Henry, 1863) with the views and opinions of the local Red River inhabitants being ignored (*The Globe and Mail*, June 25, 1868; *New York Times*, May 3, 1864). All Indigenous peoples and Métis were forced to submit to white-European culture as their crusade moved forward to control all “Indian Territory” including the Red River. If UPC authorities would not take control of the Red River, it would be the fate of the American government to take suzerainty over this region (*The New York Daily Times*, Aug 12, 1857; *The Globe*, Feb. 25, 1857). There were certain pro-American elements in the Red River settlement that saw the community as a natural extension of Minnesota and called for American annexation (*The Nor-Wester*, May 28, 1862). Within the Red River itself, there were rival claimants. Throughout the 1850s the Métis felt uneasy and became increasingly threatened by external events (Shore, 1991). Confusion led to disorder, uneasiness, and rumour; all were problematic for residents within the Red River community (*Globe and Mail*, July 15, 1857; *Globe and Mail*, Aug 21, 1857; Shore, 1991; *The Globe*, Aug.8, 1857).

Francis A. Walker wrote “as a rule, the full- blooded Indian stands a much better chance to become a man than the half-breed. The presence of these men [half-breed] causes more trouble in the management of the Indians than all other causes combined” (Walker, 1874). It could be a hard decision morally and administratively to decide how one was categorised, but the American government held this power and conducted all land transactions related to Indigenous Nations resulting in some members migrating to BNA (Walker, 1874; Walker 1873). Already in the early 1820s there were Métis “refugees from Pembina” in the Red River (Macoun, 1882). Thereafter there were other Indigenous peoples that fled from the USA to live in exile in BNA (Laviolette, 1991). This movement of displaced Indigenous peoples continued periodically thereafter, for example in 1863 a group of Sioux arrived in the Red River. The arrival of four hundred American cavalry in Pembina caused “great stress and alarm” encouraging 445 Sioux to take refuge in the Red River Settlement (Head, 1864; *Cleveland Morning Leader*, Jan.20, 1864).

The existence of this impoverished Indigenous peoples within the Red River placed pressure on the available natural resources with locals noting “not a single particle was given for the purpose of assisting them in their hopeless struggle against the Americans: and even if it had been, the deed was that of American citizens themselves . . . [the Sioux have] no confidence in the Americans” (*Globe and Mail*, Aug 12, 1865). *The Nor’ Wester*, a local Red River newspaper reported “we have not heard of any Halfbreeds in the British Possessions ‘backing the Sioux’” (*The Nor-West* April 8, 1865). The HBC reported that in Minnesota the locals “wanted to expel the Sioux” while they enthusiastically “defend their homesteads, by whom the Indians [Sioux] were speedily and effectually driven from the country to a distant region, where they are no longer dangerous” (The Hudson Bay Company, 1866). Other Indigenous Nations were also disappointed in American actions. The Winnebagoes are an Indigenous Nations group native to Minnesota and neighbouring states. The Winnebagoes signed five treaties between 1816 and 1855 with the American government with the last treaty guaranteeing them a reservation in Minnesota, which

they held until 1862 with most transitioning to an agricultural lifestyle (Jackson, 1998; American Government, January 26, 1863).

The Dakota in Minnesota has been pressured to cede land to the United States government in 1837, 1851 and 1858 with some being displaced, they were pressured to give up their nomadic traditions in favour of farming. In August 1862 an armed conflict ensued in southern Minnesota between eastern Dakota bands and the American government (Clemmons, 2005; Carley, 1976; Bryant and Murch, 1864). After the Dakota uprising and accompanying violence the citizens of Minnesota were "so determined that all Indians should be removed beyond the limits of the State, that Congress passed an Act in 1863 providing for their [Sioux] removal" (Francis, 1874). American historian Roy Meyer wrote that "news of the [Sioux] uprising did not reach Fort Garry [HBC administrative core within the Red River Settlement] until nearly three weeks after it had begun. From that time until the first parties of Indians [Sioux from Wisconsin] arrived late in December, the population was in a state of nervous expectation" (Meyer, 1967).

The Nor'Wester reported "the removal of Winnebago and Sioux tribes from Minnesota, will be commenced immediately [May 12, 1863] by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Sioux will be removed from Fort Snelling [Minnesota], where they are now kept under military surveyance, to a tract of land in the vicinity of Fort Randall on the Upper Missouri-several hundred miles distant from any settlement of whites. The Winnebagoes who have, generally, been peaceful in their intercourse with the whites, will be removed to an adjoining tract [of land]. To induce them to abandon their roving ways, and to engage in agricultural pursuits, the [American] Government has decided to furnish them, in their new homes, with agricultural implements, cattle and other necessities (*The Nor' Wester*, May 12, 1863). Arrangements were "made to remove the Winnebago Indians to their new reservation on the Missouri River" (*The Nor' Wester*, May 23, 1863). However, their removal was poorly planned resulting in Winnebago and Sioux suffering (Manypenny, 1880; *The Nor' Wester*, Nov. 15, 1864).

Historian Gontran Laviolette noted that the Métis knew that the Sioux "had suffered greatly while in the United States, a fate they [Métis] now feared for themselves" (Laviolette, 1991). The fact that some Sioux had been driven out of their ancestral homeland by the American military forcing them to take refuge in the Red River Settlement seeded fear amongst the Métis (*The Nor' Wester*, Oct. 1, 1864). Métis living in Minnesota had a vested interest in land title, employment, and the fur trade (Bryant and Murch, 1864; *The Globe*, Oct.17, 1868). The Métis in Pembina had made significant administrative and cultural contributions to American life, while attempting to preserve Métis and Indigenous peoples' cultures (White Weasel, 1998). There was a general distrust of the American authorities as hundreds of Sioux trickled over the international border, and now resided within, or near the Red River Settlement. The Sioux refugees increased Red River Métis cynicism that fair play and honesty might be impossible from UPC administrators. The fact that the Métis were essentially excluded from land treaties made with the American government caused the Red River Métis to anticipate a similar fate from UPC authorities (Meyer 1968; Gluck, 1955; Chartier, 1978; Lass, 1977).

American expansionists Charles Bryant and Abel B. Murch noted that Sioux refugees in the Red River Settlement caused deep concern and fear locally, this was coupled with a lack of formal Métis land ownership papers, which increased apprehension (Bryant and Murch, 1864). According to Meyer, years later “a number, however, still distrusted the American authorities and gradually came to spend more and more of their time north of the border. They supported themselves by hunting, fishing, trapping, and working for farmers in the harvest fields. By December 1869, there were five hundred wintering at Portage [la Prairie, ca. 47 miles west of Red River], including a group recently arrived from the Mouse (now Souris) River near the international border. More came in 1870. They took no part in the [M]étis insurrection led by Louis Riel in 1869” (Meyer, 1967).

In the Treaty of Old Crossing (1863) and the Treaty of Old Crossing (1864) the Pembina and Red Lake peoples of the Chippewa Indigenous Nations relinquished their rights in the Red River Valley south of the border, today part of modern Minnesota and North Dakota. With these agreements Indigenous Nations were moved to a reservation to make room for industrious white persons. Throughout the 1860’s, there were examples of the government delivering annuities to Indigenous Nations erratically, either too little or late, which contradicted American contractual obligations and stressed Indigenous communities (Anderson, 2014). In 1860 American Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Alfred B. Greenwood submitted a report to the Secretary of the Interior where he confirmed his administration carried “out the object of Congress in an appropriation of money and goods to extinguish the title of the Red Lake and Red River Chippewas in Minnesota” but failed to conclude articles with other Indigenous Nations groups (*New York Times* Dec. 6, 1860). By 1863 the American Department of the Interior attempted to deal with Pembina Métis claims through a treaty negotiated with the Red Lake Chippewas and Pembina Chippewas. Ramsey refused to allow the Métis to be provided for, although they often acted as negotiators, translators, and lawyers within negotiations. Ramsey coldly partitioned between the Indigenous peoples and the Métis; through this tactic he obtained better terms for the American government (Dusenberry, 1958; Foster, 2006; Folwell, 1969; Murray, 1984; Camp, 1987). At the same time the menace of the UPC and their imperialistic goals in the Red River Settlement could not be ignored (Isbister, 1860; *Globe and Mail*, July 27, 1864; *Globe and Mail*, Mar 29, 1860; *The Globe and Mail*, Aug.12, 1864; *The Globe and Mail*, March 17, 1860).

The fate of the American Métis permeated the memories of the Red River Métis (*Globe and Mail*, June 15, 1866; *The New York Daily Times*, Aug 12, 1857). Many Métis believed they should have title to the land, with the same legal claim as Indigenous peoples. The Red River Métis now actively discussed looking after their own interests, which focused on their ownership of land. The gossip and fears of the community only increased as two groups of men, the HBC, and UPC officials, were deciding their fate, giving little thought to the local inhabitants (*The Nor’Wester*, Dec. 14, 1867). Just as the American Métis had their rights and freedoms disregarded and violated, the Red River Métis feared the same fate through UPC intrusion. When dealing with the Métis the American government divided them according to their specific Indigenous band, thus destroying any dream of a separate Métis reservation or homeland. In 1863 American negotiation tactics forced Métis to identify with their Chippewa, Cree, or other lineages thus, dividing the

Métis and weakening their negotiating position. The Métis did not take part in negotiations but were included as land recipients (160 acres), if they were related to one of the Indigenous Nations, had American citizenship, and had “adopted the habits and customs of civilized life”. The 1863 Treaty of Old Crossing was disquieting for the Métis, because the increased migration of whites to Pembina threatened their traditional way of life. In 1864 the American senate modified their condition of land acceptance and asked for proof of residence and citizenship which in many cases proved exceedingly difficult, if not impossible (Dusenberry, 1956; Foster, 2006; Folwell, 1969; Murray, 1984; Camp, 1987).

The eligibility provisions for “half-breed” land scrip were scrutinized under the 1854, 1863, and 1864 Chippewa pacts. Land was to be distributed to the Pembina Chippewa, and possibly the Métis in the Old Crossing land treaties, but the process intentionally separated Indigenous peoples from their Métis kinship. The American authorities wanted to designate some land for Indigenous Nations, extinguish Métis claims, while keeping large parcels of land for white Americans, European immigrants and future development. The American Office of Indian Affairs acknowledged that the curriculum for scrip dispersal had a “practicable method of disposing of the half-breed claims.” Fraud was also connected with the issuance of Chippewa half-breed scrip because speculators, bankers and brokers, assigned, transferred, or alienated those eligible for land (Shaw, 2004; American Government, *42nd Congress, 2nd Session, March 15, 1872; New York Times*, Sept. 23, 1866). There were turbulent times for the Métis outside of Minnesota as American hegemony increased. Some Métis in Michigan left because of increased American influence and migrated to the Red River Settlement, thus bringing their concerns and fears with them (Genser, 1998). Similar actions occurred in Michigan, e.g., near Keweenaw Bay (on Lake Superior) the local American authorities viewed the offspring of marriages between Métis and Indigenous peoples as being “Indian” and extinguished Métis land claims (Cleland, 2011; St Onge, 2019). Other groups of Métis were annoyed at the American administration and complained on January 19, 1865, to military personnel at Fort Rice (frontier military fort in North Dakota) that all Indigenous peoples, including the Métis were purposely facing discrimination from American administrators (Diamon, 1865).

American Congress “authorized a Peace Commission [founded on July 20, 1867], which was to determine the reasons for Indian hostilities and at its discretion to make treaty arrangements and to select reservations for the tribes” (Prucha, 2021) and placate unhappy Indigenous peoples (Keim, 1885). The American policy of facilitating peace treaties and relocating Indigenous Nations were practical applications of the Peace Commission (Jackson and Galli, 1977). The United States Bureau of Indian Affairs belittled Métis claims because “some of the so called ‘mixed bloods’ claim rights in several tribes at one time, when probably all the Indian blood of the several nationalities combined, upon which rights are claimed would not exceed one-sixteenth: such persons are usually more boisterous in their demands than full blood [Indigenous peoples].” Officials called for more decisive criteria about full status Indigenous peoples because “a white person with a one thirty-second part Indian blood, or even less, is entitled to recognition and rights within the tribe equal to those of a full-blooded Indian” (The United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1877). The Indian Peace Commission traveled to investigate Indigenous Nations

concerns and issued a report calling for their peaceful acculturation on assigned reservations with treaties. These arrangements promised that Indigenous Nations would benefit from general education, vocational instruction, schools for the children and Christian missions under the assistance and supervision of benevolent agents, but what truly unfolded was a program that destroyed tribal cultures and dislocated peoples (Prucha, 2021). Although intended to instill peace and positive relations between whites and Indigenous Nations the reality was that “in many ways the Indians will be wronged and cheated” (Priest, 1972). Both the UPC (*The Globe*, April 22, 1869); and American newspapers’ reactions to the Peace Commission was the naive belief that Indigenous peoples were benefitting (*New York Times*, April 13, 1868).

The Métis believed in self-determination as a separate Indigenous people yet were denied the right to a reservation. Although they were noted administratively, their European and Indigenous blood disqualified them from acquiring land (Gaudry, 2014; Hogue, 2012). The Métis that lived similar to Indigenous peoples were classified as such, those that mirrored whites were classified as white with no middle ground. This overt classification was interpreted according to the whims of the American government, whatever was detrimental to Métis interests (Ingersoll, 2005; Schenck, 2010). American plans intentionally called for a diminishing number of full status Indigenous peoples with ‘mixed-bloods’ being an undesirable designation impeding the path toward civilization. Historian Michel Hogue noted that American Métis’ first-hand experiences with treaty negotiations “no doubt conditioned” how the Red River Métis viewed negotiations with the BNA. American experiences made it imperative that the Red River Métis advance their claims. This was based upon the dwindling buffalo herds and the end of an open border making assurances imperative if the Métis were to continue as a people. The Métis maintained contacts with their friends and acquaintances over the border resulting in some individuals having a spouse from a neighbouring territory. The Métis developed complex kinship structures that transgressed borders, connected communities and stretched over thousands of kilometres which was problematic for authorities. This reflected the Métis transitory nature but also how the BNA Métis and the American Métis were intertwined despite the frontier border (Hogue, 2012; Andersen, 2014; Pidgeon & Podruchny, 2019; Macdougall & St-Onge, 2017; Murphy, 2012).

Historian Roger L. Nichols agreed with Hogue’s assessment that “the strivings of these mixed-blood [Métis] people for political recognition and cultural identity provided a theme usually absent in the United States. . . . Most of the [American] agreements included no particular mention of mixed-bloods [Métis]. Apparently, they [American Government] were free to choose whether to remain members of a particular village, band, or tribe as they and their relatives saw fit” (Nichols, 1989). Nichol continued that “mixed-blood people who usually were given land or money and turned loose in the general society, or who remained on the reservations as recognized members of their respective tribes. In general, American Indian policy followed one of two courses. Either it ignored mixed-blood people completely, or it continued to treat them as Indians unless they or the particular tribe in question requested another approach” (Nicholas, 1989). On both sides of the border the Métis became absorbed and assimilated into the local white community (St. Onge, 2004). The Red River Métis observed that land over the border that had been part of

their summer hunting grounds was being taken from local Indigenous Nations and Métis and distributed to white settlers (Sharrock and Sharrock, 1974; *The Nor' Wester*, April 17, 1865).

Alexander Ross contended that the Métis south of the 49th parallel had been substantially held out of Indigenous treaties. The American government wanted to distribute land for whites, causing the Red River Métis to question how UPC authorities would administer their personal land claims (Ross, 1956). The correct Red River analysis that the Minnesota government neglected Indigenous Nations and intentionally deprived the American Métis of land, worried the Red River Métis. It was a time of many rumours, suspicion, and apprehension because the Métis feared UPC goals (Macoun, 1882). George Bryce (1844-1931), Presbyterian minister and observer living within the Red River Settlement noted that there was distrust of the American government process with all Indigenous Nations. This suspicion adversely affected Métis relations with UPC authorities. Bryce noted that the fear of Americans and their interests was transferred to the UPC and their intentions including their dreams of expansion into the Red River Settlement (Bryce, 1882; *Globe and Mail*, May 7, 1870).

In 1869 the HBC opened negotiations with UPC to acquire the Red River Settlement in a deliberate attempt to expand Canadian territory militarily, strategically, and as a potential source of raw materials. The expansion into the Red River was vital to UPC's security and future prosperity. When three British Colonies of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the United Province of Canada (Ontario and Quebec) united on July 1, 1867, to form the Dominion of Canada this was only part of what the Fathers of Confederation anticipated for the new country. Expansion was transcribed into Sections 90 and 91 of the BNA Act. Section 146 advocated the admittance of Rupert's Land and the North-western Territory into a political union with Canada. The Red River was the gateway to the North-West; with its annexation the lands of the western territory were open to future expansion, settlement, wealth, and adventure (Rich, 1956; Doutre, 1880; Great Britain, 1865). For the Red River Métis the potential of being part of Canada meant accepting the terms and conditions of the Canadian government. Pro-UPC elements inside the Red River argued in favour of annexation (Pannekoek, 1978; *The Nor' Wester* August 17, 1869), e.g., local businessman John Christian Schultz advocated UPC annexation (Grams, 2010). HBC historian E.E. Rich explained that the evolving nature of the fur trade coupled with fear of land ownership seeded distrust between the Métis and UPC authorities (Rich, 1959). Alexander Begg, writer, and businessman wrote that the Red River Settlement was troubled and confused by negotiations, not knowing what their future might be. The Métis in the Red River feared they would be annexed by Canada and lose everything they had worked for, echoing the fate of American Métis (Begg, 1956).

The artificially created border between BNA and the USA made sense to both government administrations but had no logic for those living close to it. Both the Métis and Indigenous peoples did not recognize its artificial invention and enforcement, but the American's government intentional omission of the Métis south of this contrived demarcation caused Red River Métis to become apprehensive of American land policies, which breed fear and suspicion. Discriminatory American procedures refused to grant land to the Métis while actively encouraging white colonists to the same plots of land. Due to a lack of information about the

negotiation process, actions taken by Canadian representatives, and events south of the border made the Métis suspicious. The Métis in the Red River became apprehensive of the Canadian imperialists and resisted attempts of Canadianization. Although the Métis and land treaties in the USA has often been overlooked, it also played a role in Métis discontentment and events leading up to the 1869 Red River Resistance. Métis interests were not fully appreciated and were often ignored. The Red River was re-made in Ontario's image and did not reflect Métis land rights or long-term vision (*The Nor' Wester*, Sept. 7, 1869; Owram, 1980; Murray, 1984; Swan 1991; Swan, 2003; Hogue, 2015).

Bibliography

Primary Literature

American Government: *Removal of Dakota and Winnebago Indians* (To accompany bills H.R. Nos. 613 and 614). 37th Congress 3d Session, House of Representatives Report no. 13, January 26, 1863.

American Government: *Chippewa Half-Breeds of Lake Superior. 42nd Congress, 2nd Session, March 15, 1872. House Executive Document 193, Serial set 1513. CIA Walker to Department of the Interior*, March 8, 1872, Serial Set 1513.

Andrews, C. C.: *Minnesota and Dacotah*, Farnham, Washington, 1857.

Beadle, J.H.: *Five Years in the Territories*, National Publishing Corporation, Chicago, 1873.

Begg, Alexander: *Red River Journal and Other Papers Relative to the Red River Resistance of 1869-1870*, The Champlain Society, Toronto, 1956.

Bond, J. Wesley: *Minnesota and its Resources*, Redfield, New York 1853.

Bryant, Charles and Murch, Abel: *A History of the Great Massacre by the Sioux Indians in Minnesota*, Rickey and Carroll Publishers, Cincinnati, 1864.

Bryce, George: *Manitoba: Its Infancy, Growth and Present Conditions*, Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, London, 1882.

Canada, Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Affairs of the Indians in Canada: *Report on the Affairs of Indians in Canada. Section I History of Relations between the Government and the Indians*, Appendix EEE, Ottawa, 1845.

Deloria, Vine and DeMallie, Raymond J. (eds.): *Documents of American Indian Diplomacy Vol. II*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman 1999.

Diamon, C.A.R., Colonel: *The War of the Rebellion*. U.S. First Volunteer Infantry, Commanding Post to Headquarters Post Commandant, Fort Rice, Dakota Territory, Jan.24, 1865, US War Department, Series 1, Vol.48, Part 1.

Doutre, Joseph: *Constitution of Canada*, John Lovell and Son, Montreal, 1880.

Ewing, T.: *Pembina Settlement. Letter from the Secretary of War Transmitting Report of Major Wood, relative to his expedition to Pembina Settlement: and the condition of affairs on the North-Western frontier of the Territory of Minnesota*. Secretary of the Interior to Department of the Interior, Washington, April 4, 1849, in 31st Congress 1st Session, House of Representatives, Executive Document 51 Washington, 1850.

Francis A.: *The Indian Question*, Osgood and Company, Boston, 1874.

Great Britain: *A Bill [Nr.240] Intituled for An Act Enabling Her Majesty to Accept a Surrender Upon Terms of the Lands, Privileges, and Rights of "The Governor and Company of Adventurers of England Trading into Hudson's Bay" and for Admitting the Same into the Dominion of Canada*, The House of Commons, London 1865.

Head, Edmund Walker: *Sioux Indians: Copies or Extracts of All the Correspondence between the Commanding Officers of the United States Troops in Minnesota and the Resident Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company at Red River, Respecting a Tribe of Sioux Indians Who Were Refugees within the British Territory*, A.G. Dallas to Thomas Fraser, Hudson Bay House, London, Dec. 11, 1863; Parliamentary papers, Great Britain. Parliament, House of Commons, 1864.

Hind, Henry, Y.: *Narrative of the Canadian Red River Exploring Expedition of 1857 and the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition of 1858*, Greenwood Press, New York, Vol. I, 1860.

Hudson Bay Company: "*A million: shall we take it?: addressed to the shareholders of the [Hudson Bay] company by one of themselves*". A.H. Baily, 1866.

Isbister, A.K.: On the Hudson Bay Territories. *Journal of the Society of Arts*; London. Vol. 9, (Nov. 23, 1860).

Jackson, Helen Hunt: *A Century of Dishonor*, Roberts Brothers, 1890.

Jackson, Helen Hunt: *A Century of Dishonor A Sketch of the United States Government's Dealings with some of the Indian Tribes*, Corner House Publishers, Williamstown, 1973.

Jackson, Helen Hunt, and University of Virginia. *The Wards of the United States Government*. Generic NL, Freebook Publisher, 1998.

Keim, R.: *Sheridan's Troopers on the Borders: a Winter Campaign on the Plains*, Routledge and Sons, New York, 1885.

Macoun, J.: *Manitoba and the Great North West*, The World Publishing Company, Guelph, 1882.

Manypenny, George Washington: *Our Indian wards*, R. Clark, 1880.

Marble, Manton: To the Red River and Beyond, in *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* No. CXXIII Vol. XXI, 1860.

Marcy, R.B.: *Thirty Years of Army Life on the Border*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1866.

Millington Henry, Syngé: *The colony of Rupert's Land, where is it and by what title held?: a dialogue on England: her interests in North America and in free intercourse, against certain contrary pretentions on the part of the Hudson Bay Company*, E. Stanford, London, 1863.

Millington Henry, Syngé: *On practical communication with the Red River District, central British America, or, "Alleged impossibility solved by example": an illustration applied towards the unity of the empire of Great Britain*, 1870.

Murphy, L.E.. Women, Networks, and Colonization, in Nineteenth Century Wisconsin, in Nicole St. Onge, Carolyn Podruchny & Brenda Macdougall (eds.) *Contours of a People: Metis Family, Mobility, and History*, 6, 230. 2012

Prucha, F. P. (ed.) *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, Nebraska 2021.

Rich, E.E.: *London Correspondence Inward from Eden Colville 1849-1852*, The Hudson Bay Record Society, London, 1956.

Rich, E.E.: *Hudson's Bay Company 1670-1870, Vol.2 1763-1870*, The Hudson Bay Record Society, London, 1959.

Ritterbusch, Lauren W.: *Fur Trade Posts at Pembina: An Archeological Perspective of North Dakota's Earliest Fur Trade Center*, in Janet Daley Lysengen and Ann M. Rathke (eds.) *The Centennial Anthology of North Dakota History*, State Historical Society of North Dakota, Bismarck 1996.

Ross, Alexander: *The Red River Settlement*, Smith, Elder and Co., London, 1856.

Southesk, James Carnegie: *Saskatchewan and the Rocky Mountains*, Edmonston and Douglas, Edinburgh, 1874.

Syngé, Millington Henry: *The lakes and canals of Canada*, Royal United Service, 1866.

Walker, F.A.: *The Indian Question*, in *The North American Review*, Vol.116 (2), 1873.

Walker, F.A.: *The Indian Question*, James R. Osgood and Co. Boston, 1874.

West, John: *The substance of a journal during a residence at the Red River Colony, British North America: and frequent excursions among the North-west American Indians, in the years 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823*, L.B. Seeley Printer, London, 1824.

West, John A.M.: *The Substance of A Journal During a Residence at the Red River Colony., British North America in the Years 1820-1923*, Alcuin Society, Vancouver, 1967.

United States Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior*, Washington, 1877.

Newspapers

Cleveland Morning Leader, 1864.

Globe and Mail, 1857-1870, 1887.

New York Times, 1857-1869.

The Nor-Wester, 1859-1869.

The Weekly Minnesotian, 1857

Secondary Literature

Anderson, Gary: *Ethnic Cleaning and the Indian, the Crime that should haunt America*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 2014.

Babcock, W. M.: *With Ramsey to Pembina A Treaty-Making Trip in 1851*, in *Minnesota History Magazine*, March 1962,

<http://collections.mnhs.org/MNHHistoryMagazine/articles/38/v38i01p001-010.pdf>.

Carley, K. *The Dakota war of 1862: Minnesota's other civil war*. St. Paul, MN, 1976.

Cleland, Charles E.L.: *Faith in Paper, the Ethnography and Litigation of Upper Great Lakes Treaties*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2011.

Clemmons, L. M. (2005). " We Will Talk of Nothing Else": Dakota Interpretations of the Treaty of 1837. *Great Plains Quarterly*, 25(3), 173-185.

Dusenberry, Verne: Waiting for a Day that Never Comes, in *Montana the Magazine of Western History*, Vol. 8. No.2 Spring 1958.

Folwell, William.: *A History of Minnesota*, The Minnesota Historical Society St. Paul 1969, Vol. IV.

Foster, Martha H.: The Spring Creek (Lewistown) Métis and Métis Identity in Montana, in L.J. Barkwell, L. Dorion, D.R. Prefontaine (eds) *Métis Legacy*, Pemmican Publications, Winnipeg, 2003.

Foster, Martha H.: *We Know Who We Are Métis Identity in a Montana Community*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 2006.

Genser, Wallace: Habitant, Halfbreed and Homeless Children: Transformations in Métis and Yankee Yorker Relations in Early Michigan, in *Michigan Historical Review* 24:1, Spring 1998.

Gluek, Alvin C.: *The Struggle for the British Northwest, A Study in Canadian-American Relations*, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1953.

Gluek, Alvin: The Sioux Uprising: A Problem in International Relations, in *Minnesota History*, Vol. 34, No. 8 (Winter, 1955).

Gluek, Alvin: *Manitoba and the Hudson Bay Company*, University of Winnipeg Press, 1973.

Gluek, Alvin: *Minnesota and the Manifest Destiny of the Canadian North West*, University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Grams, Grant W.: The Red River's Anglophone Community: The Conflicting Views of John Christian Shultz and Alexander Begg, in *Manitoba History*, No.64, Fall 2010.

Hogue, Michel: The Montana Métis and the Shifting Boundaries of Belonging, in *Contours of a People*, in Nicole St. Onge, et al., (eds) University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 2012.

Hogue, Michel: *Métis and the Medicine Line*, University of Regina Press, 2015.

Huel, Raymond: *Proclaiming the Gospel to the Indians and the Métis*, University of Alberta Press, Edmonton, 1996.

Ingersoll, Thomas: *To Intermix With our White Brothers*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 2005.

Innes, Robert Alexander: Challenging a Racist Fiction: A Closer Look at Métis-First Nations Relations, in Jennifer Adese and Chris Andersen (eds.) *A People and a Nation: New Directions in Contemporary Métis Studies*, 2021.

Jackson, Curtis and Galli, Marcia J.: *A History of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and its activities among Indians*, San Francisco, 1977.

Lass, William E.: *Minnesota, A Bicentennial History*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1977.

Laviolette, Gontran: *The Dakota Sioux in Canada*, DLM Publications, Winnipeg, 1991.

- Nichols, Roger L.: *The United States, Canada and the Indians: 1865–1876*, *The Social Science Journal*, 26:3, 1989.
- Macdougall, B., & St-Onge, N. Métis in the borderlands of the northern Plains in the nineteenth century. *Sources and methods in Indigenous studies*, 257, 2016.
- Manitoba: *Georges-Antoine Belcourt*, Historic Resources Branch, Winnipeg, 1984.
- Meyer, Roy W.: *History of the Santee Sioux*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1967.
- Meyer, Roy W.: The Canadian Sioux: Refugees from Minnesota, *Minnesota History*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Spring, 1968).
- Morton W.L.: *The Kingdom of Canada*, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, 1972.
- Morris, Alexander: *The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories*, Belford, Clarke, and Co. Toronto, 1991.
- Murray, Stanley: The Turtle Mountain Chippewa, 1882- 1905, in Larry Remele (ed.) *North Dakota History*, State Historical Society of North Dakota, 1984.
- Owram, Doug: *Promise of Eden, The Canadian Expansionist Movement and the Idea of the West, 1856-1900*, University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- Pannekoek, F.: “Some Comments on the Social Origins of the Riel Protest of 1869“, in Potyondi, B. (ed.) *Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, Hignell Printing Limited, Winnipeg, 1978.
- Pigeon, É., & Podruchny, C. The Mobile Village: Metis Women, Bison Brigades, and Social Order on the Nineteenth-Century Plains. *Violence, Order, and Unrest: A History of British North America, 1749–1876*, 2019.
- Priest, Loring, B.: The Congressional Decision to Use Force, in Richard N. Ellis, *The Western American Indian*, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1972.
- Reardon, James M.: George Anthony Belcourt Pioneer Missionary of the Northwest, in *The Canadian Catholic Historical Association*, Vol.18, 1951.
- Schenck, Theresa: Border Identities: Métis, Half breed and Mixed Blood in *Gathering Places: Aboriginal and Fur Trade Histories*, Carol Podruchny and Laura Peers (eds) UBC Press Vancouver, 2010.
- St-Onge, N. Le poste de La Pointe sur l'île Madeline, tremplin vers le monde franco-anichiné de la traite des fourrures, *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, 73 (1-2), 13-43, 2019.
- Schultz, Duane: *Over the Earth I Come*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1992.
- Sharrock, Floyd and Sharrock, Susan: A history of Cree Indian Territorial Expansion from the Hudson Bay Area to the Interior Saskatchewan and Missouri Plains, in David A. Horr (ed.) *American Indian Ethnohistory Chippewa Indians VI*, Garland Publishing, New York, 1974.
- Schultz, Duane: *Over the Earth I Come*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1992.
- St. Onge, Nicole, Saint -Laurent, *Manitoba Evolving Métis Identities, 1850-1914*. Canadian Plains Research Centre, Regina. 2004.
- Trask, Kerry A.: Settlement in a Half-Savage Land: Life and Loss in the Métis Community of La Baye, in *Michigan Historical Review* 15, Spring 1989.
- Unrau, William E.: *Mixed Blood and Tribal Dissolution*, University Press of Kansas, 1990.

Voegelin, E.W. and Hickerson Harold: *Chippewa Indians I*, Garland Publishing, New York, 1977.

Warner, Donald F.: Drang Nach Norden: The United States and the Riel Rebellion, in in Wendell H. Stephenson (ed.) *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. XXXIX 1952-1953.

Warner, Donald F.: *The Idea of Continental Union*, University of Kentucky Press, 1960.

White, Bruce M.: The Power of Whiteness, or the life and times of Joseph Rolette Jr., in *Minnesota History Magazine*, Winter 1998-1999,

<http://collections.mnhs.org/MNHHistoryMagazine/articles/56/v56i04p178-197.pdf>, accessed May 26 2021.

White Weasel, Charlie: *Old Wild Rice*, Belcourt North Dakota, 1988.

Winks, Robin W.: *The Civil War Years*, McGill-Queens University Press, 1998.

Unpublished MA or Ph.D. Thesis

Camp, Greg Scott: *The Turtle Mountain Plains-Chippewas and Métis, 1797-1935*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of New Mexico, 1987.

Chartier, Clem: *Half-Breed Land and Money Scrip: Was this a Constitutionally Valid Method of Extinguishing the Claim to Indian Title?*, Law Paper, University of Alberta Library, Saskatoon, 1978.

Gainer, Brenda J.: *The Catholic Missionaries of Social Change Among the Métis and Indians of Red River: 1818-1845*, M.A. Thesis, Department of History, Carleton University, 1978.

Gaudry, Adam: *Kaa-tipeyimishoyaahk - 'We are those who own ourselves': A Political History of Métis Self-Determination in the North-West, 1830-1870*, Ph.D. University of Victoria, 2014.

Payne, C. R.: *Death by economy: liberalism, the Hudson's Bay Company and the free trade movement of the Red River Settlement*. Queen's University Master's Thesis, 2006.

Shaw, John M. *In order that justice may be done": The legal struggle of the Turtle Mountain Chippewa, 1795-1905*, The University of Arizona, Ph.D Thesis, 2004.

Shore, Fred: *The Canadians and the Métis -The Re-Creation of Manitoba, 1858-1872*, Ph.D. University of Manitoba, 1991.

Swan, Ruth: *Ethnicity and the Canadianization of Red River Politics*, University of Manitoba Master's Thesis, 1991.

Swan, Ruth: *The Crucible-Pembina and the Origins of the Red River Valley Métis*, University of Manitoba, Ph.D. Thesis, 2003.