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The French and Indian War opened up the fur trade for Scots. They developed their own “model” of country marriage that evolved into a horizontal “clan” system stretching across the continent. Scots “married-in” to Native communities and encouraged other employees, including the French Canadians and Hawaiian kanaka laborers and their own Scots-Indian sons to do likewise. They married their daughters to newcomers, thereby bringing them into the network as well. This pattern can be identified by researching fur trade genealogies. Over time dowries replaced bride prices and marriage became a formal affair, written contract, before a justice of the peace or in a church rather than an oral agreement.

European fathers began to employ ideological institutions like schools and church which taught their daughter to act according to social standards such as the “Cult of Domesticity.” Native women had had a long history of adapting European trade goods into Native fashion and altering their traditional clothing styles to accommodate new lifeways, but now the daughters were expected to dress according to their European social status. The daughters of the country were now seen as assimilated and to have “married-out” of their Indian cultures and into the
Euro American culture. In order to move Indian lands into the trade network and thereby the public sphere these mixed-blood women were considered assimilated and these European-Indian marriages were deemed legal and binding.

Americans traveled across the North American continent expecting to find an empty wilderness in which to plant their own version of the Puritans “city on the hill.” They took with them ideologies about the frontier, wilderness, and Indians, especially the “Indian Princess.” Captivity narratives had been used by the Puritans to establish social conformity and their morality code continued to permeate American lives 200 years later as thousands left the United States for the Pacific Northwest. Rather than a barren wilderness they found an already established agricultural community operated by the London based Hudson’s Bay Company. This “imagined community” had schools, churches, a cemetery, a lumber mill, produced grain and had a mill, as well as orchards, gardens, and livestock.
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For my mother

…who knew she was Indian even before she was told, a brief statement at that, which included, and “it’s forbidden to speak about it,” and DNA has confirmed. Now she has the answer to the question, “Are you Indian?”
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…who, as a kid, would walk to the Indian campground while out picking up bottles for change and spent much of his retirement years making Indian regalia for reenacting (Boy Scout Camping Honor Society, aka Order of the Arrow). Would he be surprised to find out that his DNA/ genealogy links him to Pocahontas?
CHAPTER ONE:
Introduction - The Scottish Fur Trade in the Columbia River

The largest fur trade enterprise in North America was the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC). The HBC was more than just a commercial franchise, it was an “imagined community” (Anderson 7). Chartered in 1670, and still in existence today, it was originally situated on the Bay named for explorer Henry Hudson. At its apex it came to encompass parts of the United States and much of what is now Canada (Newman 4). Geographically the HBC was not limited to North America, but operated a fleet of ships which stretched around the world with representatives in Spanish California and the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, brigades in both Spanish and Russian territories, as well as trading operations in China. Life was not peaceful for these traders with many of the outposts or houses on the Bay falling to the French and then returning in the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 (Queen Anne’s War). The Treaty of Paris in 1763 (French & Indian or Seven Years War) didn’t remove aggressions towards the HBC, but rather it saw an increase. HBC employees killed and in turn were killed by fellow Brits, continuing the clan friction’s brought over from Scotland (Devine, *Ends* 18).

The HBC’s biggest rival – the Northwest Company (NWC) – had evolved out of the void left by French trappers and traders who could no longer get licenses once the French government in North America was replaced by the British government. The NWC was situated along the HBC’s fringes and employees spent much of their time exploring the wilderness seeking the Northwest Passage. Many becoming more famous for those exploits than for being trappers or traders. While the Northwest Company itself was an amalgamation of smaller trading firms, that did not stop it, nor the HBC, from either buying out or bulling their smaller rivals into giving up
the trade. This included the Pacific Fur Company (PFC) which the NWC bought out in 1813.
The Northwest Company operated in the Pacific Northwest from the eighteen-tens until it was
forced to merge with the HBC in 1821. In 1824 the reconfigured HBC moved its operations from
the NWC’s Ft. George, originally the PFC’s Ft Astoria, to Ft. Vancouver. The new location was
better for farming and the head of the Columbia District, Dr. John McLoughlin, was instructed to
grow as much of his own food as possible. This saved the Company the cost of buying and
shipping food to such a distant location. An “imagined community,” one of several agricultural
stations in the region, soon followed. They produced enough food to feed the year-round staff
and brigades for the few months they were at the fort, with the surplus being shipped to fur
companies in Russian Alaska, to Spanish California, Honolulu, Hawai’i and other ports.

The Northwest Company also had a corporate identity which revolved around that of an
“imagined community.” Imagined communities are generally considered forerunners of nations
and yet can be applied to any number of Fortune 500 companies operating today. They contain a
limited number of citizens; consider themselves sovereign and, “regardless of the actual
inequality and exploitation that may prevail …is always conceived as a deep, horizontal
comradeship” (Anderson 7). The Northwest Company employed both foreign and domestically
born Scots as well as French Canadians, displaced after the French and Indian War (1754-63).
West of the Rockies they also employed Hawaiians. According to T.M. Devine the Highlands
dominated. “Of the 225 men active in the firm, 62 per cent were Scots from Inverness, Banff and
Aberdeenshire, normally from military, farming or small landed backgrounds” (Ends 16).
Referring to the outpost at Fort Nez Percés (1818-1855) Theodore Stern stated that “The formal
relationships among the men of the Company exemplified both the class structure of nineteenth-
century England and a quasi-military ordering of relationships” (Stern 98). Of the ten “Masters
of the Post” the first five were NWC men. Those born in Scotland included Alexander Ross (1818-23), Samuel Black (1825-30), and George Barnston (1830-31), while John W. Dease (1823-25) was born “in Canada of Scottish parents,” and Archibald McKinlay (1841-46) was of Scottish descent. Simon McGillivray Jr. (1831-32), William McBean (1846-51), and James D. Sinclair (1855) were all sons of the fur trade. Frenchman Pierre C. Pambrun (1832-41) and his son Andrew (1852-55) completed the list (Stern 86-7).

The HBC on the other hand was dominated by Orkney Islanders as, according to Devine, the HBC ships passed Stromness on their “circle route to Canada” and from the later seventeen century took on young men from the Orkneys. He went on to state that in 1799 the Orkney lads made up 78% of the payroll (Ends 15). While Peter C. Newman stated that “Except for servants from the Orkney Islands, the early Bay men came from no specific social stratum of England or Scotland” for which they became an amalgamated body (10).

Men signed on with fur trade companies for three to five years and lived, at least in the Hudson Bay area, in near isolation (Newton 292). Many continued to renew their contracts, some took a brief trip home, others never returned home. Over time many of them formed relationships with local women as European women were not only absent from this frontier but, in most cases, banned as it was believed they could not withstand the rigors of fur trade life. These relationships were encouraged by both Indian men, who offered “the bodies of their womenfolk in order to affirm closer connections with the traders,” and fur trade officials. Governor Sir George Simpson “expressly advised ‘connubial alliances’ with Indian women, arguing that they were ‘the best security we can have of the good will of the natives” (Devine, Ends 186). According to Sylvia van Kirk,
There were differences in attitude and practice between the men of the two companies; yet fur-trade society developed its own marriage rite, marriage à la façon du pays, which combined both Indian and European marriage customs. In this, the fur-trade society of Western Canada appears to have been exceptional. In most other areas of the world, sexual contact between European and native women has usually been illicit in nature and essentially peripheral to the white man’s trading or colonizing ventures. In the Canadian West, however, alliances with Indian women were the central social aspect of the fur traders’ progress across the country…Fur-trade society, as in both Indian and pre-industrial European societies, allowed women an integral socio-economic role…the bond thus created helped to advance trade relations with a new tribe, placing the Indian wife in the role of cultural liaison between the traders and her kin (4).

In the early years relations generally lasted the length of the man’s contract at which time the woman was ‘turned-off,’ that is she was either placed with another European man or sent back to her family (van Kirk 51). The Northwest Company encouraged their employees to marry Native women up until July 1806 when they decided “that in well-established areas marriage alliances were no longer a significant factor in trade relations” (van Kirk 92). By this time the Hudson’s Bay Company was also

at least partially successful in restricting martial unions to the upper ranks, and
initially most of the marriageable mixed-blood girls were the daughters of officers. Understandably, these officers viewed incoming junior officers as the
most promising husbands for their daughters, and this pattern of intermarriage
was repeated many times over in the Company (van Kirk 108).

After the merger in 1821 the HBC was forced to accept fur trade marriages which they regulated
through contracts, requiring permission of the fort commander, and marriages by a Justice of the
Peace, for which many commanding officers were commissioned that same year.

In Sylvia van Kirk’s book, *Many Tender Ties*, published in 1980. There was a passage in
it that begged me to pursue it.

The Nor’Westers’ disdain for the formalities of European marriage may have resulted
from the strong Scottish influence in the Company. In Scotland, at this time, it was
possible for a legal marriage to be contracted without the sanction of either civil or
religious authorities; all that was necessary was for the couple to express their consent in
front of a witness (52).

Van Kirk’s source was Frederick Parker Walton’s *Legal Treatise, 1800-1926* entitled *Scotch marriages: regular and irregular*. In his treatise, Parker Walton stated that

The simplest form of irregular marriage which can occur is that which consists in the
mere expression of mutual consent to marry. By the law of Scotland, if a boy of fourteen
says to a girl of twelve, ‘I hereby declare that you are my wife,’ or ‘I hereby take you for
my wife,’ or uses any words to the same effect, and she signify in anyway her assent,
they are validly and irrevocably married (46).

many drew on the Scottish model (of marriage) England’s Marriage Act of 1753 required the
publishing of banns, a marriage license, and a ceremony in the public chapel or parish church with a minister and witnesses or the marriage was null and void (79). This latter example being considered a regular marriage as, according to genealogist Anthony Adolph, a regular marriage required that the banns be read three times in the parish church. Should the couple not attend the same church then the banns were to be read three times in both churches. The banns need not be read on three separate occasions, but could be read three different times at the same service (44-45).

In his social history, *A History of the Scottish People, 1560-1830*, T.C. Smout stated that the church considered all forms of marriage outside their sanctioned service (even civil unions) to be akin to adultery and/or fornication which they persecuted severely. He went on to state that somewhat different [then misbehavior] was co-habitation after a formal betrothal or 'hand-fasting’, a social custom of great antiquity which the Scots shared with the Scandinavians and many other races, but which seemed to the reformers not only to be wicked in itself, but also a threat to the holy sacrament of marriage – as many couples were content to live together all their lives without further religious ceremony (75-76).

For rural communities the purpose of *handfasting* was to 1) see if the couple could bear an heir and 2) to provide enough hands to work the farm. The procedure was simple. The couple announced their intent at the local fair or other occasion, then cohabitated for a year and a day. At the conclusion the couple could 1) undergo a religious ceremony (the preferred outcome), 2) go their separate ways. Any children were considered legitimate, or 3) renew the contract, which the church discouraged. The church was not about to allow good conscience and happenstance to lead the populous to the alter; instead it worked zealously to terminate the practice. They
succeeded in having it “outlawed by the 1939 Marriage (Scotland) Act” (Livingstone 37). While the English were willing to fall in line, the Scots were slow to obey this edict, but in general most parishioners would not oppose the church out of fear that “their children would not be baptized” (Smout 76).

This persecution was carried out, not on the national level as with the Church of England (Anglican), but on the local level as the Church of Scotland (Presbyterian and Episcopalian) did most of its work in the parish with sermons on morality and social behavior. According to Callum G Brown, the parish often provided the only community venue as it

assumed vital functions in relation to social welfare, community spirit, social order, morality, education and the rites of passage (birth, death, and marriage).

The minister supervised the schoolmaster…The kirk session, composed of the minister and upwards of four lay elders, was the instrument of ‘regular discipline’ upon the people…The kirk session was the local court for the trying of cases against parishioners accused of ecclesiastical offences…The staple offence was that of fornication (sexual intercourse outwith marriage), with adultery as the next most common offence (64-65).

The kirk lost its ability to persecute its parishioners once Scots left Scotland and the custom of cohabitation found new purchase in North America (Smout 76). While this condition, country marriages or ‘hand-fasting’, initially intrigued me, this soon gave way to the notion that, as employees of the fur trade Scots became colonizers when they quite returning home after their contracts expired. In the Pacific Northwest where agriculture and lumber required year-round
staff, this condition – from colonized to colonizer – was extended to Pacific Islanders, mainly Hawaiians (kanakas), as well.

Scotland was late to the colonization of North America due to the Navigation Acts which treated her as an independent country even with the Union of the Crowns in 1603. In the years that England was establishing colonies and corporate companies’ in competition with France the Scots found employment with the Hudson’s Bay Company whose ships stopped off at Stromness on Orkney Island, where they took on their final supplies. With the 1821 merger the Hudson’s Bay Company acquired all of the Northwest Company’s territory to the Pacific Ocean along with its employees such as Scots, French Canadians, and kanakas (a Hawaiian term meaning human being or person; Koppel 1; Barman 12; means person; Chappell 96). Later on Ft Vancouver would employ some twenty-five different Indian and ethnic groups, including Americans. Scots dominated the officer corps and South Pacific or Hawaiians served as the predominant force, replacing the Orkney Scots that worked Hudson Bay and other eastern outposts.

In his trilogy on the rise of Scotland from five separate tribes of peoples to an industrial nation second only to England, T.M. Devine described the Scots as people who had been emigrating since the thirteenth century; an emigration pattern which brought them home every winter, and sent them away again every spring. Since the fourteenth century this job market had included the procurement of men in the various armies of Europe, and displayed in a series of Jacobite Rebellions intended on returning a Catholic James to the throne. This was a militia tradition which Queen Anne had set out to harness in her 1707 Act of Union (Union of the

---

1 Scotland attempted a colony in Panama named Darien in 1694 which the King failed to support (K. Brown 179). See also Devine, Scotland’s Empire 3-4.
Parliaments; K. Brown 31).³ After each of the Jacobite uprisings England levied sanctions against the Scottish people in the form of the Disarming Acts as well as the Tartan and Dress Acts of 1746. Yet, in North America, fur traders and immigrants alike were able to circumvent these Acts, dressing in full regalia, and fully armed, in public.

Sir Walter Scott co-opted this militarism in his bid to retain a Scottish identity in the face of the “Britishness” that the Scots had begun to embrace as their world expanded into and with the English empire. The English eventually took on the British mantel as they found themselves within that same expanse of Empire. In Devine’s history of Scotland and her global diaspora he placed the Hudson’s Bay Company second to the East India Company, while it’s governor, Scottish born George Simpson, nicknamed the “Emperor of the Plains,” governed over “3 million square miles” or more than “a twelfth of the earth’s surface” (Ends 159 and Scotland’s Empire 197). Nowhere does he mention Hawai’i, only coming close with references to Captain Cook’s explorations of the Pacific. Yet, Scotland played a role in early British-Hawaiian relations, just as it has in the fur trade, through the marriage of Archibald Scott Cleghorn, Governor (1891-1893) of O’ahu, to nineteen year old Princess Mariam K. Likelike in 1870. To this union was born a daughter, Princess Victoria Kaʻiulani Kalaninuihílapalapa Kawekiu Lunalilo (b. 1875), heir to the throne, who was later educated in England (Flynn Siler 74). Cleghorn, a business man, had several liaisons with Hawaiian women resulting in three other daughters and a son. His courtship of Hawai’i was every bit as important to his business as to that of the British Empire and demonstrated Scotland’s collusion with England to create that new empire.

³ The militia was regulated by the aristocracy and not the king. The aristocracy could call up an army whenever they wanted and fight for or against the king.
The first chapter, “The American Perception of the Frontier,” explores how early English colonists perceived the American wilderness which included establishing a frontier border outside the boundaries of their respective settlements. As these colonies expanded outward, away from the Atlantic coast, these frontier boundaries were pushed ahead of “civilization” until it ran into a fully-fledged agricultural community on the Pacific coast. This reality, that a European community already existed, run counter to their perceived mythology that the landscape was barren and therefore free for the taking. Treaties were signed between the U.S., Spain and Russia clearing those two claims, but Britain insisted on joint occupancy. Britain retained possession through her fur trade enterprises. Between 1818 and 1846 it had created its own “imagined community.” After which there was a slow withdrawal north that lasted into the 1860s and 1870s. Ft Vancouver was a quasi-military organization, an “imagined community” that included school teachers, religious services, a cemetery, a saw mill and grist mills. There were also gardens and orchards located near the fort and farming on the various plains, from one (at or near headquarters) to five, each providing a location for swineherds, as well as cattle, horses, and sheep, and grain fields.

As part of the newly evolving interpretation of the frontier English colonists created the persona of the “Indian Princess”. At 1700s Jamestown this princess was Pocahontas and later the Americans restructured this myth around their own “Indian princess,” Sacajawea. Captivity narratives, once the genre of captive Indians, were appropriated by the colonists, especially the Puritans after Captain Smith related his experience with the Powhatan Indians. The New England Puritans used captivity narratives to reinforce social behavior and morality. Over time women’s voices were silenced as the wilderness became a male oriented domain. Because of the twist(s) given to Pocahontas and Sacajawea’s stories they were never included in this genre.
The next two chapters, “First Families of the Columbia [River Fur Trade] and” “Women in Between,” look at women in-between two cultures. The Columbia Plateau fur trade brought together European men and indigenous Pacific Islanders (Hawaiian kanakas), mostly men, and Native women. Europeans brought with them patriarchy, even Highland Scots who had a tradition of both matrilineal and patrilineal descent, fell into line with this thought. Native societies were both matrilineal and patrilineal and even Native women who were from patrilineal societies had more autonomy than European women. Scot’s had both a written and oral tradition. While Hawaiians and American Indians were in transition from an oral to the written tradition, resulting in the story being told by European men – fur trade employees, missionaries, explorers and other government officials.

Though fur traders either brought their wives with them to the Pacific Northwest or married local Native women they wrote very little about them. When they did, they wrote in the English custom, with the signage of a marital status, Mrs. So-and-so. It is therefore, necessary to trace their lives through that of their husbands’ record, and for that I have used genealogy extensively to place these women – Native and mixed-blood or métis – within the colonial schemes provided by first the fur trade and second colonial settlement.

In order for Natives to trade with outsiders the stranger had to be taken into the tribe by either adoption (probably the John Smith- Pocahontas scenario) or marriage. Scots and Hawaiian men, therefore, were seen to “marry-in” when they took a Native wife. Their daughters were then married off to other fur trade employees (preferably officers) or newcomers (government, military, railroad, etc.) by whom the web was extended and, in the case of newcomers, the new father-in-law held some influence. In the early years men took ‘wives” from neighboring tribes.
or the home tribe (home guard), leaving that ‘wife’ behind when they were transferred to another posting (or sent home), and taking up a new ‘wife’ at the next posting. The leaving behind of a ‘wife’ was called “turning-off” and could mean that she was either sent back to her Native family or placed with a newcomer. In subsequent generations it became important for fur trade fathers to make their daughters condition more permanent and so the bride price became a dowry and marriage contracts were initiated. Now the daughters of the country were considered “marrying-out” of their culture group and into the European model. This was the first step in the assimilation of the daughters of the country.

Scottish men, officers in the fur trade, laid the groundwork for ideological institutions (i.e. schools and media) that taught their daughters the European system of decorum, which was later influenced by the “Cult of Domesticity.” Through the institution of family, European men instructed their wives and raised their sons and daughters to eat foods appropriate to and prepared according to European standards. The fur trade stocked bolts of fabric, lace and other embellishments which were available to both employees and Indians alike, but officers were also able to special order pattern books, ready-mades, and special items so that their wives and daughters were appropriately dressed for their station. Their success or failure was viewed through the appropriation of private photographs which became public when published in fur trade literature. Native women had long had access to fur trade items which they initially used as embellishments. Later they created contemporary fashions and accessories that have become cultural icons while maintaining traditional values through the reassignment of symbolism in design and materials.
By following the genealogies we can see trends in fur trade society. In the concluding chapter I return to Marguerite Wadden McKay McLoughlin and her family. Just as Marguerite “married-in” to the fur trade culture, so her father and two husbands “married-in” to Indian culture. Of her five daughters, all married Europeans, two married British Army men and the other three stayed within the fur trade culture, as did at least one grand-daughter. Her daughter Mary McKay married James Sinclair and their daughter Catherine married Frances Ermatinger (Morrison 317). Her three sons and one step-son all worked for the fur trade at some point in their lives with two of her sons marrying Indian women. In “First Families” Marguerite was a woman in-between two cultures living the lifestyle of a Chief Factor’s wife, every bit the equal of her friend Lady Amelia Douglas, the wife of Governor Sir James Douglas of British Columbia, Canada. She had grown up on the frontier, either in fur trade outposts or the Indian villages at Sault St. Marie. Marguerite learned the skills of her mother including how to tan hides and make clothing. She was known as an excellent seamstress and, at Ft. Vancouver, had one of the first sewing machines. At the Northwest Company’s base, Ft William (1803-21) on the Kaministiquia River (now Thunder Bay), her prestige came from her marriages to European men, clerks, and her access to trade goods. As one of the established families in the region new comers “married-in” to hers and other fur trade families. However, in the Pacific Northwest Americans shunned these fur trade families legislating laws against interracial marriages and leveling pole taxes against the importing and employment of Hawaiian laborers.

Scots preferred to hire within their own regions if not their own families or clans. The Hudson’s Bay Company drew from the Orkney Islands and the Northwest Company from
Aberdeenshire and the surrounding area. Even Governor Simpson, who was brought on as an HBC clerk by his uncle, Geddes McKenzie Simpson, aligned himself with NWC men (J. Brown 115, 118). This trend snaked through the fur trade as seen, starting with Lachlan McGillvray who had taken over his uncle Archibald’s trading license in Colonial Carolina on through Angus McDonald, who came to work for his uncle Archibald McDonald at Ft Colville in 1839.

Nepotism was not restricted to Scottish born fur trade employees, but was carried on by North American born Scots as well. This inclusion of domestic born Scots into the trade included the Grant family starting with William (1743-1810) who’s outfit was an early rival of the Northwest Company. His son Richard (1794-1862) became a chief factor and took over management of Ft. Hall from Francis Ermatinger. Richard later brought his own son, John Francis “Johnny” Grant, into the fur trade. Likewise the McBeans, starting with John, who was born in Trois-Rivières and worked as a voyageur, included three generations in the fur trade. His son John (1778-1854) was a clerk and interpreter with the Northwest Company, and his grandson William (1808-1844) was a clerk and manager of Ft. Nez Percés. And of course, Marguerite’s husbands should be counted here as Alexander McKay took their son Thomas with him into the Pacific Fur Company and Dr. McLoughlin found positions for all three of his sons, Joseph, John, and David.

Though Scots were banned from participation in colonial efforts by the 1663 Navigation Acts they made a huge contribution to the establishment of the English government in both the United States and Canada (Calder 3, 31). They took on the British mantle sooner than the English did after the 1707 Act of Union and shifted their migration patterns to reflect new opportunities open to them in the new union of Great Britain. Immigration to North America was still slow until Highland Scots were recruited as home guards for several colonies and the French and Indian War. After the War Highland Regiments were disbanded in the colonies, to save
shipping costs, to relieve the pressure on jobs, which were scarce, and to remove an armed mass that might again revolt against English rule (series of Jacobite Rebellions). To insure that they did not become a burden on the government they were given bounty lands, the amount based on rank. Marguerite’s father had served in Quebec before joining the fur trade. Her first husband, Alexander McKay, was born in the Mohawk Valley where his father had settled after his enlistment was up. Marguerite’s second husband, Dr. Jean-Baptiste “John” McLoughlin had grown up on his grandfather Malcom Frasier’s seigneury in Quebec, which Frasier had acquired after the war.

Scotland had been operating on the world stage for centuries and had established an amalgamated society – starting with the union of the matrilineal Picts and patrilineal Scotti, but Hawai’i was new and the clans still independent prior to European/American assistance which brought Kamehameha to a united kingdom. Both nations were bombarded with cultural assaults on dress, language, and culture. They found migrant work with the fur trade that was intended to send them home at the end of their contracts. However, by the 1800s European colonization east of the Mississippi River and north of the Great Lakes had already created a hybrid society that would become every bit as important to the development of the fur trade in the Pacific Northwest as those employees who came from Europe. These domestic employees changed the condition of contract labor and the Hawaiians joined the French-Canadians, Scots, and newly arriving Americans as colonial settlers. The status of Scottish and Hawaiian men then moved from that of colonized subjects, that is that their home countries were ruled by outsiders, to colonizers who married Native women or their daughters, which was now seen by the new society as “marrying-out.” These daughters of the country were now expected to assimilate into the new American society, and while they were considered redeemable their husbands were not greeted with open
arms. Even after acquiring citizenship their land claims were coopted as with Dr. McLoughlin’s Oregon City property and Angus McDonald’s Flathead homestead.

If Scots found it hard to assimilate, marginalized ex-fur trade employees like the French Canadians and the Hawaiians (kanakas) were even more disadvantaged and either retreated to isolated communities, moved to their wives’ people (reservations) or, as with the Hawaiians, followed the fur trade north. Many established communities on the Gulf Islands where they sent their Hawaiian-Indian children to school and continued Hawaiian traditions such as the luau. American colonialism has rendered Scotland and Hawai’i invisible, especially in relation to their contributions to American history, and the Pacific Northwest where a variety of place names such as Kelso and Kalama, Washington are lingering reminders.
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CHAPTER TWO:

The American Perception of the Frontier

While the frontier is considered a geographical space it also embodies sound relations whereby only men – white and propertied – regulated such ideological institutions as marriage, education and landownership and women, white or otherwise, were considered chattel and were not included within this sphere as full citizens of the United States, as evidenced by current political maneuvers to reduce or eliminate women’s rights and services. And while the Fourteenth Amendment granted citizenship to all born or naturalized in the United States it appears not to have included American Indians who were granted U.S. citizenship in 1924 (Stevenson 41). This did not mean that all Indians became citizens because, as citizens of sovereign nations, many had chosen not to become citizens of the occupying nation.

Europeans brought with them their attitudes towards women which are still front and center in the marriage ceremony today. In the “dream” wedding the bride’s male relatives physically give her to her new husband after which society buries her identity under the moniker, Mrs. So-and-so. Over the course of American history ideological institutions have perpetrated attacks on women, and girls; such as television’s impact on body image and self-esteem (Dove’s self-esteem campaign) and its subliminal message that women submit to men and that “boys will be boys,” thereby turning a blind eye to physical violence such as rape, abuse, and murder.

---

4 The Civil Rights Act of 1866 made everybody born in the United States a citizen (except Indians) the same as white citizens, a statement which camouflages, as it does not specify gender, the status of women. This right of birth was also reflected in the Fourteenth Amendment (1868).

5 In Canada citizenship was granted in 1960.

6 After I got married my mail started showing up with my married name even though I told everybody I wasn’t going to adopt it. When I got divorced I had to include a statement that I wanted my maiden name back, for which the court legally granted it to me. Ironic that I had to have the court grant me permission to use my own name. I also remember my mother and grandmother having to re-create themselves, i.e. establish a credit history, in preparation for spousal death.
especially of minority women. Throughout history women have been treated as inferior to men, have undergone forced sterilization, and been condemned for health issues (women’s issues categorized as hysteria) and continue to have a lack of adequate health care.

While middle class women were pressured, either not to work, or to give up their job to a man – the designated bread winner, minority woman were struggling to provide their families with the basic essentials for survival – adequate food, shelter and clean water. Today Native American women are still struggling to provide these basics as the reservations they live on represent third world status. Native women are further caught in a jurisdictional black hole. Consequently cases in which Native women who go missing and/or are found dead are not investigated. In 2017 North Dakota introduced a bill called Savanna’s Act. It was named for Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind who was killed and her baby cut out of her body. Washington State, Oregon, Montana, New Mexico, and Arizona have all passed similar laws within the last two years. In 2018 and 2019 Washington and Oregon State Police were given more power to assist tribes in investigation and to institute collaboration between local, state, and federal law enforcement in order to investigate these cases.

This treatment of women, especially Native women, was laid down in early colonization efforts by England, and after 1707 by Britain, who regulated its citizens by dictating their interactions with non-citizens, namely sexual relations with native populations (adultery, fornication and promiscuity) and, of course, marriage. The church, in particular the Scottish

---

7 In 2004 the Unborn Victims of Violent Act was passed after a pattern of increased murders on pregnant women was detected.
church which prosecuted through its legal branch, the kirk, considered all forms of marriage outside their sanctioned service (even civil unions) to be akin to adultery and/or fornication which they persecuted severely. The fur trade blurred this line, first by dint of the fact that it operated on the frontier out of sight of colonial authority and secondly by establishing a hierarchy that encouraged its employees to marry local women as a means of entering the kin network by which trade was conducted.

In fact, this colonial mission happened twice - once on the Atlantic seaboard and again on the Pacific coast. American Indians, first in New England and then in the Oregon Country, were hit by plagues which greatly reduced or totally wiped out whole populations, making way for European and Euro-American re-population schemes and colonial policies (manifest destiny). Donna Kessler, in her book *The Making of Sacagawea*, summed up this mythos by stating that “America dawned...when European settlers secured areas of the continent with the help of a beneficent God. That act inspired belief in a mission to carve out a consecrated space for the erection of a new social order” (11). I liken this episode in history, the expansion of the United States into the West, as similar to the Exodus from Egypt. Jefferson, like Moses, sent out scouts (Lewis and Clark in the north and Thomas Freeman and Peter Custis followed by Zebulon Pike in the south; Kastor 99) to survey the desert in search of a place to settle. While both Moses and Jefferson were seeking the Promised Land they ignored those that were already living there.⁹

While the implication is that these populations only consisted of “insignificant” American Indian nations, other European countries had claims backed by more than right of discovery and many had established settlements dating back hundreds of years. Nevertheless, the

---

⁹ Spanish backed expedition of MacKay and Evans (1795-97) in the Missouri River area prior to the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 (Woods).
citizens of these various European countries also became “insignificant others” in American frontier mythology and in many cases large cosmopolitan areas, such as Ft. Vancouver were entirely obscured. As Americans infiltrated the well-established community of the Columbia District fur trade they first condemned marriages made outside the church and then re-introduced anti-miscegenation laws reminiscent of the colonialism of the seventeenth century.

Frederick Jackson Turner wrote of Wisconsin, which became the 30th state in 1848, and the “civilized” areas of the continent that came before, that all were conquered through “waves” of occupation, starting on the east coast with fishing and moving westward with the fur trade, mining, ranching and then farming, but not once mentioning missionaries (11). Theodore Stern did note this and other differences when he stated that Plateau society was impacted first by “the traders, then missionaries, and later settlers, Indian agents, and the military” (Preface, Chiefs & Change, xi). Once past the Mississippi, initially settled by the French and Spanish, American manifest destiny lead across the wilderness of the Great Plains to the west coast occupied in the south by the Spanish and their mission system and in the north by the British. The British, while operating under the guise as fur traders and bypassing mining, gave equal measure to both ranching (sheep, as well as cattle, and pigs) and farming with large stations at Ft. Vancouver, Cowlitz, and Nisqually. Ft. Vancouver operated year round as an agricultural station, in addition to exporting food to Russian Alaska and timber and fish to Hawai’i. They might not even have been considered a fur trade outpost except for the annual arrival and departures of the brigades which cemented them as a transitory business, and not for what they had become: a sedentary outpost pre-American invasion, imagined community.

---

10 California came out of the southwest territory acquired in the Mexican-American War of 1847-48 and became the 31st state in 1850. Oregon, originally shared by the Americans and British became an American territory in 1848 becoming the 33rd state in 1859.
In the Pacific Northwest missionaries were some of the first non-fur traders in the area who pushed for American intervention. Reverend Jason Lee (a Canadian with the American Methodist Episcopalian mission) arrived in 1834 and settled among the Kalapuya in the Willamette Valley followed by Dr. Marcus Whitman in 1836 (Soden). When neither mission succeeded in converting Indians in any great number the missionaries turned toward supporting and encouraging immigration. In 1838 Lee organized a convention that produced a document in which they requested the United States to extend its jurisdiction over the Oregon Country. The affidavit was “signed by 36 persons, well more than half of the adult males in the Willamette Valley. Every member of the mission, ten in number, signed; the other signatures were those of 17 American citizens and – importantly – nine French-Canadians…” (Hussey 134). Later, these French-Canadians would be seen as blocking American efforts for self-government as they remained the largest European based population until about 1842. In the meantime, Dr. Whitman was turning his mission into a truck farm. Both missionaries gave talks when they returned east and in 1840 Whitman lead a wagon train back to Oregon to bolster American claims to the region.

These missionaries, and the settlers who followed them, brought with them their perspectives about the wilderness and the frontier that they had learned from their colonial ancestors. For those early colonists, any land located “outside the settlements” were considered wilderness (Kessler 14). To reinforce this ideology, the English colonies published captivity narratives that were in vogue up until the end of the nineteenth century. It was also during this early period that such concepts as “Indian savagery” and the “Indian princess” evolved. With the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory new frontier myths came out of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. This was followed by the Rocky Mountain fur trade. These fur traders penetrated the
wilderness and lived isolated lives, without the comforts of wives and families, only coming into the company of others at an annual rendezvous. This concept of wilderness ran counter to what Americans found on the Pacific Coast. As the frontier became a man’s world and narratives evolved into dime novels, women’s voices were silenced. This included women in the fur trade. In the newly evolving American history where real people were spun with mythic qualities, the Buckskin trade of the colonial era received only brief notice, even though Scots and other Europeans had married into the Five Civilized Tribes creating a population that, by the 1830s, included a leadership sporting such Celtic names as Ross (Cherokee) and McGillivray (Creeks). The Rocky Mountain Fur Trade (1824-40) eclipsed both the Great Lakes and the Pacific Northwest fur trades, which took place geographically within the United States, but were dominated by French and/or English concerns rather than American. Instead, American fur traders represented the conquering of the wilderness through representations of masculinity and mastery, which has since been romanticized (Kessler 16). As previously stated, this sphere did not welcome the presence of women, especially not one that included polygamy, as represented by such Frenchmen as Toussaint Charbonneau.

It is interesting that frontier myths conveniently obscured the history of Catholic-based societies requiring fish on Fridays that numerous fishing fleets crossed the Atlantic before Columbus. A number of European countries had been fishing off the North American coast for years; some prepping their fish on board ship while others maintained seasonal camps on shore, and a few, the French, staffing year round sites (Riendeau 30). Post-fishing camps official colonization began starting with the English in 1585 (Roanoke) and the French in 1598 (Sable
Island) followed by the Bay of Fundy (1604) which was moved to Port Royal (1605), and Kebec/Quebec (1608). Further English settlements were established at Sagadahoc in Maine and Jamestown in Virginia (1607), and at Plymouth (1620), and Massachusetts Bay (1629). Additionally, as part of their colonization strategy, the French carried on a lucrative trade in furs for some time before the English received news of their wealth and chartered the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1670 challenging France’s monopoly on the fur trade.

Another aspect of the English colonial history in America was the use of prisoners of war as indentured servants. One such example was the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715 whereby one hundred Scottish Highland prisoners of war were indentured. At this time, unlike the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745, prisoners were able to regain their citizenship rights after their terms were up. Of the 100 POWs from the ‘15, 13 were McGillivrays from Clan Chattan (Cashin 7). The McGillivrays were very active in both colonial affairs and the fur trade starting with Archibald who acquired a trading license in Carolina after he completed his indenture. In 1735 Highlanders were recruited for the Georgia Colony. The organizers were seeking men that would serve as both farmers and, when necessary, soldiers, as they had the Spanish to the south and French to the west to contend with. They founded towns like Savanna (1733) and Darien (1736), but were not very good at farming. Among this lot were three more McGillivrays including Archibald’s nephew Lachlan who would eventually take over his uncle’s license. Lachlan stayed in the colonies until 1782. During much of this time he was involved in Colonial politics and had a Creek wife.

---

11 The North American colonies were a continuation of English colonial policy which had started with Scotland and Ireland. Townsend 31 (Gilbert, Roanoke), 33 (Kennebec).
Other Clan Chattan members included Simon McTavish who emigrated from Scotland in 1763 at the age of 13. He was a key figure in forming the Northwest Company in 1779. His McGillivray nephews: William (1784) became the chief director in 1804, Duncan (in trade 1793-1808), and Simon, who did not become a wintering partner but participated in merger negotiations with the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1821. McTavish also brought in other relatives including Simon Fraser, and Fraser’s son Simon and his brother-in-law Charles Chaboillez (1794; Cashin 7-8; Brown 39-40).

During these early years Scots, such as Archibald and Lachlan McGillivray, came and went from the colonies as their fortunes dictated. However after the French and Indian War, the disbandment of Highland Regiments resulted in a large volume of new settlers, not just in the southern thirteen colonies, but also in the new, fourteenth colony of Quebec. It is from these early settlement efforts that European women became available to fur trade employees and many a Montreal trader had a city wife and at least one country wife. For instance, in 1793 Simon McTavish (Scottish Presbyterian) married into one of the oldest Montreal (French Catholic) fur trade families when he married Marie Marguerite Chaboillez (Brown 40); and French speaking Swiss Protestant Jean-Étienne Waddens (Wadins) (c.1736-1782) married Marie-Josephte Deguire on Nov 23, 1761 at Saint-Laurent in Montreal. Their daughter Véronique married Scottish Presbyterian minister John Bethune and their son Angus worked for the Northwest Company (NWC). Waddens also had a country wife (possibly of Cree or Ojibwa descent, some historians even think she might have been métis), and their daughter Marguerite, married two different NWC men who were on the continent due, in part, to members of their family having been in disbanded Highland regiments. The first was Alexander McKay who “turned her off” when he retired in 1808 and the second was Dr. McLoughlin for whom she married – three
different times in three different forms – in the custom of the country (1811), in a civil
ceremony, and in a catholic rite (1842; Cooper).

While the practice of fur trade marriages has been considered more of a form of
prostitution, i.e. living together without benefit of a church ceremony, there were further
complications in English colonial society; it was against the law to enter into an inter-racial
marriage (miscegenation). One well known exception was the marriage of John Rolfe to
Pocahontas.\textsuperscript{12} It is generally easier to follow the male line than the female so we will start with
John Rolfe (1585-1622) businessman and tobacco planter. He and his wife Sarah Hacker were
sailing to Jamestown when they were caught in a storm (hurricane) and shipwrecked in Bermuda
(1609).\textsuperscript{13} Sarah gave birth to a baby girl, Bermuda, but both mother and child died and one or
both were buried on the island. After repairs were made John Rolfe continued on to Jamestown
(1610) and started a tobacco plantation at Varina (1612).

In 1614, after getting permission from the Governor, Rolfe married Pocahontas and they
had a son, Thomas Pepsironemeh Rolfe, in 1615 (Rountree, \textit{Pocahontas’s People} 60; Townsend 128,130). The Rolfes were sent to England to gather support for Jamestown, being a commercial
enterprise every bit as much as the Hudson’s Bay Company. In 1617, as the ship was leaving
England, first Thomas and then Pocahontas became ill. Thomas began to recover, but Pocahontas
died. She was buried at Gravesend and Thomas, a toddler, was left with relatives (Rountree,
\textit{Pocahontas’s People} 63-64; Townsend 157, 158; Brown et al 3). John Rolfe continued on to
Jamestown where, in 1619, he married Jane Pierce and in 1620 they had a daughter, Elizabeth
(Townsend 164; Brown et al 3). John Rolfe died of unknown causes in 1622.

\textsuperscript{12} My 11 times great-grandmother on my father’s side.
\textsuperscript{13} According to Camella Townsend Shakespeare’s play, \textit{the Tempest}, was based on the shipwreck of Rolfe’s ship
\textit{The Sea Venture} (144).
Thomas returned to Virginia in 1636. In 1641 Thomas requested permission from the Governor to visit his Powhatan relatives (Opechancanough/Opechankeno and Aunt Cleopatra) then later joined the militia on promises of gaining more land (Rountree, *Pocahontas’s People* 18; Townsend 174). He is linked to a number of women including: Elizabeth Washington (daughter, Anne, 1633); Jane Poythress (daughter, Jane Rolfe Bolling, 1650; Brown et al 4); a cousin, Oconoco/Oi Poi (son, Thomas ‘Powhatan’ Rolfe); and Dorothy Jennings and her maid Mary Grimes.\(^{14}\)

Ironically, we know more about Pocahontas before her marriage and during her trip to England, through other people, than we do about her time at Varina as the wife of an English landowner. Pocahontas (1595-1617) was first mentioned by John Smith in 1608 at which time he described her as a child of 10 (birthdate of 1598).\(^{15}\) According to Helen C. Rountree Pocahontas would have married in 1610 when she reached puberty (*Powhatan Indians* 91). If she was 10 in 1608, in 1610 she would only be 12, taking into account an early puberty and the practice of betrothals at birth (in Europe 12-14 was not a common age for marriage) she could very well have been living with a husband, Kocoum, and probably had had children, i.e. daughter, Ka Okee or “Jane” Pettus. Then in 1624 Smith changed her age to 12 or 13 (b. 1595), and related, for the first time the story about how she saved his life (Rountree, *Pocahontas’s People* 38; Townsend 52).

\(^{14}\) Townsend only mentions one marriage and daughter Jane, 175; Wyndham Robertson’s book was adopted by the Pocahontas Foundation as the authority on Pocahontas descendants and therefore lists Thomas as her only child and Jane as his only child ignoring her Indian family with Kecoum and others with a family history of descendant many of whom have been able to verify their paper trail with DNA. My dad was told he was a descendant of Sir Walter Raleigh not Pocahontas so were somewhat surprised with that reversal.  
\(^{15}\) John Smith was in Jamestown from 1607 until 1609 when he was sent back to London because of an injury. Pocahontas was told he was dead and did not see him again until her trip to London. Brown et all lists her life dates in their descendant chart.
Pocahontas was the daughter of The Powhatan (king or emperor), who was a Pamunkey. Her mother was an unknown commoner from one of the villages in the Powhatan Confederacy. After she gave birth to Pocahontas she was free to return to her village, whereby The Powhatan supported her, and all his wives, until she/they married another (Rountree, *Pocahontas’s People*, 9 and *Powhatan Indians* 90; McCary 49-50). They lived in the Tsenacommacah or Tidewater area of what became Virginia and Pocahontas was born in the village of Werawocomoco, (Wicomico, Gloucester County, Virginia) one of six villages that her father had inherited.

Unlike English women, Powhatan women were not simply defined by their roles as mothers, but held autonomy within their community(s). As an agrarian society the women maintained large fields containing the Three Sisters (corn/maze, squash, and beans) and other vegetables (peas, passion flowers, pumpkins, sunflowers, tobacco, and gourds). They were matrilineal, that is, men became eligible for leadership through their mothers (McCary 16-19; Rountree, *Powhatan Indians* 47). Corn was the measure of wealth in their society and the domain of women who were responsible for all food stuffs including the receipt of, processing, and serving (Rountree, *Powhatan Indians* 89). Pocahontas had grown up and into the role of provider and it was this product of her labor that she shared with the colonists. As a Powhatan woman she, and the other Algonquin women, made “mats, baskets, pots, cordage, and wooden spoons, platters, and mortars…made bread” served as barbers, moved the families household goods, erected shelters, collected firewood and kept the fires going, “prepared and served meals, and they were themselves served up as a form of hospitality to important male visitors,” and bore and raised children (Rountree, *Powhatan Indians* 89).
However, as the colonists’ world view was patriarchal providing no status for women, Pocahontas’ role as a provider was not recognized. Instead the role that defined her was that of The Powhatan’s favorite daughter, a princess. The Powhatan Confederation was comparable to that of a unified England and Ireland. Similarly, The Powhatan was comparable to the Stuart king, King James VI of Scotland, and after 1603, King James I of England and Ireland, thereby making Pocahontas a princess. Relations between the colony and the Confederation deteriorated after Smith’s departure in 1609. Drastic measures were called for and in 1613 Pocahontas was lured into a trap and held prisoner by Captain Samuel Argall on his ship (Rountree, Pocahontas’s People 58-59). Her marriage was one of several marriages between the two peoples resulting in a break in the war that lasted until 1644; during this time a series of open conflicts, interspersed with periods of calm, ended with a final confrontation that depleted the colony by a third of its members.

In 1614 Pocahontas was allowed to speak with her relatives whom she is said to have informed that she preferred to stay with the English. The English took this as a sign that she, and all Indians, could assimilate. We do not know what she was thinking, whether it was “Stockholm Syndrome” or she thought her actions could save lives, in any case she remained with the English. As a condition of her release from physical confinement she agreed to marry Rolfe, then a 28 year old widower. The marriage could not take place however, until, as previously mentioned, permission was granted by the Governor. Although permission was granted, their union, which took place on April 5, 1614, was still illegal in the other colonies (Brown et al 1). On January 30, 1615 their only child, Thomas, named after Governor Thomas Dale, was born.
During the year of her internment Pocahontas was kept on board ship surrounded by English sailors and indoctrinated into the Christian faith by Alexander Whitaker and John Rolfe. At her baptism, and to complete the brainwashing, she was renamed Rebecca (for mother of two nations). What hardships she endured during this time are unknown including whether she was compromised by any of the men that dominated her life. Though American mythology has long connected Pocahontas romantically to John Smith, current authors insist that John Rolfe was in love with her, and felt that she returned that sentiment, fore stalling any notion that she was ‘forced’ to marry Rolfe (Rountree, *Pocahontas’s People* 59). As a condition of the Christianity of the day a wife had to be available to her husband which, therefore, fore stalls any mention of any rape that she may have had to endure from that marriage until her death.

Pocahontas and Thomas were taken to England on *the Treasurer* in 1616 (Townsend 136). It must have been difficult for Pocahontas during those months at sea, traveling in such close quarters with her captors and prison guards, Captain Samuel Argall and his crew, even with a contingent of Powhatan Indians and an English family on board. After being wined and dined and displayed as the “good Indian” by the backers of the Virginia Colony the Rolfes boarded ship for home, she however never made it to open water, dying in March of 1617. Thomas, age two was probably still nursing as there were no other means of feeding children at that time. As a matrilineal society Powhatan women raised their children until their daughters reached puberty and married and their sons went through the manhood test between the ages of 10 and 15. Consequently it was common for Indigenous women to have full responsibility of their children until they transitioned into their gender dominated world (Brown 67-68). This was not the case in English society where men owned their children and could send them away to live with relatives anytime they wanted and without regard to the age of the child or the mother’s feelings. As such
John Rolfe chose to leave his son in England, first with Sir Lewis Stukley and later with John’s brother Henry Rolfe. Thomas returned to Jamestown in 1635 at the age of twenty.

John Smith’s account of his capture by Opechancanough, with or without Pocahontas’ assistance in his rescue, along with those of American Indians snatched by the fishing fleet or coastal (Spanish) explorers, launched the colonial captivity narrative genre which lasted until the end of the nineteenth century. It found purchase in New England’s Puritan society which saw them as moral guides used “to urge social conformity.” In theory the premise was that God was punishing them for their wayward ways and only through forgiveness and mercy were they rescued and returned to their families (“Captivity Narrative”). Since the basis was founded in Christian theology, it was against the law for colonists to forsake their countrymen and live among the Indians. These narratives influenced the literature of the day, including James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans* in which Hawkeye, raised by the Mohicans after his parents were killed, is ridiculed for not giving up his carefree ways as a frontiersman to join the fight against tyranny. Pocahontas’ story, though published in every American school history book, has never been classified as one of those captivity narratives.

In 1857 Olive Oatman’s story was published by Rev. Royal B. Stratton. The Oatman family, traveling with the Brewster wagon train from Independence in 1850, found themselves the last of the 43 wagons still heading for the Land of Basham, at the confluence of the Colorado River with the Gila, after leaving Maricopa Wells. They were attacked by Yavapai – with six dead and Lorenzo (14), left for dead, Olive (13) and Mary Ann (8), the latter later dyeing of malnutrition or starvation, were taken captive and later traded to the Mohave. In 1856 Olive was

---

16 *The Captivity of the Oatman Girls*, was a sanitized version of Olive’s story.
“taken away from the Mohaves against her will” and ransomed, she was a beautiful young woman sporting the distinctive chin tattoo, not of a slave but of a married woman with two children (According to editor Bob Boze Bell even with the tattoo many historians do not believe she had children, 26). Her virtue as a captive, still under speculation today, fueled the genre as in the Puritan mind sexual relations with “savages” was considered a ‘fate worse than death’ (Boze Bell 27). Olive, in deep depression and mourning in the months following her repatriation, married a Texas rancher in 1865, but was never able to have children; she suffered from post-traumatic stress the rest of her life. Perhaps, if Pocahontas’ story, as her story rather than history were told, we would have found out that she too suffered from post-traumatic stress from her time in captivity at Jamestown. While Captivity Narratives continued to be popular until the turn of the century and the closing of the frontier and continued to reflect Puritan attitudes they evolved, first by eliminating Indians, for which the genre was established, and then women as men took on the great unknown, the North American wilderness.

Author Vine Deloria was, in the 1960s, the executive director of the National Congress of American Indians, and as such received thousands of visitors every year. Everybody, it seemed, had a story about being descended from an ‘Indian Princess’ but none from a chief (Kessler 24). My immediate family believed neither in the princess, a role not normally found in Indian society, nor the chief scenario as any one – man or woman - who could afford to buy a captive could own one and in many cases the captive was integrated into the family to replace lost or absent (childlessness) family members, thereby removing the stigma that ‘slave,’ at least in U.S. society, implies. Recently my family found out that we had a “captivity narrative” in our past, one that included an “Indian Chief” rather than the ‘Princess Myth.’ The paper trail led us to my
five times great grandmother (on my mother’s side of the family) but we could go no further than that.

Then a couple of years ago my mother, her brother, and I did our DNA through *Family Tree* and over the summer my brother and his son did their DNA through *Ancestry*. My mother had known she was Indian from looking at the family photo album(s) even before she heard that it was forbidden to talk about “grandma’s” Indian ancestry. We found out that my mother’s DNA had been uploaded to the website through an e-mail asking if we were related to “the McCunes.” Several other e-mails followed with relatives telling which daughter (great-great grandmother) they were related through as well as exchanges of photographs and genealogies.17

The story that has been pieced together so far is that the Barnhouses, who lived in Virginia, were visiting relatives in Texas when they were attacked. Mary P. Barnhouse was taken by Comanches where she grew up and married one of the chiefs and had children. Mary was a contemporary of Cynthia Ann Parker who was taken by Comanches in 1836 (Waldman stated they were Caddo, 76). Cynthia became the teenage wife of Peta Nocona, chief of the Nocona band, where she had three children – Quanah, Pecos, and Prairie Flower. In 1860 Cynthia and Prairie Flower was taken by Texas Rangers and returned to the Parker family. It is unknown when Mary, and her baby daughter, was forcibly repatriated. Like Olive Oatman, Cynthia and Mary were unhappy and wanted to return to their Indian families. Cynthia never adjusted to the white world and died of grief after her daughter died of a disease. Mary’s adjustment was compounded by the fact that she was shunned by white people; she died of a broken heart (abt

17 The information I have is that there were five known children of whom I am a descendant of Rebecca as is Betty Smith, who claims both a Comanche and a Cherokee ancestor. The genealogy provided by Rachel Hartman, who is a descendant of Druzilla (b.1857), lists the 2nd wife of Thomas Barnhouse as being of Cherokee descent, but she is unrelated to us except by marriage. Chad Ray is a descendant of the third sister, Sara (b. 1865). The other two children were boys: Barnabas (b.1855) and Thomas (b.1860).
Mary’s baby daughter was sent to family in the East. They tried to hide her Indian heritage from outsiders and gave her an English name, Rebecca.\textsuperscript{18} Family was told never to discuss this issue, but at some time she overheard something about her ancestry because she quietly passed it on through a select few.

As the United States moved westward, it renewed its “Indian princess” mythology in another pre-teen captive, Sacajawea. Sacajawea’s story runs parallel to that of Pocahontas, for which, again, we know only the side told “primarily [by] white males” (Kessler 194). Sacajawea was introduced to us through the various journals kept by members of the Corps of Discovery and embellished by subsequent publishers. In the fall of 1804 the Corps of Discovery settled in next to a Mandan village for the winter. As a well-established trade center the village had drawn European fur traders for some time and currently in residence was a Frenchman by the name of Toussaint Charbonneau who courted Lewis and Clark in hopes of landing a job as interpreter. Charbonneau was the villain of the story, in part because he was French and the French were seen as weak, having been lured in by the wilderness and become “squawmen.” In contrast, American heroes such as Cpt. William Clark were able to overcome that lure (Kessler 216 n 5).

According to Donna Kessler, when Charbonneau visited the American camp he brought with him two Shoshone women whom the Corps members tried to categorize according to their perceived social norm of marriage, i.e. monogamous – one wife and a squaw (possibly slave) - or

\textsuperscript{18} Rebecca would have been born in Comanche country (Texas) and not West Virginia as is stated in the various genealogies provided to us to date. Her birthdate is listed as May 17, 1852, but this could be an arbitrary date as this would make her 82 when she died in 1934 (West Virginia), but according to my grandmother, Wilma Breedlove, she was almost 100 years old when she died. Her mother’s birthdate is listed as “abt 1785” which would mean that if she was 16 when Rebecca was born (there were supposedly two older brothers who were left with the Comanche) then Rebecca would have been born in 1841 making her 93 when she died. My grandmother gives Rebecca’s dates as ca. 1840-ca. 1935.
polygamous – two wives. Harold Howard stated that this man was not Charbonneau but Réné Jussome and his wife with another Indian woman (16). When the Corps left it was Charbonneau who was hired, and he was allowed to take one woman with him, the young mother and her newborn baby, to whom the company then referred to as “wife.” He then left behind another Shoshone “wife.” It is generally understood that she is a friend or sister to Sacajawea, but Howard contends that she is from the Southern not Northern tribes and that she is possibly a woman known as Otter Woman. As he had been in the area for eight years and was known to have married à la façon du pays often, Charbonneau may have also left a Mandan and another woman, of which little is known (17, 183).

On July 28th the Corps was camped on the spot where this teenage Shoshone girl told of her capture at age 10 or 12 by the Knife River Hidatsas. On August 15th the Corps met up with the Shoshone only to discover that their translator, a slip of a girl, was related to Agai’Dika band chief, Cameahwait. He was possibly a brother or cousin as, according to Shoshone culture, all in a generation are considered either brothers or sisters, there being no word for cousin (Howard 57; Madsen 20). Of her family she found that there was only an absent brother and a nephew (Snag?) still living. Similarly we have no idea what was going through Sacajawea’s mind when she found herself camped on the spot where her village had stood five years previous, but Lewis wrote that she was unemotional about her abduction, and reduced her to the status of a child by further commenting that “if she has enough to eat and a few trinkets to wear I believe she would be perfectly content anywhere” (Kessler 59). In that singular moment he disregarded any possibility of trauma she may have been feeling in regards to her capture and/or the death of her family, not to mention disbelief at the fact that she probably never expected to return to her homeland.
Because her “brother” had been elected chief, Sacajawea’s status changed from slave girl to Indian princess. Once again Sacajawea, like Pocahontas, has had her story printed in every school history book, yet it is never treated as a captivity narrative. Like Pocahontas, who was romantically linked with Cpt. John Smith, Sacajawea was paired with Cpt. William Clark, a man she could never marry. The underlying theme was still anti-miscegenation which conveniently ignored the fact that she was already married to a European. American myth making also ignored the fact that Pocahontas was married and had a family before the English forced her into a polygamist relationship with Rolfe.¹⁹ Imagine the surprise when it was revealed that Sacajawea had a Shoshone husband/fiancé for which she had been betrothed as a child (Howard 61-2 n1). Both girls had Indian marriages that were usurped by European entanglements and all but ignored by American frontier mythology.

It would be years before Sacajawea became the face of manifest destiny, but as Euro-Americans moved westward they replayed their beginnings. Frontier mythology flirted with other women in the fur trade but they never became “Indian princesses” in the same manner as Pocahontas and Sacajawea. In 1810 German immigrant John Jacob Astor organized his Pacific Fur Company sending half his company overland (Euro-Americans) and the other half by ship (Scots) to the Pacific Coast. There they built Ft. Astoria in Chinook territory which was under Chief Comcomly. This delegation of Europeans and Pacific Islanders pronounced Comcomly a king and his children princes and princesses (Schodt 39). The coastal trade had been in existence longer than Comcomly had been alive and he understood the power and prestige he could command by marrying his daughters off to fur trade employees. The first marriage was with

¹⁹ Rountree stated that The Powhatan had the power to annul marriages, which he did for Pocahontas, but refused to do for another favored daughter (Pocahontas’s People 60, 298n50).
Partner Duncan McDougall on July 20, 1813. He paid a bride price of “A total of 15 guns and 15 blankets and a great deal of other property” which had taken him a year to acquire (van Kirk 37). This practice harkened back 200 years to Pocahontas and the Powhatan for which Helen C. Rountree stated,

A man could not acquire a wife until he proved himself as a provider … and he had to pay bride-wealth to her parents. The English saw the latter, of course, as ‘buying’ of wives. However, ethnographic studies have shown that bride-wealth compensates a woman’s family for the loss of her valuable labor and child-bearing potential, so the amount paid is a public declaration of value for the woman involved (Powhatan Indians 90).

While the English held disdain for this practice, the Scot’s understood it and complied with local tradition. For instance, Alexander Ross stated of the Chinook in his journal that “All classes marry very young; and every woman, whether free or a slave, is purchased by her husband” (107).

McDougal appears not to have had children, or at least none that survived, from this match. Infanticide was common in Chinook-fur trade marriages due to the fact that the men would not allow their wives to flatten the heads of their children. In turn, Chinook women could not allow their children to grow up looking like ‘slaves.’ Nonetheless McDougal encouraged the company clerks to marry the chief’s daughters - Alexander McKenzie married the eldest, known as The “Princess of Wales” and Archibald McDonald married “Princess Raven” also known as “Princess Sunday” (Koale’xoa), though the marriage did not last as she died after the birth of their son Ranald, born on February 3, 1824 (van Kirk 30, 36-7; Brown 187-8; Schodt 45; Terry...
Ranald was raised by his mother’s sister Ca-cumcum, it being the practice to breast feed for two to three years (Ross 107). Thomas McKay married Timmee who died in the 1830s malaria outbreaks (Brown 96, 98; Jackson 48-9; Hyde 112). They had three sons and two daughters. Their sons were all educated at the Salem mission and their eldest, William, became a doctor.

The fur trade spurned settlement. The Northwest Company had caused havoc with Selkirk’s Red River Settlement, founded in 1811 and bought out by the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1836, at which time it became a retirement community for ex-employees and became the District of Assiniboia. Scottish immigrants had walked across the continent from Hudson Bay to Red River in the dead of winter to find no accommodations available. In 1841 some of those settlers were relocated at Cowlitz and Nisqually only to eventually end up in the Willamette Valley (Hussey 129). It was the American missionary movement, however, that paved the way for American settlement in the Columbia District. These American Missionaries piggybacked on the fur trade, taking trails used to freight supplies to either the Southwest or Ft. Hall. Missionary wives were present at the 1836 and 1838 rendezvous arriving with the Americans and leaving with the London based Hudson’s Bay Company. During their stay they mended their clothing, did laundry and made dresses for traders and trappers to take home to their Indian, métis, and mixed-blood wives and daughters (Ottman 73). Yet, in American frontier mythology no other (white) woman had ever crossed the wilderness, and certainly not crossed the Rockies before the Whitman party did so in 1836.

Though answering the Salish call for religious instruction, the Whitman’s built their mission among the Cayuse. A small, but distinct band of Plateau Indians that had threatened the
fur trade communication line – the Columbia River – and for which, the Northwest Company, had built a fort in 1818. Ft. Nez Percés was located at the confluence of the Columbia River and the Snake at what is now known as Wallula Junction. The fur trade considered this area “the most hostile spot on the whole line of communication” and for which Dr. McLoughlin advised Dr. Whitman to look elsewhere for a mission site (Stern, *Chiefs & Chief Traders* 9). Whitman’s mission, Waiilatpu, was located about 20-25 miles away and slightly overlooking the fort’s employee (mostly French Catholics) village scattered along the river’s banks. This is the location of another Captivity Narrative, one for which I found I had a connection through my second cousin, twice removed, Philip Mulkey Hunt’s accounts that were first included in *Mulkeys in America* (1982) and later as a stand-alone narrative published in 2000.

Whitman Mission was a busy center with people coming and going regularly, a contingent of employees, wagon trains, and other visitors. The Columbia River saw constant traffic as Ft. Nez Percés continued communications with Ft. Vancouver down river and Ft. Colville up river. Ft Vancouver had a year round staff that swelled to four or five hundred - employees and families - when the brigades were in, making it the largest city between San Francisco (Spanish) and Sitka (Russia). There was also a chain of missions and their respective settlements in such places as the Willamette (Lee, Methodist), The Dalles (Methodist), and Spokane (Tshimakain, Walker/Eells). Since 1829 retired employees had settled near their last duty station rather than returning to their port of entry resulting in the growth of the Red River Colony (est. 1811) to the north, and to the south Oregon City and French Prairie (five communities) in the Willamette Valley (these engagés were kept on the books by McLoughlin in order that they be allowed to remain in the area). This was not the frontier of romance or dime novels, but a well-established and diverse population fueled by regular sea going vessels,
overland immigration between Red River, Cowlitz and Ft. Vancouver, and seven years of American overland wagon trains. This was not a wilderness surely but a frontier none the less, as a wilderness is defined as “a wild and uncultivated region” and a frontier as a border between two countries or, as in early colonialism, any land “located just west of pioneer settlements” (Kessler 12; “wilderness”). The Pacific Coast hosted multiple borders for which treaties were drawn up between claimants: Spain, Russia, Great Britain and the United States, the latter two agreeing on joint occupancy when they could not agree upon a border. After the second revolution (War of 1812) the treaty delegation was able to strike an agreement on a border from Lake O’ the Woods to the Rocky Mountains, but from there the Americans wanted to continue the forty-ninth parallel. But Great Britain wanted to use the Columbia River as its dividing line; as such the Hudson’s Bay Company directed settlement below the Columbia River retaining the north side for the fur trade. That is, up until the Whitmans moved in.

The culture clash between the Whitmans and the Cayuse was slow to boil. The Whitmans had turned to truck farming and promoting immigration when they could not get converts. Dr. Whitman led the first wagon train in 1840, he having gone east to protest the closure of his mission due to the lack of said converts. By 1847 the Cayuse were frustrated with Whitman’s refusal to either pay for the land or leave (Minthorn 63). Coupled with the new house that limited Indian access to its inner sanctum and occupants, the “poisoning of the melons to detour theft,” and the epidemics that continued to plague the region; they started rallying neighboring tribes against the mission. The Cayuse already had a history as a militant tribe, but they had one other thing going for them, the political climate between the British and Americans, not to mention the religious strife - between Catholics and Protestants as well as among Protestantism’s various denominations. The Cayuse, therefore, were more than happy to take advantage of this power
shift and planned attacks on both Waiilatpu (Whitman’s mission) and Lapway (Spaulding’s Mission).

In the fall of 1847 the Bewley family wagon train arrived at Whitman’s mission. The Bewley wagon train had consisted of John W. Bewley and Catherine B. Ellis and their eleven children. John’s brother Isaac W. Bewley and his first wife Sophia Ellis, Sophia and Catherine’s sister Theresa Ellis Marquiss (later Jeffery), and several others including William Chapman who would marry Lorinda Bewley after she arrived in the Willamette Valley. After a brief stay at the mission the rest of the party, including the Bewleys other nine children, continued on to the Willamette leaving Lorinda (21), and Crockett (22). Lorinda stayed on at the mission to be a school teacher and regain her strength as she had tertian ague, and her brother Crockett stayed to accompany her west in the spring (Hunt 1). Also leaving the party was Theresa Ellis Marquiss who went to work for the Walker Mission near Spokane.20

Of the people staying at the mission fourteen were killed, including Crocket Bewley, and 53 people were taken hostage (Drury 305). They were not looking for slaves, per say, as the women were stopped from dispatching the captives by word from the HBC. Most were easily ransomed, though many of the leaders, hoping to acquire (white) Christian women as wives, had taken this opportunity to lay claim to many of the young girls. They expected that these women like Indian captives, would capitulate after a couple of weeks. But to the consternation of Five Crows and the others they didn’t. While Indian women understood their futures lay in assimilating into the new tribe Euro-American women had been raised according to the Puritan code which required that they not give in to “savagery.” Lorinda was not so easily recovered,

20 I am related through Sarah Mulkey, the wife of Theresa’s son, William Rufus Marquiss who was a sheriff in Columbia County Washington. This side of the family was included in an epilogue which is available upon request.
however, as several men claimed her. Her freedom required Peter Skene Ogden’s (HBC) constant attention for three days and nights, and then, even after the captives were on their way to Ft. Nez Percés Indian aggression was directed at them. The hostages, successfully removed to the Willamette, the militia was only too happy to engage the Indians, resulting in the first Cayuse War. In the end five Cayuse died to save their people (Minthorn 64).

Unlike Oatman and Barnhouse who lived with the Indians for years, Lorinda Bewley was only with the Cayuse a short time, after which there was a trial. Bewley told her story, several times and then, like Oatman and Barnhouse, she never wanted to talk about it again. The difference in their situations reflected the extent of civilization on the wilderness in which they found themselves. Oatman and Barnhouse were crossing the Great Plains, the lawless American frontier acquired in the Louisiana Purchase for which the United States had little control, but Bewley was in a region which had been settled by the Scots since 1810 with their network of outposts and the weight of the British Empire behind them. The British Parliament had, in 1821, “extended the laws of Canada and the jurisdiction of the courts of Upper Canada over all British subjects in the politically unorganized territories of the far West” which served to give weight to the fur traders authority (Hussey 131).

While this did not extend to the newly arriving American settlers, it had, none-the-less, served to keep some sort of order on the frontier. Especially since the 1821 ruling granted HBC officers the right to become Justices of the Peace in order to enforce those laws. When joint occupancy was terminated in 1846 the HBC no longer had jurisdiction and the United States was in no hurry to step up and protect her citizenry. A population which was slowly increasing in the Willamette from its 1841 population tally of 500 people, 65 American families and 60 French
Canadian families, to several thousand people (Hussey 129). Knowing that the Americans were ill equipped to rescue the captives the HBC had stepped in, negotiating for and paying, at their own expense, the resulting ransom. The Americans stepped up with a militia, which sparked further hostilities, and took care of the trial and summary executions.

In 1849 the U.S. finally responded with an Army detachment which was stationed at Ft. Vancouver. The HBC was kind enough to let them camp on their property, a kindness which was not returned as the U.S. Army began to take the place over. The Army and the HBC were soon at odds over who occupied what bit of land and who had the right to that occupation even though the 1846 Oregon Treaty “allowed the Company ‘possessory rights’ to land it already occupied” (Klan 42). In 1846 the HBC had “16 officers, 215 employees…and a large number of Indian workers. By 1860 there were only about fourteen employees of all grades” (Klan 42). William R. Kaulehelche was one of those. Known as “Kanaka William” Kaulehelche and his wife Mary S. Kaai had arrived in 1845 (Mary was not heard of after that) and were initially situated in “kanaka row” in the little village outside the fort walls. This village was generally known as Kanaka Village because the Hawaiians lived there year-round while the other inhabitants were gone part of the year on brigade. With most of the staff removed to northern posts the bustling little village was beginning to look pretty sad. In 1860 the U.S. Army began to remove structures it felt no longer necessary so that it could put the land to other uses (Klan 42). William’s house was one of those. He was given notice, for which he reported to his supervisor John Work, but refused to go.

On 12 March 1860, William watched the army remove the fences from around the Company’s fields. On the 16th he saw the soldiers burn down a vacated house which had been used for storing hay. On the 19th the soldiers destroyed the
Company’s old hospital and another house, and then they turned their attention to William’s dwelling. When they removed the doors and the windows William finally left. The next day, 20 March, the Hawaiian watched helplessly while soldiers set fire to the remains of his old home (Klan 43).

The HBC reported the incident to London; the British sent a protest to President Buchanan, Buchanan informed the Army that they needed to leave Company personnel alone. The damage was already done however and the rest of the staff, including William Kaulehelche, moved to Victoria. After their departure the stockade and remaining buildings were also burned, effectively obliterating all evidence of HBC presence.

This was the frontier in the 1840s when American immigrant wagon trains arrived in the Willamette Valley. They brought with them their ideologies about the frontier and tried to reenact the founding of America only to find it, not barren of indigenous people as was the case on the east coast, but already settled by Europeans. Rather than assimilate into these already established imagined communities they strove to overlay their own society and culture by enacting laws that elevated white male property owners to decision making and voting status while alienating everyone else. They squatted on Indian land, until the U.S. government finally sent a commission to negotiate treaties and land cession agreements, and claim jumped Hudson’s Bay Company and ex-employee claims. Esther Short and her family were HBC claim jumpers. After numerous attempts they were finally able to secure a homestead. She later gave a portion of her donation land claim to the citizens, a five acre park, the oldest in the state (est. in 1853), which is named for her. Today the Ke Kukui Foundation holds a three day “Aloha in the Pacific Northwest” event at the park celebrating Pacific Island culture.
Other examples of claim jumping include: Dr. McLoughlin who had retired from the HBC in 1846. He moved to Oregon City where he could manage his claims only to have them seized by the American government. A bill, the 1850 Donation Land Claim, was passed denying his land claims. The Oregon State legislator passed an Act in 1862 allowing his descendants to purchase the house he had built, the rest of the property having been sold off (Hyde 143; Morrison 462, 476). At issue, in part, as it was with William McBean, was his citizenship status. William McBean, managing clerk at Ft. Nez Percés during the Whitman incident before his retirement, was claim jumped twice, and his claim was tied up in court until 1878 when he finally received his donation land claim patent.
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CHAPTER THREE:
First Families of the Columbia [River Fur Trade]

The gentlemen of the fur trade consisted of twenty-eight chief traders and above them the twenty-five chief factors, all of whom received percentages of the profits (Stern 98). Below them were the clerks who usually served a five year apprenticeship (ex. Dr. McLoughlin, J. Douglas, and Ogden). After thirteen to twenty years they might be advanced to chief trader, and according to Theodore Stern, in a few more years might be advanced to chief factor. The reality of the situation was that until a chief factor or trader either retired or was killed there was no mobility in the ranks and many men were angered at being passed over when a position did occur (ex. J. Work). As clerks most of these men were married to Native women or their daughters. Of these, two of the most prominent women in the Pacific Slope fur trade, Marguerite Waddens and Amelia Connelly, started out as daughters of the fur trade. Both were the daughters of Cree women and European men. They were women in-between two worlds.

Marguerite first married (c. 1793) Alexander McKay, a Scotsman born in the American colonies, then in 1808 he retired and left (“turning off”) her, pregnant and with two little girls. A few years later (1812) she married John McLoughlin, whom Anne F. Hyde called a mixed-race man, though in reality he was an ethnically diverse man of European stock (Irish, Fraser Scot, and French) born in Quebec (Hyde 97; Morrison 3). Amelia married James Douglas, a man of mixed-race ethnicity born in British Guiana of a Scottish father “and a free coloured West

21 Hyde suggests that according to the “one drop” rule, that McLoughlin may have some Indian ancestry and therefore he is “tainted,” but I have never seen any other reference to any Indian ancestry. To verify or disprove I would have to spend more time on his French genealogy.
Indian” woman (Adams 1). Both men rose to prominence - McLoughlin becoming known as the Father of Oregon\(^2\) and James Douglas as the father of British Columbia (he was the first Governor of both Vancouver Island and British Columbia). In 1863 Douglas became “a Knight Commander of the Bath” upon his retirement as governor (Adams 155). Amelia was therefore known for the rest of her life as Lady Douglas. And yet, her life, as with that of Marguerite’s, like most women in a male dominated world, were barely acknowledged (Fogdall 286). As John Adams wrote in his conclusion to *Old Square-Toes and His Lady*,

> To some, Lady Douglas’s legacy may not be as obvious as her husband’s, but her story is a fascinating one that exemplifies the often-overlooked role of women and families during the fur trade and the period of economic diversification in western Canada and the United States from the 1820s through the 1870s. Together, Sir James and Lady Douglas’s lives linked to important aspects of 19\(^{th}\)-century society, religion, commerce and politics on three continents (222).

I think this can also be said of Marguerite and Dr. John McLoughlin as well, as both couples were on the fur frontier west of the Rockies until those lands were broken up into territories in preparation for joining either the Union (United States) or Confederation (Canada).

Marguerite was born about 1775; the date is ambiguous because she was raised in a culture with an oral not written record. Amelia was born in 1812, the same year Marguerite started her second family and James Douglas, age nine, sailed to Glasgow to start his education. Marguerite was raised in the villages around Saul Ste. Marie after her father was killed when she

\(^{22}\) Oregon Legislation, 1907, then nominated for Statuary Hall, Washington DC in 1921.
was six or seven. After she married she spent much of her married life at Ft. William (est. 1803) and before taking up residence at Ft. Vancouver (est. 1825). Amelia lived in fur trading posts on the east side of the Rockies until 1817 when her father was transferred. She lived there until 1830 when her husband was sent to Ft. Vancouver. This transfer meant that Amelia was no longer living an isolated life among the Carriers (or Dakelh) but was joining Marguerite among the Chinook. At Ft. Vancouver the two women were able to bond over their shared upbringing as Cree women. They were able to speak Cree again and practiced such customs as eating separately from men and telling the stories to their children that their mothers had told them as children. In 1838 the Douglas’, as did the McLoughlins, moved into their own apartments in the big house (it had been under construction since 1829 when the fort was moved closer to the river) and the two women spent hours sitting on the porch sewing and doing beadwork until the McLoughlins moved to Oregon City in 1846 (Adams 46; Morrison 277).

The Douglas’ were sent to Ft. Victoria in 1848 where Amelia lived to be 78, dying in British Columbia on 8 January 1890 surrounded by friends and family (Adams 215). Her house of 40 years, James Bay House, was torn down in 1906. Marguerite lived to be 85 years old, dying in Oregon City in 1860, surrounded by controversy as the government held all McLoughlin’s property until they deemed it appropriate to sell it back to the Dr.’s heirs. Her Oregon City home was saved from demolition and moved in 1909 (Mathews). It is now located on land originally donated by McLoughlin to the city for a park. Marguerite and Amelia had seen the Oregon Country Split in two, first by the international border in 1846, and then Marguerite saw it split again as Oregon became a U.S. state and Washington became a territory. Amelia saw British Columbia and Vancouver Island united and then become a province of Canada in 1870.
Birth, Death and Marriage, the sum of one’s life boiled down into facts and figures, details that give historians and genealogists fuel in which to recreate their/our lives. It is usual for obituaries to list those who have passed before and who survive the named deceased and often times the only way you find out who they were. But besides their roles as wives they were also mothers. Marguerite had eight children of her own, four from each marriage, and a step-son, Joseph, born about the same time as her youngest from her first marriage. Amelia had thirteen children, with one set of twins, and helped raise the children of her in-laws who also lived in her home in Victoria (Adams 91).

Of Marguerite and Amelia’s daughters all had at least some European education; Dr. McLoughlin paid for the McKay girl’s, as well as his own, most or all, of which he sent to Quebec where his sister Marie Louise McLoughlin was Mother Superior (St. Henry) of the Ursuline’s convent school. He also established a school at Ft. Vancouver in 1832 which the Douglas children attended while there. Otherwise Douglas taught them or, when in Victoria, they went to an Academy. McLoughlin also saw them all well married. Alexander McKay left his daughters dowries and Dr. McLoughlin saw them well matched with husbands, only two “marrying-out” of the fur trade: Catherine McKay married O’Gorman or McCormack of the British Army (Fogdall 299; Morrison 108, 121, 292); Mary McKay married fur trader James Sinclair (Fogdall 91, 300; Morrison 108; William 121, 293); Nancy McKay married Captain Robert McCargo (HBC captain; Morrison 52, 58, 89, 121, 293); Maria Elizabeth ”Eliza” McLoughlin married William Randolph Eppes, a British Army Officer (Fogdall 187; Morrison 121, 278); and Maria-Eloisa McLoughlin married 1) William Glen Rae (Orkney Scot) and 2) Daniel Harvey both company men (Morrison 278).
As for the Douglas girls, all but one “married-out”: Cecilia Douglas married Dr. John Sebastian Helmcken (English dr. for the HBC’s coal concern); Agnes Douglas married Arthur Thomas Bushby (an Englishman “employed as secretary to Judge Matthew Baillie Begbie”; Adams 139, 151); Alice Douglas married 1) Charles Good (an Englishman employed as “clerk in the office of the Colonial Secretary for British Columbia” (Adams 138) and 2) Baron Augustus Ernest de Wiederhold (Siffken) (Portugal, born in London, merchant; Adams 208-10); and Martha Douglas married Dennis Harris (an Englishman and civil engineer employed by the railroad; Adams 207, 209).

As for their sons, all received an education. Thomas McKay had six years of education before becoming a clerk for the Pacific Fur Company, his employment then rolling over to the Northwest Company (1813-21), and then the Hudson’s Bay Company. He had a short marriage to Timmee, the Chinook daughter of Chief Comcomly, from 1824 until she died in the 1830s of malaria (Hyde 509). During that time they had three sons of which all were educated- with William Cameron McKay becoming a doctor - and two daughters (unknown if they were educated or not; Hyde 509; Fogdall 232). Thomas then married Isabelle Montour, a mixed-blood woman, and they had five children (Hyde 509; Fogdall 232). John McLoughlin Jr never married. James William Douglas married Mary Rachel (May) Elliott, the daughter of the premier of British Columbia (Adams 210). After his death at the age of 33 she converted to Catholicism which landed her in court, Harris v. Douglas, over the upbringing of their two sons (the only grandchildren to retain the Douglas name). David McLoughlin married Annie Grizzly, a Kootenai woman (Hyde 511; Hale 114). In 1901 he attended a Pioneer Day Celebration hosted by the Oregon Pioneer Association and Portland Historical Society, the Society seeking everything that David could remember about his parents, the fur trade and other participants.
Later two of David’s daughters went to Portland seeking employment, but being Indian were turned away and returned to Porthill, Idaho (Fogdall 224).

Fur traders (Canadian born Irishman) William Connelly and (Swiss immigrant) Jean Étienne Wadin/Waddin/Waddens married into Indian communities when they married Cree women. Their daughters stayed within the culture when they married McKay, McLoughlin, and Douglas, just as coalminers’ daughters married coalminers and fishermen’s’ daughters married other fishermen. Only a few of their granddaughters (Mary, Nancy, Eloisa, and Cecelia) married within the culture, the others married out- to doctors, military men, railroad employees, and the colonial administration. By marrying the daughters of the fur trade, the first families as they were, these young men strove to raise their own status and fortunes. At the same time, by “marrying–out,” these daughters either censored or were advised to censor their relationship to their Indian mothers or grand-mothers (Adams 189; van Kirk 236-37). Martha Douglas, for instance, was cautioned by her father not to talk about her mother or the stories she had passed down, but she didn’t listen, instead she published them in a book, History and Folklore of the Cowichan Indians, in 1901 (Adams 221). In comparison, two of the sons married Indian/métis women while the other married into the government. This “marrying-out” and distancing themselves from their mothers for the sake of social status was the first step in erasure or rendering invisible their Indian ancestry. On the other hand, while many married into Canada’s upper class society, none married Americans or into her colonialist settler society.

As Chief Factors, Marguerite and Amelia’s husbands were at the top of their field when they left the fur trade. As such Marguerite and Amelia had few equals at their respective postings. At Ft Vancouver Marguerite and Amelia spoke Cree when together and French with
everyone else, but most especially with Jane, Dr. William Frasier Tolmie’s wife (and the
daughter of John Work), Dr. Forbes Barclay’s wife Maria Pambrun (daughter of clerk and Ft
Nez Percés manager Pierre C. Pambrun) and her mother Catherine (Binns 94). When Amelia
moved to Ft. Victoria she was alone until Chief Factor John Work, also from Ft. Vancouver, was
stationed there with his wife Josette in 1849. It could also be said that this circle included their
daughters and possibly nieces. (Canadian born Englishman) Peter Skene Ogden’s wife Julia
Rivet was not at Ft. Vancouver much during this timeframe as Ogden was running brigades (six
of them), mostly out of Ft. Nez Percés.

In 1845 the management of Ft. Vancouver went from that of a single manager to a
triumvirate (Board of Management) consisting of McLoughlin, Douglas, and Ogden. A position
Douglas retained until his retirement from the Hudson’s Bay Company. His retirement was
necessary in order to concentrate on the duties of governor, especially when those duties
involved both Vancouver Island and British Columbia. When McLoughlin moved to Oregon
City in 1846 he was replaced by (Irishman) John Work (Binns 63, 66-67). Work had been
directed by the Governor to marry a Cayuse, but instead entered into a country marriage with
another Columbia Plateau woman, Josette in 1826 and then married her in 1849 at Ft. Victoria.
She has been referred to as Spokane, “a half breed Pend d’Oreille woman” (McDonald 111) the
daughter of a Nez Perce woman and fur trader Pierre Legacé (Adams 87) and the daughter of
Charles Legacé and Emma, a Flathead; her brother’s name was Pierre (Barman 160). Not much
else is known about her other than they had ten or eleven children, which he either enrolled in
school or taught himself, though his own education was questionable. His sons-in-law included:
Roderick Finlayson, James Allan Grahame, Dr. William Fraser Tolmie (Scotland), and Edward
Huggins.
Ogden met Julia Rivet at a dance held at Spokane House. It was their first as Ogden had just been assigned to the district and Rivet had lived all her life away from the fort. He found Julia, all dressed in plains buckskin, more appropriate to his lifestyle as a clerk in the fur trade than any of the debutantes his mother had introduced him to. Ogden did not speak Salish but Julia spoke both French and English (Binns 95). She was Flathead according to Archie Binns, though both Jennifer Brown and Sylvia van Kirk say she was Nez Perce. The Flathead were the home guard for Spokane House, where Ogden was stationed in 1821, while the Nez Perce were more frequent at Ft. Nez Percés, later called Ft. Walla Walla, where Ogden would lead brigades (Binns 94-5; Brown 143; van Kirk 30). Her mother was Thérèse Tête Platte and her step-father was Francois Rivet (he had traveled with Lewis & Clark as far as the Mandan’s; Keith and Jackson 271; Stern 130-31).

It is unknown if McLoughlin or Work paid a bride price, but Ogden did. In Julia’s case Ogden paid 50 horses for her, at which time they rode through the village and to the fort, that was all there was to the marriage ceremony (Binns 97). Douglas got Amanda as a signing bonus when he renewed his contract in 1828, at which time her father William Connolly, having been promoted to chief trader in 1818 and probably a justice of the peace since 1821, preformed the marriage ceremony (Adams 28). All but Ogden rehabilitated their marriages at some point during their lifetime, he having every confidence in Julia’s view of their marriage. However, this missed legality allowed Ogden’s family in England the chance to contest his will at his death in 1854.

Racism and prejudice arrived at Ft. Vancouver in the guise of Christian morals as Anglican ministers were assigned to Hudson’s Bay Company posts and missionaries began to arrive in the Oregon Country in the 1830s. At Ft. Victoria, where the Douglas’ were transferred
in 1848 and Works in 1849, it was Americans that arrived in British Columbia after gold was
discovered on the Fraser River in 1857. One social custom that drew ire from the ever increasing
American population was the fur trade custom of the sexes eating separately. The Whitmans and
Spaldings chose to ignore this custom and on occasion ate in the women’s quarters of the big
house. Marguerite was so upset by this that she could not eat in mixed company (Adams 43;
Fogdall 123). After the McLoughlin and the Douglas families left the fur trade the men and their
children shared the table, quite often with various house guests, though Amelia still retained the
Cree custom and usually ate separately (Adams 146).

This custom was not unique to the Cree. Other tribes like the Nez Perce also customarily
served men first, maybe with older children, while the women and younger children ate
afterwards, if there was anything left (James 28, 31). This custom having served the fur trade, as
business was conducted during the midday meal, mealtime being one of the few times when all
the men were together and from which women were excluded. As more and more colonial
settlers arrived with their prejudice toward fur trade marriages and/or Indian women, Marguerite
and Amelia restricted their appearances in public, entering into a more sedentary lifestyle. This
may have contributed to their health issues, as did a more Western Diet. Angus McDonald, on
the other hand often sent Amelia treats such as “bitter root, camas, and buffalo tongue… [as] she
is much bored by the compound dishes which the rank and wealthy of civilization offer her
table…” (Adams 215; Hussey 270).

While Amelia received some European education, Marguerite, probably did not, having
grown up with her mother’s people (Adams 58). In their cultures and societies these women’s
mothers, however, were highly educated in a manner not generally recognized according to European standards. They understood and applied mathematics to their quill and beadwork, made their own sewing supplies (Farrell Racette 3-5), created clothing without the use of patterns – something my mother’s family could do but seems to have skipped over me; knew how to treat diseases and injuries, what plants to use and how to use them; knew and applied cosmology (Peat 268), and knew a multitude of languages. Amelia’s mother Miyo Nipiy (Susan or Suzanne Pas-de-Nom) knew Swampy Cree and Sauteux, as well as the French of her husband and other fur trade employees (Adams 5-6; Hussey 274). Marguerite’s father was also a francophone, as was her husband Dr. McLoughlin, whose grandmother was French (Adams 34). Julia Rivet knew her step-father’s French and her mother’s Sahaptin language. Josette knew her father’s French and her mother’s Salish. Julia was apparently the only one who spoke English, the lack of which plagued at least Marguerite and Amelia later in life.

Most importantly, they were providers and taught their daughters this skill. This was especially important during the time Amelia and her family was at St James where their primary food source was fish. Douglas’ tour of duty was described as highly stressful and they nearly starved because the fish runs could not be depended on. It was during this time that Amelia was pregnant with her first child, which did not survive. When Ogden and his family were there some years later they subsisted on dried salmon and water. Julia was pregnant at the time and gave birth to a feeble minded child. If it were not for the women’s ability to hunt and trap small animals and forage for wild plants they might have starved. This could very well be why Amelia continued to gather and preserve food even after her husband left the Hudson’s Bay Company to concentrate on his duties as governor. While these women held status within their respective
societies as European civilization caught up to them, their status plummeted to that of prostitutes and drudges (Hussey 267).

While marriage on the Pacific Slope was considered a permanent affair, that was not the case throughout the fur trade. George Simpson, governor of the Hudson’s Bay Company, had a number of dalliances and fathered children by at least three fur trade “wives” and one Englishwoman before marrying his cousin Frances at age eighteen in 1830 (Brown 123). At the top of her social class, Frances had no equal in which to make friends and was lucky if she had the wives of the clergy to associate with. Simpson did his best to keep her segregated from the Indian and métis wives whom he considered inferiors. According to Jennifer Brown, Simpson had the same attitude toward fur trade marriages as the clergy and referred to his fellow officers’ wives as concubines or mistresses (126).

Bringing Frances from London to the Red River Colony was as good as taking her to any other remote posting in the fur trade and, while Simpson was adamant that European women had no place in the fur trade, he started a trend among his officers. To this end Simpson and Chief Factors John George McTavish and James McMillan went on furlough and came back with wives. Whereas, in the past fur traders had left their European wives in the city (Montreal), McTavish went to Moose Factory and McMillan to the experimental farm at Red River with theirs. As if this didn’t cause enough of a stir, McMillian was the only one to separate from his Clatsop wife, Kilakotah, before leaving. The other two “gentlemen” had abandoned their wives and families leaving others to inform them that their “husbands” were not coming back to them (Simpson had directed Chief Factor John Stuart to break the news to his sister-in-law, Margaret Taylor). Consequently McTavish’s wife Nancy McKenzie or Matooskie was forced to marry
Pierre Lablanc in 1831 because her “husband” had not bothered to arrange something (“turning off”) before leaving (van Kirk 182-88).

When employees were not able to go to Europe in search of wives, they turned to the colonies at Red River and the Swiss for wives. Simpson was alarmed at their unsuitability, not as women crossing the occupational divide, but rather, as “ladies.” Red River, established on the frontier in 1818, was a far cry from the more civilized Montréal, London or New York and the settlers daughters had grown up in such a fashion as to draw harsh criticism as to their status as ladies and therefore suitability as wives (van Kirk 183). What was required was a woman who lived “up to their middle-class ideal of womanhood – a lady pure and devout, of beauty, genteel accomplishment, and dutiful obedience” (van Kirk 183). Not women who had been brought up in, and therefore able to handle, the harsh realities of the frontier, and by default, fur trade life.

So it is not surprising that William Connolly left Suzanne for his cousin Julia Woolrich (age 46) whom he then married in 1832 (van Kirk 188-89; Brown 40). In 1803 Connolly (c.1786-1848) of Lachine, Quebec had married Miyo Nipiy or Suzanne (c.1788, Manitoba, d. 1862, Grey Nun’s Convent, Red River colony) according to the Swampy Cree custom of wíkihtowin, aka in the custom of the country (Adams 4). Connolly, like Ogden, never consecrated his marriage. As Brown noted, seven HBC and twenty NWC men seem to have lacked “positive commitment” to their Indian wives (138). For Connolly marrying the chief’s daughter had resulted in an increase in trade at Rat River House (Rivière aux Rats) in Athabasca, but for what other purpose did they marry (van Kirk 29)? They had eleven children, of which Amelia was their second child. Children of such unions were called ápihtawikosán (mixed blood) by the Cree, but were also called bois brûlés (burned wood) by the French Canadians; we
also know them as métis (Adam 5). Connelly gave his children some education, but eventually sent Amelia’s older brother John to school in Quebec City, the same year nine year old James Douglas went to school in Scotland.

Connolly’s clerk James Douglas’ contract (six years) was up in 1826, along with that of another clerk, and Connolly was able to get him to renew it though he was only going to get £60 compared to the other clerk’s £100. When that contract was up two years later Douglas was ready to quite the trade, that is, up until Connolly offered up his daughter as a signing bonus (Adams 27). Connolly officiated at their wedding on April 27, 1828 (Adams 28). In 1829 Amelia gave birth to her first child and a few months later (March 1830) her mother, age 42, gave birth to her eleventh child, Marguerite. In 1831 Connolly went on furlough and settled his family, Miyo Nipiy and their six youngest children, at St. Eustache, Lower Canada (Quebec; Adams 39). He stayed a few months validating his marriage, at which time (Dec) Father Turcotte baptized his two youngest, Marie and Marguerite. When he left Miyo Nipiy in 1832 he married his cousin Julia and the newlyweds moved to his new station at Tadoussac on the St. Lawrence River. In 1843 he took leave which terminated into retirement and the couple lived in Montreal. Connolly died in 1848 at which time his will was read and everything was left to Julia. Miyo Nipiy died in 1862 and in 1864 John Connolly took Julia (d. 1865) to court. Three years later the judge, Chief Justice Coram Monk, declared that though

William Connolly was not legally married to Miyo Nipiy…he had no doubt that

wikihtowin – the Cree marriage between William and Miyo Nipiy – was valid

and, consequently, John Connolly and his siblings were legitimate and Julia
Woolrich Connolly’s marriage was bigamous and her children were illegitimate
(Adams 182).

In Monk’s opinion the couple had been married according to tribal custom which, if that were
not reason enough, was then backed up by 28 years of cohabitation, repute, and public
acknowledgement. This included giving Suzanne his name, caring for her and their children
(even after he set her aside) and seeing to it that those same children were educated (van Kirk
240-41). This declaration is much the same as that for Scottish (Celtic) and Scandinavian hand-
fasting. On September 7, 1869 the Court of Appeals upheld the lower court verdict – four to one
(Adams 183).

Monk’s decision was passed within months of Canada’s confederation in 1867. However,
in 1886 attitudes had changed. In Jones v. Fraser Chief Justice Ramsay ruled against à la façon
du pays as “He declared that the court would not accept that ‘the cohabitation of a civilized man
and a savage woman, even for a long period of time, gives rise to the presumption that they
consented to be married in our sense of marriage’ (van Kirk 241).” In the British Empire there
may have been “a growing antipathy in the nineteenth century towards mixed marriages” but in
the United States manifest destiny and ownership of land weighed in on marital legalities (van
Kirk 241-42).

In their imagined community of the early fur trade, where outsiders were the minority,
the status of wives, whether first generation Indian or second generation métis daughters were
accepted as the status quo. But as the outsiders, 1) stayed put rather than being transient and 2)
began to outnumber fur trade employees in a given settlement the imagined community was
shattered and reorganized into a new and evolving one in which the first families, or early
pioneers, were no longer respected and these young immigrant men no longer sought to marry
into fur trade families for the prestige it offered. These second and third generation daughters of
the fur trade, aside from Martha who seems to have had a bit of a rebellious streak, started to
shun their mothers. They distanced themselves in church and other social events, in order to
reduce the stigma that their Indian ancestry caused in this new society. A society which was
descending as the territory(s) was/were restructured in preparation for joining the larger
governmental structure(s). And, whereas their fathers had been the governing forces within the
communities of their childhood, these daughters saw their fathers struggle to maintain order and
discipline under this neo-colonialism whereby they weren’t just faulted for their marriages to
Indian, half-breed, or métis women, but also, in U.S. territories at least, their citizenship as
foreign nationals, i.e. citizens of the British Empire, was challenged, some even after becoming
United States citizens.

For James Douglas complications also arose around land which the newly arriving
Americans felt should be free. Douglas had indeed suggested that colonists be granted 300 acres
of free land way back in 1848, but the Company had chosen to follow “Parliament’s wishes by
adopting the Wakefield system which imposed a price of £1 per acre on all land, with a
minimum purchase of 20 acres” (Adams 81, 98). Douglas encouraged senior Hudson’s Bay
Company staff members to buy up large quantities of land thereby forming a block that, at least
for a time, remained pro-HBC (Adams 99). On the other hand, Dr. McLoughlin had encouraged
settlement by company men early on as a means of bolstering British claims to the territory. The
American government then allotted 360 acres of free land to those wishing to leave the United
States and settle in the Oregon Country, putting those early claims in jeopardy.
On the one hand, like Douglas at Ft. Victoria, McLoughlin was the face of the Hudson’s Bay Company and the colonial settlers were angry towards HBC “ownership” and control of the land. Over time they also became angry about McLoughlin’s own commercial interests, that is, his development of a claim at the falls. McLoughlin platted Oregon City to counter the Methodist mission’s establishment of a mill (Hussy 144). Most importantly the Americans were angry about McLoughlin’s control over the French Canadian ex-HBC employees who were still on the pay rolls and therefore subject to company influence. This influence was directed towards disruption of any attempts to the establishment of an independent government, something that the Methodist mission felt strongly about, and for which they changed their tactics by holding “wolf meetings” in which only certain settlers were invited to attend (Hussey145). In the end McLoughlin’s claims were sieged by the new government and held until after his death.

The men in these first families were fixtures in their respective communities and their families had to dress in a fashion that represented this status. As their husbands moved from clerks to chief traders and then, in the case of Douglas and McLoughlin chief factors, their wives shed their native clothing and began to dress in European styles. For most of these women – Marguerite, Amelia, and Josette – there are photographs, all in grey scale, or what we would call black and white. These photographs reflect many of the latest fashions and styles. Amelia, as first lady of Vancouver Island and British Columbia, even though she was reclusive, had a number of portraits and photographs done, at least during her life in Victoria and there is one photo each for Marguerite (c. 1855) and Josette (c. 1875).
Josette Work and two of her children are represented in Jean Barman’s *French Canadians, Furs and Indigenous Women* (250). Taken c. 1875 after the family had relocated to Victoria, it appears to have been taken in a studio setting and could possibly be a Tin Type which was popular between 1856 and 1900 (Moorshead 3). In it Josette is seated with her children, Suzette and David, who are dressed in youthful light colors and Suzette with a gay little hat, while Josette is dressed in a medium tone, possibly silk, dress and wrapped in a somewhat darker colored shawl (Barman 250). Suzette looks as though she would rather be anywhere else but there, especially since, in the early days of photography, sittings took so long. David, on the other hand, sits facing his mother, an adoring look on his face.

John Adams only included three pictures of Amelia in his biography of the Douglas family. Separate photos of James and Amelia (print dress with white collar and colored ribbon) on the cover, an inset of the couple together in their old age (her dressed in black from head to toe), and one of her with daughters Agnes and Alice (she is wearing a dark, probably black dress with a white collar and they are in youthful light colors, none are wearing hats or gloves; 136). Stephen Hume included the same picture of Amelia in the print dress in his book *Lilies & Fireweed: Frontier Women of British Columbia* (24). He also included two photographs of her in widow’s black, one of them with a large gathering of family (26-27). None are dated though we know that they were taken between 1849 and 1890.

Ft. Vancouver, and every other Hudson’s Bay Company storehouse, stocked various readymade items of apparel, as well as material, that all employees could buy for their wives and children, but Chief Factors also had the ability and finances in which to order straight from

---

23 A picture of Alice in front of James Bay House shows her in hat and gloves (Adams 144).
London. In 1854, for instance, James Douglas sent away for dresses for his daughter Jane (b. 1839) and her cousin Cecelia Cameron, asking that they have wide seams so they could be let out as the girls grew (Adams 114). In 1856 he out fitted the whole family, placing a substantial order, which for Amelia alone, included: “a black silk dress, a dark woolen dress, a summer shawl, a winter shawl, six shirts, a dark silk bonnet, and a neat straw hat” (Adams 114). The black silk could have been for an evening dress while the woolen dress was probably daywear.

The only photograph of Marguerite is a daguerreotype, popular from 1839 to 1860, it is available on both the internet and in a number of publications including Alberta Brooks Fogdall’s *Royal Family of the Columbia: Dr. John McLoughlin and his Family* (45); NCRI Curation Series No. 4 – *McLoughlin Family Collection* (18); Anne F. Hyde’s *Empires, Nations, and Families: A New History of the North American West, 1800-1860* (103); Dorothy Nafus Morrison’s *Outpost: John McLoughlin and the Far Northwest* (431), and John A. Hussey’s article “The Women of Fort Vancouver” (this reprint is so dark as to barely make it out) (Moorshead 3). In it Marguerite is wearing a dark colored dress with a matching cape or pelerine, a white collar and brooch, but no hat or gloves. A lady never went out without the proper accessories which included jewelry, collars, hats, gloves, and even parasols if she was going strolling, and a wrap appropriate to the season.

In the 1850s the McLoughlins had their pictures taken. Unlike most fur trade families, they did not have a joint sitting nor did either of their sittings include children, but rather, they had individual daguerreotypes taken. This is the only picture known to have been taken of Marguerite. Like other members of the fur trade elite, Marguerite is dressed in western clothing,

---

24 I have never seen the original; however, the printed photos are not sharp though Moorshead stated that it “is extremely sharp and detailed.”
a sign of her collusion with the American immigrant success story (Kosasa 218). The photograph is dated c. 1850 with the Fort Vancouver Historic Site leaning towards 1855 while Anne Hyde stated it was 1857. As the later date represented the year Dr. McLoughlin died I question the reasoning of this late date for the occasion of this, for her, once in a lifetime event. I also question this date as she is not dressed in mourning attire. Unlike Amelia who is definitely dressed in mourning black Marguerite only appears to be dressed in a dark colored day dress.

There is no way to actually know what the bodice of Marguerite’s dress looked like because she has both a shawl and a short cape (plerine) on over it. Either the pelerine or the white lace collar is held by a colored brooch. In comparison, Amelia is wearing a black long cape over a black dress, gloves, and hat. The black is a flat none reflective color as compared to Marguerite’s shinier taffeta.25 Therefore, the photo was not taken after September of 1857. By convention mourning has been defined by two major events: the first, the passing of Prince Albert and the second, the Civil War. After Prince Albert’s death on December 14, 1861 Queen Victoria (reign: 1837-1901) went into isolation for ten years and when she returned to the public eye she remained in full black for the rest of her life (English). This has caused many to view the fashions in old black and white photographs as representative of mourning instead of the “formal occasions that required one’s best dress,” which meant the most current fashion in the color and fabric of the time (Moorshead 6; Hale 112). Mary Todd Lincoln, like Queen Victoria, also spent a lifetime dressed in mourning as her son Willie died during the Civil War. She was in deep mourning for over a year after Willie’s death, dressing in black veils, black crape ‘without the gloss,’ and black jewelry. By 1863 she had progressed

25 Free Dictionary described it as A lustrous fabric with a crisp texture.
to half mourning and appeared in lavender, gray, and some purples, with a little white trim visible at the wrist. But after her husband’s assassination, she returned to full mourning for the rest of her life…A widow mourned for two and a half years, moving through prescribed stages and accoutrements of heavy, full, and half mourning, with gradually loosening requirements of dress and deportment…The work of mourning was largely allocated to women (Faust 147-48).

In comparison a widower mourned for three months, a sister for her brother for six months, and a mother for a child and a child for a parent for a year. Men wore simple tokens of mourning such as “black crape on his hat or armband” or the “badges and rosettes…displayed…for a month after Stonewall Jackson’s death” (Faust 148).

Portraits, at least for women were, according to Halvor Moorshead, regarded as an occasion for which they needed to be “well turned about with their hair adjusted” (7). While the hair-style itself changed over time, for women, the part remained down the middle until the mid-1870s. “Hairstyles, jewelry, parasols and other fashion paraphernalia all changed from year to year…Women in the 1840s [for instance] wore high, tight corsets that gave their upper torso a V shape” (Moorshead 6). From 1841 until 1847 skirts were attached to bodices with the use of gauged gathering (Harding). In 1846 the sewing machine was invented and Marguerite was said to have had one of the first. She was a skilled seamstress who sowed for friend and family whenever the need arose even though it would have been frowned upon for a woman of her class to have sewn for any other reason than for pleasure (Morrison 195).
In the 1850s women’s dresses changed from the gauged waistline to a box pleating, the latter of which is visible in Marguerite’s photograph. The skirts became so full, and often “fully lined with stiff muslin,” that they needed extra support. In 1856 the crinoline or hoop skirt was invented with the ability to carry even more weight. Minimally an under- and over- petticoat were required. Marguerite, however, probably continued to wear a corded petticoat, to keep her skirts off her legs so she could walk. The over-petticoat kept the look smooth, rather than showing the uneven cording of the stiffer petticoat. The under-petticoat covered the legs and offered the only protection before pantalets came about in 1800 (women’s appropriation of men’s under pants; Harding). The sleeves in the 1850s not only remained fitted but also continued to restrict movement (not able to raise arms above head) and the bust continued to focus on the V shape which emphasized a broader shoulder line.

It is obvious that Amelia is in half-mourning in both the Hume (26-27) and Adam’s books. In the Hume book her dress and coat are done in a flat black with white ruffles at the sleeves and a white cap with tails and black gloves. In the insert in the Adam’s book she is seated, with James standing behind her, she is wearing a flat black dress, long cape or coat, and a black bonnet with the veil pushed back and a bit of white peeking out around the edges, and gloves. In contrast Marguerite has no gloves and is wearing a short cape with a shawl just peeking out around its edges, probably for warmth, a white collar and the two fastened with a shiny not a black brooch. Light reflecting off the material gives it contour and definition demonstrating that it is a taffeta silk or similar fabric rather than the dull black of mourning. When a replica of the dress was made for me it was done in a dark chocolate silk tafetta and I wore it without a head covering or gloves and I was still asked if I was in mourning. So ingrained is this impression of mourning that the woman asking the question could not be dissuaded that I
did not represent mourning, but in fact was representative of a specific person. Nor could she be redirected to another Promenade participant, one who was dressed in full mourning from hat and veil to shoes.

Marguerite’s picture, as well as those of other wives (ex. Amelia and Josette) and daughters of fur trade personnel, was originally taken to be displayed in the privacy of her (their) own or the homes of other family members or friends. However, as Eiko Kosasa suggested, once these photographs became part of the public domain they were “Transferred from a personal context to a social and political context… [and they then] become significant representatives of the entire ethnic group” (211). In this case these photographs of fur trade families have become public examples of, not just prosperity, but of the assimilation of Native women and their mixed blood children into American and Canadian society. In her essay “Ideological Images: US Nationalism in Japanese Settler Photographs” Kosasa looked at four photographs by the same photographer. Three that represented “the American immigration experience…evoking the concepts of American nationalism.” One that did not, or rather, was not published in any celebratory books relating to the preceding one hundred years of Japanese history in Hawai’i (211). Her fourth photograph was ambiguous as to its location. At first glimpse it did not represent as a Hawai’i with a Euro-American dominant culture. This ambiguity, while representative of “a nation of immigrants” does not reflect the Yankee culture transplanted by American missionaries in the 1820s and was the ideal by which Hawai’i was expected to evolve.

Native Americans are also viewed within this same framework of “a nation of immigrants” and are expected to assimilate into the dominant culture, something that Julia Rivet Ogden does not appear to have done. And like Kosasa’s photographs which represented the
transition from transitory plantation worker(s) to prosperous colonial settler(s) these fur trade first family photographs represent a transition from transitory fur trade employees, previously at Ft. Vancouver, to colonial settlers in their respective communities – Victoria and Oregon City. While these photographs represented (indigenous) female assimilation they also represented the redemption of male fur traders; that European men (Irish, Scottish, and English) could be reintegrated into civilized society. For those relocating to Victoria it was a reaffirmation that they were citizens of the British Empire and for those relocating to Oregon City it came with the price of allegiance to a new country (McLoughlin became a U.S. citizen in 1851).

Of the twenty-eight chief traders in the fur trade, four - Dr. John McLoughlin, James Douglas, Peter Skene Ogden, and John Work - became prominent figures in the Columbia River basin. They married as clerks, remaining with the same native women – Marguerite, Amelia, Julia, and Josette – until death. They raised families who had a foot in both worlds, being educated by their mothers as young children and then, for most of their adolescence, were educated according to the European standard. Some of their sons found employment within the fur trade while many of these daughters of the country married into the trade. As these men’s condition improved their wives were expected to dress the part which meant, for all but Julia, the shedding of their tribal clothing for that of the latest European fashion. They were also expected to take up other European customs, such as eating European fare rather than native foods and gathering the whole family around the table at mealtime, instead of the genders eating separately.

They also became more sedentary which may have led to health issues. Marguerite died in 1860 and suffered from kidney disease in her final years. Her first husband, Alexander McKay, was killed in an explosion aboard the *Tonquin* in 1810 and her second husband Dr.
McLoughlin died in 1857 in Oregon City. Lady Amelia died in 1890 of “a complication of diseases induced by the accumulating weight of years” while her husband, Sir James Douglas, died in 1877 in Victoria (Adams 215). Julia died in 1886 at the age of 98 (b. c.1788) and Peter Skene Ogden in 1854. It is unknown when Josette died, but her husband, John Work, died in 1861. These four couples were married, sometimes multiple times, in different services: in the custom of the country, by a justice of the peace, and by religious figures. Three of the wives were secure because their marriages were rehabilitated. Both Julia, and Amelia’s mother, found themselves in court cases brought by European relatives seeking to have them disinherited. Today we know about these women and their families because their images, photographs taken for family and friends, have become part of the public domain and as such, they represent the successful assimilation of, not just a woman or her children, but of a whole race of people.
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Prior to moving into the Pacific Northwest in the 1800s the fur trade, and its employees, established relationships with local Indians, some of whom became known as home guards. The home guard was relied upon to provide provisions to the trading post and in turn expected assistance for the sick and elderly, especially when food shortages occurred (van Kirk 15, 16). This familiarity resulted in intimate relations between European fur trade employees and local women. Around Hudson Bay these home guards were the Cree and Chippewa. The Cree territory extended across the continent to the Saskatchewan River and south into the United States as they followed the bison, while the Chippewa, also known as the Ojibway in the United States, ranged from Hudson Bay to Alaska and subsisted primarily on caribou. As the fur trade moved westward more outposts were established and more neighboring tribes became home guards. In western Canada one such trading house was established at Île à la Crosse (Saskatchewan) (the Cree word is Sakitawak means ‘where the rivers meet’) where the Algonquin speaking Cree or Kenistenoag and the Athabaskan speaking Chippewa or Dene homelands converged. It was here that the Hudson’s Bay Company established their English River District. One of their outposts, Frobisher Fort, was under the charge of Patrick Small when, in 1785, Alexander Mackenzie and his cousin Roderick, of the XY company, established a competing trading post nearby.

Amelia Connelly’s mother, Miyo Nipiy, was a Swampy Cree, her band named for the territory they inhabited. She was born near Rivière aux Rats (Rat River) in Manitoba. This is also where she married William Connelly then a clerk with the Northwest Company who became a
chief trader in 1818. In 1816 John McBean was at the Northwest Company’s Ft. William when he became a partner. He had married Madeleine Cloutier whose mother was Ojibwa. Marguerite Waddens was born near Montréal. Her mother was probably a Cree but there is speculation that she might have been Ojibwa or even métis as there is no real information on her. These three women – Amelia, Madeleine, and Marguerite - represented the new daughters of the country. They lived in-between two worlds, learning the traditional ways of their mothers, while also gaining a foothold into the world of their fathers. This knowledge prepared them to assist their fathers as interpreters and culture brokers. As their fathers and husbands moved from post to post these daughters of the country represented a cultural connection that enabled these outsiders (European men) to carry on trade.

As the fur trade moved into the Columbia River basin its employees – European, Euro-American, Euro-Canadian, métis and kanaka – married into local populations, many of which were from tribes that evolved into home guards as new posts were established. At Spokane House, Peter Skene Ogden married Julia Rivet (Plains Flathead) and John Work married Josette Legacé (Spokane). William Kittson was with Ogden on his brigade in 1824-25 when he married his first wife Marie Walla Walla. His second wife was Helen, the daughter of Finan McDonald and Charlotte Pend’ Oreille (Hunter 128; Ens 367). After Richard Grant’s first wife, Marie Anne Breland died, Grant married Helene Kittson née McDonald, her husband having died in 1841 (Ens 366). Alexander Ross helped build several forts including Astoria, Nez Percés (with Kittson in 1818) and Okanagan. While at the latter post he married Sally in the custom of the country (Jetté 30). In 1828, in a religious rite, the two were married again (Bryan 42).
This tradition of “marrying-in” was passed on to Angus McDonald by his relatives Finan and Archibald (married Princess Raven, Chinook). He was sent to Ft Colville in 1839 and later to Ft. Hall. In 1840 he was sent to the yearly rendezvous which was also attended by the Nez Perce which included Chiefs Looking Glass and Eagle-from-the-Light and a kinswoman married to Baptiste “Rascal” and their fourteen year old daughter (Anderson 24). In 1842 Angus married Catherine Baptiste, who is known as a Nez Perce woman rather than a métisses woman. Catherine was a culture broker, having learned Nez Perce culture, language, and traditions from her mother and the fur trade from her father who was French and Mohawk/Iroquois. The ceremony was conducted by the new post master, Chef Factor Richard Grant. In 1847 they had a daughter, Christina, born on the camas prairie near present day Boise. In 1852 they were transferred to Ft. Colville and along the way Christina fell into the river, her Glengarry tartan frock filled with air keeping her head above water until her mother could get her out of the river (Hisbet 1).

In 1854 Angus and Catherine were married in a Catholic rite by Father Joset (Williams108). Catherine, like others, had grown up in the fur trade, accompanying her father on brigade, but found the forts where Angus was stationed, stifling. She, therefore, spent a great deal of time on the prairie with her Nez Perce relatives and raised her daughter Christina to have self-confidence and to understand the autonomy allowed native women. In fact, Christina’s confident was such that she had no problem entering into horse races with (European) men, and winning. With her mother absent from the fort, it fell to Christina to play hostess to all the U.S. military officers, government surveyors, and fur trade dignitaries that came through, as her father had prepared her by raising her in the manner he was accustomed to as the descendant of Clan chiefs. As a woman in-between two worlds she often accompanied her father on business acting
as his clerk and interpreter. In 1870 Christina married a Scot, James McKenzie, who was a chief
clerk. Later she became a trader in her own right, first having learned the business from her
father and then helping her husband.

Aside from McDonald’s Chinook wife, Princess Raven, Julia Rivet, Josette Legacé,
Marie Walla Walla, Sally, Catherine, and Christine McDonald were all from peoples considered
part of the Plateau culture. Lillian A. Ackerman described the geographic boundaries of the
Plateau as laying east and west between the Rocky and Cascade Mountains and north-south from
(the Great Bend of) the Fraser River to the Blue Mountains (75). With two major rivers – the
Frasier and the Columbia – and their many tributaries the Plateau Indian Culture relied on fish,
primarily salmon, for their subsistence.

Like the Chippewa they were considered egalitarian, that is, that neither men nor women
were superior to the other, instead, their labor was considered complementary to that of the other
(Sharp 65; Ackerman 83). While men hunted, providing meat (large game animals and fish),
women prepared the meat and hides and were the owners of that food source and the product
produced from tanning the hides to make such items as shelter, clothing and moccasins
(Ackerman 82). Women also gathered and prepared all other food sources such as grain, berries,
and small animals (Ackerman 80). While they each had their own jobs to do both men and
women had the necessary (cross) skills to live on their own if required. Any taboos they had
towards the handling of another’s tools, such as a woman’s gathering basket or digging tool or a
man’s fish weir or hunting tools, were considered complimentary, that is, if there was a taboo for
men then there would also be a related one for women and vice versa. On the other hand, neither
gender could have contact with the other prior to the first harvest ceremony and during either the
gathering of seeds, berries or other plant foods, nor for hunting and fishing (Ackerman 96). These periods of abstinence also served as birth control.

Another Algonquin speaking tribe was the Blackfoot.\textsuperscript{26} Their territory extended from Western Saskatchewan to Alberta and through Montana. After they acquired guns they became a force to be reckoned with. Even the Hudson’s Bay Company brigades sought safety in numbers and traveled with Nez Perce or other tribes going in the same direction they were. The Blackfoot lived in the foothills, their lands were part of several river drainages including the Missouri, South Saskatchewan and the Snake, but they were not fish eaters, instead they hunted bison, antelope, deer and elk. The Blackfoot used bison pounds in order to harvest buffalo meat with every adult participating in the process from the drive to butchering. After which the women took over drying the meat, tanning the hides, and therefore owned the product of their labor. Furthermore, “Some women specialized in certain crafts, such as tipi making, and exchanged or sold their work in the specialty to other women” (Kehoe 115). It is important to note that both men and women had the ability to accumulate wealth and were knowledgeable about the use of the power they obtained through that wealth. The Blackfoot had a term, \textit{ninauposkitzipxpe} or manly-hearted, for women who were assertive, owned property, were forthright, good managers and effective workers (Kehoe 115). Such a woman was both feared and respected by her peers, both male and female. Alice Kehoe stated however that “Blackfoot men claimed they wanted women to be submissive, docile, and quiet…” (115). This did not mean, however, that they wanted their women to become subservient like European women.

\textsuperscript{26} Tribe is made up of Piegan (Pikuni), North Blackfoot (Siksikal) and Blood (Kainah).
The arrival of missionaries, like the Jesuit Father Joseph Joset, was the first step in chipping away at the autonomy of women who held a complimentary status with men in Chipewyan, Blackfoot and Plateau societies. In one instance Father Joset noted that the women would not submit to Christian obedience which he attributed to the fact that they held ownership of all food stuffs. This made them, in the Father’s opinion, too independent and haughty (Ackerman 77). He missed the fact that, unlike his own society where men owned everything, Native women also owned their own homes, not the men, because they were the ones who, not only tanned the hides, but also moved the lodge from place to place and setting it up and taking it down as necessary. Men in Plateau society provided a third to a half of the food through salmon followed by hunting, while in Chipewyan culture they provided up to ninety percent, which was primarily caribou. Women provided nearly seventy percent of the caloric intake in Plateau culture whereas, in the subarctic, plants provided few if any calories and no agricultural options (Sharp 50, 51; Ackerman 80). In Blackfoot society men burned the landscape to encourage grasses while the women cultivated camas, dug turnips and other roots, tubers and bulbs, and picked a wide variety of berries (Kehoe 114).

Missionaries also strove to interrupt migratory subsistence patterns by instituting the practice of agriculture whether the land cooperated or not. This resulted in permanent instead of seasonally occupied villages, which in turn, led to the implementation of the nuclear family framework promoted by both Canada and the U.S. When it came time to make pay outs, according to Henry Sharp, women were seen as being the responsible adult in charge of children (64). While in the United States, men were the ones to stand in line for commodities, leaving the women and children to stood on the sidelines. Traditionally women had participated in seasonal
rounds that might cover up to 1500 miles and interacted with other women, women they no longer saw once they became more sedentary.

The Chinook tribe, which Archibald MacDonald’s wife Princess Raven came from was of the Coastal Indian culture whose territory occupied the lands between the Cascade Mountains and the ocean. The Coastal Indian culture stretched from the Oregon-California border northward into Canada. To the southeast (Oregon area) of the Chinook and Plateau tribes were the Shoshone. The Shoshone had gradually pushed the Riverine tribes from the south bank of the Columbia River to the north bank and extended south into California. At Ft Nez Percés the fur traders were constantly trying to get the Plateau tribes (Nez Perce, Walla Walla, and Cayuse) to make peace with the Shoshone so they could come in and trade. The Plateau tribes refused; though they had suspended aggressions long enough to acquire horses in 1730 (Conner and Lang 31; Dickerson 16). In 1834 Nathaniel J. Wyeth built Ft Hall and in 1838 sold it to the Hudson’s Bay Company. This positioned the HBC for trading within Shoshone territory.

Prior to the fur trade Shoshone territory had extended from the Saskatchewan River (Alberta, Canada) to New Mexico. They were divided into three different groups: Northern – subsisting on large game animals such as bison, of which a branch became the Eastern Shoshone, Western – subsisting on rabbits and other desert animals, and the southernmost peoples became known as the Comanche (Wells 18). The Comanche having been around horses since 1598, it was not unusual for them to trade horses to their northern relatives with horses arriving in Idaho in 1690 and Western Montana about 1710. Not all the Shoshone acquired horses. Some, in both the desert and the mountains, chose to remain traditional. The Northern Shoshoni evolved a culture which had traits of both the Great Basin and Plateau, which Merle W. Wells termed a
composite culture (18). Those that became mounted and traveled to the plains also added Plains Indian culture into the mix (Wells 23). It was this acquisition of horses that had drawn Lewis and Clark to the Shoshone.

Richard Grant, who managed Ft Hall from 1842 until 1852, had joined the Hudson’s Bay Company at age eighteen. Grant was from Lower Canada, the son of Scottish emigrants William Grant and Marguerite Laframboise, whose parents had emigrated from France (Ens 364-5). While at Ft. Edmonton Richard married his boss’s, Chief Factor John Rowland, adopted daughter Marie Anne Breland. She was the daughter of the widow Louise Umfreville (Scott-métis) and her late husband Pierre Breland or Berland (French Canadian). Maria had three brothers, one married the daughter of Cuthbert Grant, who may also have been Richard’s brother, and her name was also Maria. In 1835 Maria Ann Breland died and eighteen months later Grant took a leave of absence to take his children to Trois-Rivières, Quebec where he had family. The couple had three sons, William, Richard and John and a daughter, Jane (Ens 366).

John, known as Johnny, born in 1833 at Ft. des Prairie (Edmonton, Alberta) stayed in Quebec until age fourteen (1847) when he and his brother Richard Jr. joined their father and step-mother at Ft. Hall where he learned the fur trade. In the meantime Richard Grant Sr. had married William Kittson’s widow Helene McDonald and their house, up to that point, had been full of girls. Besides their own daughters, Julia, Helen and Adeline, they were also raising Helene’s daughter, Jemima Kittson (Ens 18, 367). Because there were no white women on the frontier these daughters of the country were the only available marriage partners for the fur trader employees.

---

27 Grant had taken over for Portuguese born Francis Ermatinger who had been working the Rocky Mountain fur trade since 1832 (S. Anderson 18).
Johnny Grant learned the fur trade from his father and a stint at Ft. Vancouver, at which time his father sent him out on his own. He was married to at least four, and possibly seven, Indian women at one time – all from different tribes (Blackfoot, Shoshone, Bannock, Flathead, and Pend d’Oreille), as related in Grant’s memoir (Ens 320n12). Not only did these women bring their skills which enhanced his business, but they also brought with them a kinship network that added to his business success, but more importantly, they brought a sense of security. Whenever a band of Indians approached their camp the wife from that tribe came out and talked to the men while the other wives and children hid. Gerhard J. Ens, the Canadian editor of John Francis Grant’s memoirs, *A Son of the Fur Trade*, listed eight marriages in his appendix of which Grant’s country marriage to a Shoshoni woman, Quarra, is listed as the second marriage (368-69).

Quarra (sometimes spelled Cora) was the sister of Tendoy who was chief of the Salmon River or Lemhi Shoshoni. According to Ens, Cameahwaite, who was chief of the Agai’Dika (salmon eaters) Shoshoni during Lewis and Clark’s visit, was succeeded by his nephew Snag (whom Ens stated Sacajawea adopted), and who was in turn succeeded by his nephew Tendoy (370-71). Johnny and Quarra were married when she was 13 (Ens 159) and they had six children before she died in 1866. Grant stated that “she spoke several Indian languages as well as English and French” (Ens 166), she had a way with horses, and she had worked at Ft. Hall before they married so she had learned to cook and sew and could make butter (Ens 100). Grant commented several times on her sunny disposition and the fact that she was good with the children and had easily adapted to the lifestyle of a European woman demonstrating the attitude that Indian and métis women were beginning to be expected to assimilate into European culture. Native women were expected to assimilate, not European men. As European settlement began to encroach upon
the fur trade frontier women-in-between were seem as “marrying-out” of their mother’s culture and into their father’s culture as demonstrated by the Grant family.

Johnny Grant said of his wife Quarra, in the American edition of his memoir *Very Close to Trouble* that “She could make my clothing as well as a tailor” (Meikle 87). Native women had been sewing for centuries easily adapting new materials into their traditional way of life. This skill was in great demand in the fur trade as women were set to work making moccasins, snowshoes, and other items of necessity. The fur trade outposts refused to support women who lost their husbands but had allowed them to support themselves as seamstresses (Hussey 290). Like Quarra native women who lived and worked at fur trade posts began to sew more and more clothing in the European style. As the status of their husbands changed, such as Richard Grant at Ft. Hall and Dr. McLoughlin’s at Ft. Vancouver, their wives and children, such as five year old Christina McDonald, were expected to dress accordingly.

At Ft. Vancouver there were several widowed women living in Kanaka Village who thus supported themselves and their children, including Pierre Chrysologue Pambrun’s wife, Catherine Humpherville. After Pambrun’s fall from a horse resulted in his death in 1841 his family was sent from Ft Nez Percés, where he was a Chief Trader and the fort manager, to live at Ft. Vancouver to Catherine worked as a seamstress. Their daughter Maria was one of the children who had accompanied Catherine to Ft. Vancouver. She later married Shetland Islander, Dr. Forbes Barclay, the medical doctor at Ft. Vancouver.

Trade goods had appeared on the Plateau from about 1700 on, arriving from both the western coastal sea trade as well as from the south where Shoshone traders acquired horses and cattle from the Spanish, and later, the Mexicans. According to John Terry the earliest European
(i.e. Spanish) ships began to arrive in the 1540s and from 1774 to 1800 he estimated that 311 ships traded along the coast (21). This period of early trade – 1700 to the 1810s - is defined by Larry Cebula as the protohistoric period (4). During this time trade goods arrived in the Pacific Northwest, from all the cardinal points of the compass and were incorporated into local Native lifeways. Not necessarily in the form intended by the person initiating the trade as cloth was first used by the Native women as an ornament on traditional buckskin dresses rather than as an item of clothing in itself. Most notably, during this time period was the trading of Sacajawea’s blue beaded belt which the Captains traded for a white, ermine tail coat. Blue could not readily be made from natural materials, and was therefore, in great demand by Native Americans until it flooded the market. Having a belt made of blue beads was evident of Sacajawea’s standing as it gave her an extreme amount of prestige.

Women wore buckskin until cloth became plentiful. As women began to wear trade cloth dresses, just as with blue beads when they first arrived, these pioneering women were endowed with a special prestige; but as animals were trapped or hunted out of an area, the wearing of cloth dresses became a necessity, and that prestige was lost (Her Many Horses 27). Native women then sought to return to the rarer and harder to acquire (or buy) buckskin. Native fashion then, just as with European, Euro-American, and Euro-Canadian women, revolved as much around the foundation fabric as with its style and ornamentation. Fashion in European circles, however, was more reflective of social class whereas Native fashion invoked identity, culture, tradition and the ancestors (Her Many Horses 11-12).

While Larry Cebula examined the protohistoric period for its adaptation of religion through such events as the evolution of the Ghost Dance, the intertwining of material culture and
religion was also visible in women’s fashion. For instance the French Ursuline sisters introduced silk appliqué work to the St Lawrence Valley in the 1640s; it is thought that these floral designs later found their way into Native beadwork (Johnson and Yenne 54). European fashions were taken up by fur traders’ wives, having first seen French and later Scottish settlers, wearing them in such places as Montréal and Toronto. In Albany the officers ordered magazines that sported the latest fashions as well as dressmaking items, lace, ribbon, and cloth (such as chintz and calico; van Kirk 99). In the 1820s Peter Rindisbacher, a Swiss colonist, sketched métis women wearing what was termed the “Canadian” fashion which demonstrated how Native women created a new identity incorporating European design and materials into the Native culture. Ft. Vancouver curator and textile authority, Eileen Tristain stated the “Canadian” style was based on a (French) Josephine style gown with a short jacket. The open neckline being covered with a scarf and the outfit completed with Native women’s beaded leggings and moccasins (van Kirk 101).

For the most part Native women never took to European shoes and while officer’s wives wore hats laborers wives did not, instead they used their blanket to cover their head. In the Rocky Mountain fur trade (1824-40) there were few examples of women’s fashion and “proper” behavior available to Native and métis women before the arrival of the missionaries and their wives in the 1830s. While the missionaries laid over at the rendezvous on their journey west the wives found themselves in large demand making dresses for fur traders to give to their Indian wives and sweethearts (Ottman 73). At Ft. Vancouver (1824-60), according to fort historian John Hussey, the “Wives of fort employees, whether they lived in the village or within the pickets, wore European clothing.” Here officers’ wives did wear European shoes while the rest of the
women wore moccasins and universally, Native women wore beaded leggings. The Indian Trade shop carried fabrics in gingham, bombazette, and cassimere (Hussey 288).

Just as Native and métis women in populated areas, such as fur trade posts and financial districts such as Montréal, took to wearing European fashions, so traditional styles of clothing was altered by trade goods. In 1833 Karl Bodner painted a Teton Sioux woman, Chan-Châ-Uiá-Teüin in a side-fold dress. Popular in the Upper Missouri River region, the western Great Lakes and the northeastern Plains in the early 1800s, this style represented a sedentary lifestyle rather than that of mobility offered by the horse. In the mid-1830s the two-hide dress evolved making it possible for Indian women to ride astride, a condition often commented on by fur traders, missionaries, and the like who were used to the constraints of a European system that required their women to ride using a side saddle. On the Plateau this dress was called a “tail-dress” as the tail was left on both hides used for the garment, preferably the skins of female animals, as it was thought that the wearer acquired certain properties of the animal whose skin she wore” (Her Many Horses 28). By the 1870s three hide dresses (one hide for the yoke and two for the skirt) were in vogue; Southern Plains women used two additional hides for fringe which looked like flowing grass when these women danced.

When the Nez Perce transitioned from the two-hide buckskin dress to trade cloth they kept the same basic style though the dress became known as a wing dress because of the sleeve. The tail was replaced with quill or beadwork on the yoke. Sleeves, which had been made by sewing the hind leg skins together as far as the elbow were now left open under the arm allowing the material to flap, or material was added to form a cap sleeve. To add more volume and flare another piece of material was added from under the arm to the hem (we used this technique to
make a dress big enough for one of our reenactors as we had miss measured the diameter needed and cut it too narrow to fit). Trade cloth dresses were made from a single piece of material with only side seams. Unlike European styles which consisted of two separate pieces, a bodice and a skirt and their multiple seams. Nez Perce trade cloth dresses, according to interviews done by Caroline James, were made from “woolen felt, flannel, corduroy, and velvet” and lacked fringing (40, 44, 47).

As previously stated a Native woman’s dress was more than the material(s) used for the foundation garment. She would have an everyday dress with little or no ornamentation and then she would have a ceremonial dress which we would recognize today as being heavily seed beaded, probably in a Lazy Stitch, over much of the dress and her accessories. Seed beads, however, were not available prior to technological advances in the 1830s. The early trade beads were large bulky things used in necklaces and other forms of decorations. It wasn’t until the 1830s that the small seed bead began to appear “on the northern plains, and by the 1850s, was the dominant medium…” and by the 1870s “Sioux dresses were being fashioned with fully beaded yokes” (Farrell Racette 3; Her Many Horses 27, 40). The Nez Perce had beads around 1780, at first glass and then brass. These large “pony” beads were used for “necklaces, dresses, cradleboards, and ornaments for [the] horses [tack]” (James 47). In the 1900s cut glass beads were introduced and remain popular today (Her Many Horses 17). Just as trade cloth replaced the labor intensive hide preparation for buckskin clothing, so beads replaced labor intensive quillwork, however, the Nez Perce were famous for horse-hair quill wrapping and their clothing

---

28 Introduced in 1675 in the great lakes and 1800s on the plains, became known as pony beads, (Her Many Horses 23, 27).
and ornaments were very popular trade items prior to the introduction of beads. After the 1877 War the art form all but died out (James 51).

First identified as Cree, Dene, or Anishinaabek before it was identified as a distinct style, Métis beadwork represented their love of color, with some pieces having more than “twenty different colours on a single design – with metal beads strategically placed to catch the light with movement” (Farrell Racette 4). Their best work was done prior to the union of the Northwest Company and the Hudson’s Bay Company when the métis were the great buffalo hunters of the plains supplying pemmican to the Northwest Company (Farrell Racette 4). It was during this time that they were able to acquire the best velvet and woolen broadcloth by which to back their work, which was done with Italian beads. Sherry Farrell Racette equates the “joyous visual celebration” of Métis beadwork to that “of the fiddle music and jigging that so characterizes the Métis spirit.” Beadwork, Farrell Racette stated, served as a form of meditation and prayer. The beadwork, was mostly floral, but was also representative of Christian beliefs as well as including the French fleur-de-lis and the Scottish thistle (3-5).

Like Farrell Racette, Juanita Growing Thunder Fogerty spoke “of the spiritual side of beadwork” when she relayed her mother’s sentiments on a good day of beading. On those days her mother Joyce would say “Oh, I must have had a lot of help on this one” and she stated “that her mother understands that ‘there are spirits that come with [beading]’ (Her Many Horses 46).” Sioux beadwork reached its pinnacle during the reservation period (late 1800s-early 1900s) when the “traditional Sioux style” was created and formalized (Her Many Horses 46). As part of their coming of age young girls often spent their isolation during their first menses beading a pair of moccasins and in contemporary times, Juanita Growing Thunder Fogarty (Assiniboine/Sioux)
stated that she spent five years making her first dress. “It’s kind of a womanhood rite,” Juanita explains. “When a Sioux girl finishes her first fully beaded top, she becomes a woman” (Farrell Racette 46). Though generally women beaded in groups where their individual expertise at stitching garments or cutting out patterns contributed to the welfare of the group at large (Farrell Racette 3-4).

In the Columbia Plateau women continued to use natural materials as well as the new trade items which, according to Emil Her Many Horses, make them hard to date. Dresses were decorated with a variety of natural materials, including porcupine quills used for quill work, elk teeth, and the dewclaws of deer all of which became hard to come by as the area became more inundated with Europeans and were gradually replaced by European trade goods. Elk teeth, the eye teeth of which there are only two, were of ivory and represented longevity. When they could no longer be obtained they were carved out of bone, today they are plastic. A large number of elk teeth on a dress represented the skill of the husband as a good hunter, or the fact that he was wealthy enough to be able to trade for them, first through the Indian trade network and later the European fur trade (Her Many Horses 37). Dew claws on dresses were replaced by tin cones or trade metal. Wearing jingly things was a warning to other people of a young woman’s approach so that proper protocol, such as a proper chaperone, could be arranged. This was to insure that the woman was not alone with certain family members, like a father-in-law (Her Many Horses 24). In the 1980s dresses decorated entirely with cones (tobacco tin lids rolled to form a cone) and known as Jingle Dresses became popular with the younger set at Pow Wows.

29 My mother has a necklace made out of the teeth from her, not my dad’s, first elk kill.
While the women at Ft. Vancouver wore European clothing, Indian leggings or gaiters were still seen, especially when on horseback, peeking out from under their skirts (Hussey 288). Leggings were made out of cloth, generally blue or red, and were heavily beaded; showing off the women’s sewing skills and reflecting their tribal influence and individual flair for design. Officers’ wives were provided with beads and other trade items as new shipments arrived, giving them prestige. Women who accompanied brigades had to work but were not paid for this activity. They were responsible for packing, moving, and setting up camp, as well as the day-to-day activities of cooking, collecting fire wood, and raising child, but most importantly, they tanned hides. Their work was reflected in their husband’s pay (bonus) due to the quality if not the quantity of tanned hides produced. From their pay/bonus trappers brought their wives such items as beads, thread, or needles, by which they could decorate clothing items such as leggings, belts, and bags, as well as horse bridles and other accessories.

Native women had long been adapting European trade goods into their lives and onto their clothing since the 1500s. The arrival of the horse in northern climes meant changing from a wrap-dress style to two-hide and three-hide dresses which allowed women the ability to ride astride, like men, rather than sidesaddle as was the European custom. Metal and cloth were both cut up and used as either ornaments or soaked to remove the color and used as sources for dye before they became significant items of clothing or household goods in their own right. The most identifiable example of this adaptation came about in the 1830s when seed beads became part of the fur trade. Native women evolved into extraordinary artists decorating every piece of leather and cloth they came across with detailed designs identifying their culture and individuality. Not only did they decorate their own clothing and that of their families but they decorated everything
that went on their horses as well. After seed beads became available young girls, as part of their coming of age rite, beaded a pair of moccasins or dress yoke.

There were always women at Ft. Vancouver (1825-1860) though they rarely showed up in the record. Of the first year McLoughlin wrote that there were two women and two children present and Governor Simpson wrote that almost all the servants had wives/families. According to John Hussey the French Canadians refused to sign on unless they were allowed to marry and the Scots held a similar attitude (1977). Two major events happened in the 1820s which impacted women in the fur trade. The first occurred prior to the construction of Ft Vancouver when, in 1821, the Hudson’s Bay Company and Northwest Companies merged. A large number of Scots from the Northwest Company filled the officer ranks of the new Hudson’s Bay Company and insisted on retaining country marriages. The London Committee responded by instituting a marriage contract. The second issue to impact Native women was a campaign, or social movement, aimed at women in the upper and middle-class known as the “Cult of Domesticity.”

There was nothing new about regulating marriage. The Northwest Company had passed an edict in 1806 which forbid marriage to Native women in areas where trade was well established. The new regulation consisted of several parts, starting with asking permission of the man in charge of their respective outpost for permission to marry. Once granted permission employees were able to draw what they needed from the company store to pay the bride price. Where possible the couple was married by a justice of the peace, but in any case the couple was required to sign a contract which, among other things, stipulated that they seek a church service.
at their earliest convenience. This system increased protection for the daughters of the fur trade, as well as their mothers, but only for marriages after 1821 (van Kirk 108). Marriages prior to that were still subject to “turning off” and court actions challenging inheritance, such as what happened with the Connelly family (see chapter three), could go either way depending on the climate at the time. “Turning off” had originated, as with marriage in the custom of the country, as part of Indian culture. It harkened back to the fact that either party, men or women, could choose to end a marriage at any time. European men, however, had also used the custom as a means of switching sexual partners (van Kirk 51). The Hudson’s Bay Company had resisted any form of marriage because of a threat to their security in the early years, according to T.M. Devine (201). Later on they did not want to incur the expense of transporting employees and their families.

The second major event was a campaign aimed at middle and upper class Euro-American women, which also seeped into the lives of Native women. The “Cult of True Womanhood,” also known as “the Cult of Domesticity” (1820-1860), came on the heels of the Second Great Awakening (1795-1835), the campaign was waged in religious literature, magazines, and kitsch (what we know as coffee cups and other materials with slogans on them). Euro-American woman like Narcissa Prentiss (1808-1847) were moved by religious revivals and some, like Narcissa, decided to join missionary efforts. Narcissa was one of the earliest generations to be raised according to the “cult of domesticity” which emphasized that women should be stay at home moms and raise as many children as they could. Her job was to insure a safe environment for her husband, who worked outside the home and to do all manner of work – cooking, cleaning, and laundry- for little or no reward.
Narcissa, however, was not an ordinary housewife. As the wife of a missionary doctor, as well as a missionary in her own right, the job was even more taxing because her house was open to everyone and she had little privacy. In preparation for her work Narcissa had become a teacher and, as it happens, turned down fellow classmate Henry Spaulding’s proposal. She married Dr. Marcus Whitman in 1836. In 1837 Narcissa had her only baby, Alice Clarissa Whitman who, at age two drowned getting a drink of water. In 1844 her depression and grieving were alleviated when seven orphans arrived on her door step. Other orphans followed, as wagon trains rolled through, and fur trappers left their children to be educated at the mission school. These orphans allowed Narcissa to be both teacher and mother and she was able to impart the four virtues - domesticity, submissiveness, purity, and piety – of “true womanhood” on the next generation as many of the older girls lived through the 1847 incident at Whitman’s mission to raise families of their own.

Narcissa Whitman came west in 1836 and stayed several months at Ft. Vancouver while her mission was being built. Other missionary women also came through Ft. Vancouver as well, including Anna Marie Pittman and Eliza Spalding. But they were not the first European or Euro-American women in the country as in 1813 the Northwest Company had hired Jane Barnes and sent her to Ft. Astoria where she had worked as a seamstress. In the 1840s other European women followed including Jane Beaver, Mrs. Capendale, Anne Charlotte Covington, Martha Cable, and Sarah Crate (Hussey 1991, 278). Like the missionaries they did not travel around the world alone, but accompanied their husbands to jobs at forts Vancouver or Nisqually or the Puget Sound Agricultural Company. Also at the fort at this time were several Hawaiian women including Kanaka William’s wife Mary. Both William and Mary had been educated by missionaries, who had themselves arrived in Hawai‘i in the 1820s. In 1845, Hussey estimates that
one in five of the 160 women (as compared to 210 men) at Ft Vancouver were mixed-bloods or métis, many of these were officers wives who were expected to dress and conduct themselves according to European social norms.

As more European and Euro-American women came into the western regions they perpetuated the mythology of what a “True Woman” was. Men like Governor Simpson gave up their native wives and went to Europe looking for cultured women to marry, many of whom married their cousins. Men no longer returned to the port of entry when they completed their contracts, but chose to settle among their wife’s family or one of the towns that began to grow up near trading posts like French Prairie (Willamette Valley) or Red River (Winnipeg). The Hudson’s Bay Company had always encouraged the education of métis sons, but discouraged the education of the daughters of the country which coincided with the rise of the “Cult of True Womanhood.” This social movement insisted that women spend their time reading the Bible or an occasional novel, but not too many, as they needed time to contemplate its meaning. It was felt that women needed little or no education to be contented in their roles as wives and mothers.

Native women, even from patrilineal tribes, had more autonomy than Euro-American women, because they held ownership to the products of their labor. Euro-American women, like Narcissa Whitman, were raised under the “Cult of Domesticity” which required them to be highly religious (piety), remain pure until marriage, be submissive to their husbands (all men), and dedicate their life to a domestic sphere that provided sanctuary to their husbands, while depriving them of any creative outlet and self-fulfillment. Native women owned their own homes and whatever food, whether it was obtained by their own hand, traded for, or provided by men,
and had a say over how their children were raised. Missionaries like Father Joset found this condition unacceptable as it denied them submissive and obedient converts.

However, since the 1560 Reformation, the Scots had a strong attitude toward education which stressed that everyone should be able to read the Bible, in their own language, and be able to interpret it without aid from religious leaders. John Knot set out a tier system that would put a school in every parish, a grammar school in every town, a high school and/or college in every major city topped by universities, there were five built between 1410 and 1593, though most wealthy Scots and Clan Chiefs sent their sons to Europe (Szasz 36). The Highlands did not fare as well as the Lowlands so the Scottish Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge (SSPCK), established in 1709, set up their own school system which included sending missionaries to the Highlands to teach English and stamp out the Gaelic language and superstitions. Scotland then became a strong Calvinist, predominantly Presbyterian, state. The Presbyterian tendency toward “elementary learning to enable reading of the Bible by the laity” was underscored, according to Devine, in the American colonies by such events as the first “Great Awakening” of the 1730s and 1740s (fueled by the Scots-Irish love of fire-and-brimstone revivals) and the American Revolution (163).

While education was still primarily the domain of the church on the North American frontier religious institutions were virtually nonexistent so most fur traders (such as Richard Grant and Dr. McLoughlin) sent their children to Quebec, either Quebec City (1608), Montréal (started as a mission school in the 16th century) or Trois-Rivières (1634; later site of a convent). In 1794 the Hudson’s Bay Company sent school books to its outposts on the Bay but left
instruction up to the children’s fathers. In the early 1800s the London Committee decided it was time to send schoolmasters to the Bay for a more formalized educational structure. The Committee had trouble, at first, hiring teachers and those headmasters that they did send out were usually more interested in the fur trade than teaching school and catechism class. What the Bay men really wanted, however, was to send their daughters off to boarding schools. They didn’t just want to give them a proper education; they wanted to separate their daughters from their Indian mothers’ influence and attitudes about sex which disrupted any attempts for Bay men to teach their daughters the virtue of chastity (van Kirk 103).

By divorcing their daughters from their Indian family, Bay men left their daughters vulnerable and “increasingly [more] dependent upon white male protectors… For a mixed-blood woman,” according to Sylvia van Kirk, “who lacked close ties to her Indian relations or was unaccustomed to the hardship of their existence, life was fraught with danger after the withdrawal of white support through death or retirement” (106-7). On the other hand, fur traders didn’t just marry Native women for their kinship ties, but also because they understood the nuances of native life, and therefore served as culture brokers. This attitude curtailed any potential educational opportunities and reduced their daughters’ effectiveness as brokers. Several traders, including James Douglas, were saved by native and mixed-blood women who understood these subtleties, but suddenly these qualities did not mesh with what their fathers considered a “true woman.”

Fathers, then, took the first steps towards assimilating their daughters into civilized society: 1) by restricting their contact with their mothers and Indian relatives and 2) through marriage to non-Indians. Whereas fur trade employees had married into Native cultures, now
their daughters were “marrying-out” to European newcomers, fur trade officers or ships captains, ministers, government officials, military officers, etc. The next step toward full assimilation was done by the government who designated them as non-Indian. Additionally, Native women, and native culture, came under attack in Canada with the passage of the Indian Act of 1876 which removed Indian status should a Native woman marry a non-Indian or non-status Indian man. Native men, on the other hand, could marry any woman he wanted and she would be granted his Indian status. In the United States it was the implementation of blood quantum, implemented with the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, that trumped cultural identity, and people who had been Indian all their life suddenly lost their status.30

While ideological institutions like the church, schools, and the media campaigned for “True Womanhood,” it was fur trade fathers who, 1) by severing the ties of daughter-to-mother and 2) marrying- their daughter “-out” to European men rather than “-in” to Native men, engineered the assimilation of the daughters of the country which ultimately resulted in the loss of Indian status. As trading posts evolved into settler communities, such as Edmonton House (1795) which is now Edmonton, Alberta, the stress of fitting into society was felt by mixed-blood daughters who then began to regulate their own proximity to their Indian mothers. An example is the Ross family who settled in the Red River colony, now Winnipeg, Manitoba. Alexander Ross came from Scotland to Canada and worked as a school teacher (1805-1810) in Glengarry before hiring on with Astor’s Pacific Fur Company (Brown 171). After Astor’s company was bought out by the Northwest Company Ross shifted his alliance to them. When the HBC and NWC merged he was retired, but continued to work for the new HBC for several years before taking his Okanagan wife, Sally, and mixed-blood children to Red River.

30 British first used blood quantum in Virginia colony in 1705.
Alexander and his wife Sally had thirteen children, most born after the couple settled in the Colony. Four of them were the most well-known. Two of the sons went into politics with James embracing his Indian ancestry (Brown 219). Daughter Henrietta married Rev. John Black in 1854. The Reverend’s Scottish Presbyterian congregation would have preferred that he not marry a woman of Indian descent and “it was predicted (albeit wrongly) that Black’s unfortunate choice of ‘a native for a helpmate’ would be detrimental to his ministry” (van Kirk 234). Henrietta was not the only one to feel the hostility of the community because of her ancestry, her sister Jemima attempted “to avoid being seen riding to church with her mother” but was chided by her brother James towards her disloyalty to her mother (van Kirk 236). Among Alexander Ross’ numerous occupations at Red River were school teacher and author. While he remained true to Sally he never mentioned the family’s Indian connection. This complacency allowed the government to re-designate the daughters of the country as non-Indian.

The Northwest Company did not have a policy pertaining to the education of company children as; for the most part the French did not consider such an education to be important. Officers, who were mostly Scottish, did however consider an education important and many men sent their children off to Montreal or one of the neighboring religious schools. They were more concerned with their daughters’ future prospects and passed an edict in 1806 prohibiting marriage with Native women in areas already well established within the fur trade. The Hudson’s Bay Company opposed marriage with Native women but had to grant cessions when it merged with the Northwest Company in 1821 and marriage was one of those. As part of the process, employees had to get permission from their post commander, draw supplies to pay the bride price, and sign a contract agreeing to honor the marriage as though it was a conventional marriage, and seek a religious ceremony as soon as possible. The Hudson’s Bay Company
encouraged the education of male children but not female children by sending books and later recruiting headmasters and headmistresses to run post schools.
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CHAPTER FIVE:
Conclusion

I grew up in a pioneer culture. As such my ancestors, by crossing the continent by wagon train, participated in the United States’ colonial policy in the Pacific Northwest. As these early pioneers died their exploits (and the subliminal message of their participation in colonialism) were published in every newspaper that could claim a connection to them. Because I did not find an obituary for Marguerite McLoughlin when I was working on her story for my chapter on “First Families,” I decided to write once according to the style of the time.

Oregon City, 1860: Marguerite McLoughlin, 80, died in her Oregon City home after a long illness. She had lived here for 14 years. She was born about 1775 or 1776 near Montreal to Jean Étienne Waddens, a Swiss fur trader who died in 1782. She married Dr. John McLoughlin, businessman and founder of Oregon City, November 19, 1842 in a Catholic service held at Ft. Vancouver. Dr. McLoughlin was born in Quebec in 1784, the son of Irish farmer John McLoughlin and Angelique Frasier (d. July 31, 1842), and died on September 5, 1857 at his home in Oregon City. Marguerite enjoyed sewing for friends and family and

---

31 Waddens had gone to Saskatchewan about 1779 and was killed, possibly by Peter Pond or his clerk, in Lac la Ronge (Gordon 59-61). Wadin – Swiss Protestant (Brown 112). Wadin, a Swiss Protestant was killed in a dispute. His daughter was born in Indian Country (Brown 157). Peter Pond murdered Wadin in 1782 (Hyde 99). Wadin “had been shot in a fur-country squabble (D. Morrison 58).
32 Married in Catholic Rite (Hyde 138); 1811 – consent of marriage (58); civil marriage (D. Morrison 258); Married in 1811 (Hyde 104); Solemnized by Blanchet (142).
33 (Hyde 97-98). Angelique was the daughter of Malcolm Fraser (Scotland) and Marie Allaire (French Canadian). She married John McLoughlin in 1778. John’s uncles were Simon and Alexander Fraser. Alexander was also in the
owned one of the first sewing machines. She was also an accomplished seed bead artist. She will be buried beside Dr. McLoughlin at St. John the Apostle Catholic Church. She is preceded in death by Alexander McKay (1811), John McLoughlin, Jr. (1842), Joseph McLoughlin (1848), and Thomas McKay (1849-50). She is survived by Eloisa Harvey of this city, Eliza Eppes, David McLoughlin, Nancy McCargo, Mary Sinclair, and Catherine McConnick (Webber 3).

Obituaries usually included the number of grandchildren and great-grandchildren, but her daughter and son-in-law Eloisa and Daniel Harvey may not have known about the extended family. I did not include that information here as it would have taken more research into genealogical databases than is necessary for this project. Notice that Marguerite’s Indian ancestry has also been rendered invisible.

The above obituary reaffirms Marguerite McLoughlin’s life as presented in “First Families” as a woman in transition from the wife of a clerk to that of Chief Factor. Like Amelia Douglas who became a Lady of the Realm after her husband James Douglas was knighted, Marguerite was at the top of the social ladder and had no equal. At this same time the Hawaiian monarchy was trying to prepare the Kingdom for a place equal to that of European powers and I can’t help but compare Marguerite’s social standing to that of future Princess Victoria Ka’iulani Kalaninuiahilapalapa Kawekiu Lunalilo. Marguerite was always a woman-in-between two cultures, but never more so than when she “married-in” to the fur trade at Ft. William. Raised in

fur trade and married Angélique (Indian). His marriage to Angélique to upheld by the court while his relationship with servant Pauline Michaud was considered illegitimate (Brown 92-93).
the Indian villages of Sault St. Marie from the age of six, she was well versed in Indian culture, and found refuge there in 1808 when she was “turned-off” by her first husband, Alexander McKay. For the next three years her daughters were immersed in this same Indian culture before the family returned to the fur trade.

The First World War, known in Canada as the Seven Years War (1756-63) and in the U.S. as the French and Indian War (1754-63), was pivotal to Marguerite’s story. Her father Jean Étienne Waddens (Wadin) was a French speaking Swiss Protestant who served in Quebec in 1757. Unhappy with what was going on in Quebec at that time he left the military to join the fur trade where he became a casualty of the fur trade wars. In 1779 he “became a member of the ‘nine parties’ agreement” a predecessor of the Northwest Company (Cooper). Then in 1782 Waddens was killed by trader Peter Ponds, or his clerk, when an argument broke out in the Waddens’ home. Waddins died of blood loss from one or more gun shots. Inquiries were made but as the incident occurred in the Hudson’s Bay Company territory of the Lac la Ronge area of Saskatchewan the Northwest Company did not feel they could pursue the matter (Gordon 59-61; Brown 157; D. Morrison 38, 58).

Also serving in Quebec during the French and Indian War were Donald McKay (1759) and Malcolm Frasier (1761). After serving in the 78th Foot Donald McKay (pronounced McKī) settled in the Mohawk Valley and Malcom Frasier, who served in the Frasier Highlanders, settled in Quebec on “the seigneury of Mount Murry” (D. Morrison 4). The British government had opened up land for settlement by military soldiers and, for the most part, these emigrants settled wherever Highland soldiers had fought such as “the Hudson, Champlain, and Saint Lawrence valleys, the Maritime provinces, and the Carolinas” (Calloway 205).
In the Mohawk Valley, Sir William Johnson had lands to rent. Johnson, an Irishman…considered Highland Scots industrious people and settled them on lands he had obtained from the Mohawks. About twenty veterans mustered out of Fraser’s Highlanders and their families settled on Johnson’s estate. Most of the people listed on the rent rolls [after 1773] were Macdonnells, along with Camerons, Chishoms, Frasiers, Grants, McGregor, McKays, McPhersons, and other clans (Calloway 206-7).

Britain had resorted to sending convicts to its American colonies as part of its colonial policy but now it had a new immigration source and began to disband its military forces in North America rather than after they were sent back to Britain. Land was made available as an incentive so that its soldiers could become productive members of society and not a burden on the colonial government(s). This new situation altered Scotland’s immigration pattern as well. For centuries Scots had immigrated to Western Europe, Ireland, and to a lesser degree, England. Now, with Scottish soldiers taking up land in the colonies, they were sending letters home to friends and relatives telling of their good fortunes and asking them to come over. This was the beginning of a trend known to genealogists as chain migration. Highland Scots, in particular, practiced this system of migration as they tended to move as whole families or even villages. Lowland Scots, on the other hand, tended to relocate as individuals and to assimilate into the established population.

Being loyalists the McKays/MacKays moved north as tension in the lower colonies mounted. They removed first to Trois-Rivières in Lower Canada and then settled “in the
Glengarry region of Upper Canada, at Martintown” (J. Morrison). By late 1791 Alexander, born in the Mohawk Valley in c.1770, and his two brothers Donald and William, were Northwest Company clerks. In 1800 Alexander was made a partner (J. Morrison). During this time he had two wives and five children. With his first wife he had a son, Alexander Ross McKay who would die in British Columbia (Caledonia) in 1811, a few months after his father died in the explosion of the Tonquin in Nootka Sound. With his second wife, Marguerite Wadden, he had a son and three daughters (J. Morrison). In 1808 McKay left the fur trade only to turn up in 1810 as one of John Jacob Astor’s partners in the Pacific Fur Company. With him was his and Marguerite’s son Thomas (1797-1849) who was employed as a clerk.

There is some disagreement as to when and for how long Marguerite was married to McKay. Anne Hyde stated that she “married prominent Nor’Wester Alexander McKay in 1793;” this is also the official position of the Fort William Historical Park which stated that she was eighteen when “she married Alexander McKay a la façon du pays (marriage in the custom of the country) and together they had four children: Nancy, Mary, Catherine, and Thomas” (Hyde 102; “Thunder Bay”). According to Richard Matthews, a volunteer at the McLoughlin House in Oregon City, Oregon, she was age fourteen (b. ca. 1789) when she became McKay’s consort. Mathews also stated that McKay abandoned Marguerite and their children when he signed on with Astor’s Pacific Fur Company in 1810. The date of their marriage, however, is not as controversial as this, their divorce. There is little or no discussion in the literature that McKay “turned-off” his family as it was generally thought that he either abandoned them or died, providing an opening for the influence of romance, even an affair. Like Pocahontas with Capt. John Smith and Sacajawea with Capt. Meriwether Lewis, Marguerite was paired with Dr. McLoughlin in a failed attempt to rehabilitate her, to make her over into the image of an “Indian
Princess.” However, according to new literature, including that of Anne Hyde, the union lasted until McKay’s retirement in 1808 at which time “he left dowries for his daughters but took his son Thomas, aged eleven, with him” (Hyde 102; D. Morrison 52-57; Brown 157). At that time McKay sent her back to her relatives (“turned off”) along with the couple’s two daughters. Besides the new addition of dowries, “Some Nor’Westers did leave their Indian wives an annuity for the purchase of goods from the Company stores, but they also resorted to a more novel expedient to relieve the burden on the Company” (van Kirk 50). The fur trade was in transition and still observed the custom “known as ‘turning off’” whereby a bourgeois leaving the country arranged to have his spouse (sometimes his entire family) placed under the protection of another officer or, in many cases, an engagé” (van Kirk 50).

It is ironic that with all this controversy over Alexander’s termination of his relationship with Marguerite nothing has been said about the fact that his three daughters were in fact two (Nancy b. 1801 and Mary) and that Marguerite was pregnant with their third daughter (Catherine b. 1809) at the time she returned to her Indian family; thereby abandoning a pregnant mother with two small children. Marguerite did not enter into another fur trade marriage until 1811 when Catherine was two. Dr. McLoughlin’s contract was coming to an end when he married Marguerite. The literature attributes his renewed contract to his brother David’s need for finances to get through medical school. McLoughlin had a reason closer to home, a two year old son Joseph born the same year as Catherine (1809). It is possible that Joseph’s mother died shortly after his birth whereby Dr. McLoughlin became a single parent raising an infant son. When the two families came together Marguerite became the mother of two toddlers, and two young girls moving into their pre-teens. In 1812 she had the first of four children with the Dr. In 1820 she watched Dr. McLoughlin, eight year old John, six year old Elisabeth and twelve year old Joseph
leave for Montreal (Hyde 106-07, D. Morrison 121, 278). Dr. McLoughlin accompanied his
cchildren that far on his way to London where he was to represent the Northwest Company in
egotiations with the Hudson’s Bay Company.\textsuperscript{34} When Marguerite crossed the continent to the
olumbia District four years later her older daughters were married and almost lost to history.\textsuperscript{35}
She was accompanied on her arduous journey by the two youngest, Eloisa age seven and David
age four.

Just as Richard Grant had taken his children William, Richard, Johnny (age three), and
ane to live with their grandmother in Three Rivers where they would receive an education and
cculturation into British society, so Dr. McLoughlin took his children to his uncle Dr. Simon
iator in Montreal. Anne Hyde stated that this was so that the McLoughlin children would have
ore advantages in a changing society, but in essence Dr. McLoughlin was severing his daughter
isabeth’s ties with, not just her mother Marguerite, but with her culture group – her and her
ther’s people (89). By putting Elisabeth in the care of his sister Marie Louise (Sister St.
ney) at the Ursuline convent in Quebec her Indian upbringing was peeled away and she
amed to be a cultured British woman according to the dictates of the time, the “Cult of
onomy” (D. Morrison 121, 278). Like her older sister Nancy, Elisabeth “married-out” of
her culture by marrying British Army officer William Randolph Eppes in 1833 (D. Morrison
78).

\textsuperscript{34} Dr. McLoughlin traveled in the company of Angus Bethune, Marguerite’s nephew. Bethune’s mother was
onique Waddens. Her father was “a Swiss Protestant named Jean Etienne Wadin” (J. Brown 112). The pair
epresented eleven other traders proposing to merge with the HBC (Keith and Jackson 238, Fogdall 50).

\textsuperscript{35} Nancy married Robert McCargo ca. 1816. Mary married William Sinclair in 1823. Catherine moved to England
aving married a McCormick or O’Gorman. (Morrison 292-93, 121). Eloisa would marry HBC clerk William Glen
ae (Scot) in 1838.
For the next ten years the fur frontier settled into a routine and created an “imagined community.” The fort had had foreign visitors throughout this time, but issues arose when, in 1836, Reverend and Jane Beaver were sent to Ft. Vancouver by the London headquarters coinciding with the arrival of the first American missionaries to the Oregon Country. For the two years they were at Ft. Vancouver the Beavers were housed in the Bachler’s quarters. They had been unprepared for frontier living and were unhappy with their accommodations, meals, and servants, which included a young Hawaiian couple. Beaver also refused to let his wife, Jane, associate with the women of the fort, whom he considered their inferiors. He also felt this way about the American missionaries. Beaver put up with Narcissa Whitman and Eliza Spaulding attending his services but he was not willing to share teaching duties. When he could not get Dr. McLoughlin to retract his invitation for them to help out, Beaver went straight to the ladies and told them to leave off. He was also appalled at the number of Catholics employed at the fort and upset that McLoughlin conducted separate services in French and English. Dr. McLoughlin insisted it was so that all could have an opportunity to attend in their own language (D. Morrison 255). Beaver had insisted on taking over the fort school which he used as a means to indoctrinate the children into the Church of England counter to Dr. McLoughlin’s insistence that it be conducted as non-denominational.

To further alienate the population Reverend Beaver refused to baptize women before they traveled to other posts where they were to marry company employees as he considered any weddings not performed by him illegal. He routinely preached against such conditions making no distinction between marriage (outside the church) and prostitution. He refused, therefore, to baptize Chief Factor Douglas’ daughter Ellen (b. 1836) before her 1837 trip until after he had married her parents, James and Amelia Douglas (Adams 44). Things came to a head when Rev.
Beaver verbally assaulted Marguerite, both in letters to London and in public, for which Dr. McLoughlin struck him. Being the bigger man, McLoughlin made a public apology, but Beaver refused to accept it. All dealings then fell to Douglas, who had been able to get along with Beaver, but eventually even Douglas’ patience was sorely tested and he began to appeal to the London committee for relief. Even after the Beavers left the fort his attacks on Ft. Vancouver and her personnel continued for several years. The Beavers were replaced by the more compliant Catholic priests, Father Blanchet and Father Demers, who understood that the best way to get couples to marry within the church was through baptism and non-condemnation of the predominant lifestyle (D. Morrison 261).

The school, which Rev. Beaver had tried to corrupt for his own agenda, was established at Ft. Vancouver in 1832. It operated whenever there was someone available to hold classes. The school was open to everyone including Indians and often held separate classes for children and adults. After Sarah Julia Ogden married Archibald McKinley in 1840 she began attending the school at Ft. Vancouver. While London supported the education of boys with occasional shipments of books, at Ft. Vancouver one third of the students were girls. This was no doubt because in Scotland women and girls had more freedoms than in England, including the right to an education. The largest population of students was the children of the (Catholic) French Canadians who had little if any education themselves, and most often worked at the lowest paid jobs of the trade. In 1845 Dr. McLoughlin brought in a Hawaiian couple, William R. Kaulehelehehe, aka Kanaka William, and his wife Mary S. Kani, as a teacher to minister to the fort kanakas. With this non-denominational school, an insistence on marriage longevity (no “turning-off” of wives) and respect for their wives, the officers in charge of the Columbia District formed the backbone of the Pacific Slops “imagined community.”
The American missionary community lacked the converts they needed in order to show the home office that they deserved to remain open. Several, including Jason Lee and Dr. Marcus Whitman, turned their attentions towards promoting immigration into the Willamette Valley and the Columbia Plateau. With colonial settlement came government and racist attitudes found purchase in the region. According to Peggy Pascoe, in her book *What Comes Naturally*, the Willamette government established pole taxes for bringing in and/or hiring kanakas, as well as “negro, Chinaman...or mulatto” (79). The kanakas were the major labor force for the Hudson’s Bay Company who often sublet them to the missions. Without kanaka labor these missions would not have been built or continued to operate. Miscegenation laws were cropping up all over the west in the 1800s with Oregon passing its law in 1866. Washington Territory (1853-1889) had a Color Act from 1855 to 1868. An amendment was added in 1866 which prohibited marriage between whites with blacks or Indians (Pascoe 98). This was not new legislation as Virginia (1691), North Carolina (1715), Massachusetts (1786), Rhode Island (1798), and Maine (1821) had all enacted similar legislation. Some of them were in opposition to Patrick Henry’s 1784 bill encouraging intermarriage between (free) whites and Indians with a guarantee of citizenship for their children (Pascoe 94).

Fur trade marriages on the frontier served to move Indian tribes into trade networks which then allowed for the passing of land out of Indian hands into those of whites through land claims. Indians were than relocated to reservations opening up more land for settlement. By recognizing marriages in the custom of the country or Indian marriages, “American state laws, which vested the right to economic authority and land ownership in husbands…, used marriage to confirm the land and property rights of White husbands” (Pascoe 96). Yet, this does not quite

---

36 Miscegenation laws banning marriage to Indians were also passed in NV (1861), ID (1864), and AZ (1865).
work for the McLoughlin’s who had their land seized by the Territorial Government and held for
twelve years. The 1850 Oregon Donation Land Claim Act was put into effect before Indian tribes
were moved to reservations five years later. The Act stated that white men and half-breeds had
the right to claim land up to 350 acres of land. They could also claim another section in the name
of their wife whether she was white or Indian, but an unmarried Indian woman could not take up
a claim.

Claim jumping was a problem in the Oregon Territory and it was not just these Indian
wives’ land claims that were in jeopardy. William McBean, clerk at Ft Nez Perce from 1846
until 1851, retired from the Hudson’s Bay Company and took up a donation land claim at
Frenchtown. He first applied for citizenship, as most or all Hudson’s Bay Company employees
were expected to do, only to find out that his birthplace fell south of the U.S.-Canadian border.
His lawyers stated that as he claimed his mother was a Fond Du Lac Chippewa, a band or tribe in
which the U.S. government had treaties, he was already a U.S. citizen no matter where his
birthplace was. Having established his right under the 1850 Oregon Donation Land Claim Act to
take up a claim, McBean’s lawyers urged the court to protect him and his claim from further
assault (the boundary had been changed once already due to claim jumping). There was no
mention as to whether they had taken up a claim in his wife Jane Boucher’s name, or not, or if
she had had any issues with claim jumpers.

With the arrival of American immigrants the Hudson’s Bay Company had divided up its
Ft Vancouver property into sections and put employees on them as claimants with Dr.
McLoughlin moving to Oregon City to take up the Company’s claim there. Though he “bought”
the Oregon City Property (took it as part of his severance) and became an American citizen, his
claim was seized by the Oregon Territorial Government (Hyde 509). It is possible that part of
the reason it was held for twelve years was that the government was waiting on the outcome of
the 1854 Territorial Court case - *Vandolf vs. Otis*. The court’s decision was that these frontier
arrangements were not seen as illicit sex but as marriages and as such the court “protected White
husbands’ property rights by bringing Indian women and mixed-race children within the circle of
familial inheritance rights” (Pascoe 97). Another reason could have been that both Dr.
McLoughlin and William McBean had the taint of their past employer; the London based
Hudson’s Bay Company, on them which ran counter to American manifest destiny.

Even though Marguerite lived in the Oregon City house until her death in 1860 it must
have been disconcerting not to know from day-to-day if she would be allowed to stay or be
evicted at any moment. Citizenship was not an option for Marguerite, however, and the property
was not released to her, but to her descendants, son-in-law Daniel Harvey. What a difference a
few years, and a few miles, would make. Christina McDonald was born on the Camas Prairie
near Ft. Hall in Idaho in 1847. Her father was ethnically Scottish and nationally a British subject.
He applied for American citizenship when he retired from the Hudson’s Bay Company and
settled his family on property he bought from the HBC.\(^3\) Her mother was a daughter of the
country as she had a Nez Perce mother and an Iroquois father (he was Mohawk and French). In
1870 Christina married James McKenzie and helped him with the business just as she had her
father. He resigned from the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1872 and the couple opened their own
trading post at Kamloops (B.C.). When he died in 1873 Christina was made the executor of his
estate and continued to run the business until 1877. Christina was not, however, a U.S. citizen.
Like Marguerite their status as women and their Indian ancestry precluded them from citizenship

\(^3\) Ft. Connah, which later became part of the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana.
until 1888 (provided their husbands were US citizens), with all Indians becoming eligible for full citizenship in 1924.

Initial efforts by American missionaries to form a territorial government had waned, but in 1843, at the last ‘wolf meeting,’ American settlers once again focused on a more structured form of government. The 1843 Organic Law was also signed by at least seven French Canadians, though that number was reduced to two in the retelling (Jetté 170). Most French Canadians were concerned with the US-Canadian boundary issue and their land claims. American pioneer chroniclers would craft a mythology that became a standard by which historians passed on as fact, the reason that the French Canadians opposed Territorial Government was because of their pro-British allegiance (Jetté 171). With the passage of the 1844 and 1845 Organic Laws which “recognized equal rights for male citizens from the United States and Great Britain and theoretically sanctioned the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which recognized the preexisting land title of the region’s indigenous inhabitants,” the French Canadians agreed to support the new government. However, very few had enough education in which to take an active part in governance other than to serve on a jury (Jetté 173).

While the French Canadians were allowed to participate in the new “white males only” government, Hawaiians were not. When the US-Canadian border was finally settled and the Oregon Territory officially recognized Hawaiians presented themselves before government officials requesting to become American citizens so they could vote in the June 1849 election. The Governor turned them away as “Kanakas were excluded on the basis of federal legislation limiting naturalized citizenship to White males. The 1849 Oregon census, entitled ‘an enumeration of the inhabitants and qualified voters,’ did not count Hawaiians” (Barman 14).
When Congress passed the 1850 Donation Land Claim giving “every white male settler or occupant of the public lands, American half breeds included” land grants “an Oregon territorial delegate [was] initially opposed.” Samuel Thurston’s reason was that “giving ‘land to every servant of the Hudson’s Bay Company, including some hundreds of Canakers, or Sandwich Islanders, who are a race of men as black as your negroes of the South, and a race, too, that we do not desire to settle in Oregon.” He later amended his statement by saying that when those foreigners “left the company, or shall leave it, and prove their love of our country by completing their final oath of love and allegiance… [they shall] be taken into the fold of American citizenship – aye, sir, shall have a donation land grant; but I am not for giving land to Sandwich Islanders or negro…” (Barman 14). While Thurston opposed US citizenship and land claims to kanakas, under Canada’s 1860 exemption law kanakas did become eligible to claim 160 acres (Koppel 63,86).

Not only were they barred from obtaining Donation Land claims, but they were barred from marrying white women. While Washington Territory “only forbid marriage between Whites and Indians” Oregon’s 1966 legislation “made it unlawful ‘for any white person, male or female, to intermarry with any negro, Chinese, or any person having one-fourth or more negro, Chinese or Kanaka blood, or any person having more than one-half Indian blood; and all such marriages, or attempted marriages, shall be absolutely null and void’” (Barman 14).” In contrast, when British Columbia became a province Hawaiians, who were considered White, became citizens with all the related rights including the right to vote and own land (Barman 14-15). In 1844 the HBC had between three and four hundred Hawaiians working for them in such positions as “shepherds, gardeners, dairymen, sawmill workers, and general laborers,” but with more American settlers arriving every year and pressing for a determination on the border issue
the Hudson’s Bay Company started its move north to Victoria and the Hawaiians followed (Klan 41).

The American Army had moved onto the Ft. Vancouver grounds in 1849 and by 1860 had worn out their welcome. A skeleton crew had been left at Ft. Vancouver until 1860 waiting for the United States to process claims and buy out the Company. William R. Kaulehelehe was one of those who had stayed. Also known as Kanaka William he had arrived with his wife Mary S. Kaai in 1845. Soon after Mary vanished from the record, but according to Yvonne Mearns Klan, William could be found working “as an ‘assistant’ in Victoria until at least 1868-69” after which he also vanished from the record. Dr. McLoughlin had requested of his Honolulu office that it find “a trusty educated Hawaiian of good character to read the scriptures and assemble his people for public worship” (Klan 40). William and Mary arrived the next year and he became the chaplain of the ‘Owhyhee Church.’ The couple was initially housed in the Kanaka section of what was known as Kanaka Village. Generally where employee villages occurred they were named after the French Canadians that made up the brigades and worked as oarsmen. At Ft Vancouver, however, the village was named for its year-round agricultural staff, the Hawaiian kanakas. Within the village the various ethnicities, of which there were over 25 European and Native groups, including Americans, Scots, French, métis, and Iroquois, established their own separate neighborhoods. When the brigades were in, the village grew to about 500 making it the largest community between San Francisco and Sitka (Koppel 27). This then was how the couple came to reside in the Hawaiian or kanaka neighborhood of Kanaka Village.

However, the Hawaiian population was not happy with William’s arrival fearing the loss of what little free time they were allowed, so the couple was moved into the stockade (Klan 39;
Koppel 25-26). At some point William returned to the village. We know this because in 1860 he was one of fourteen staff remaining at Ft Vancouver. At that time the Army had “appointed a board ‘to examine and report upon the value of certain improvements on the military reserve, placed there by the Hudson’s Bay Company’ (Klan 42).” William’s house had become a dilapidated dwelling by then and he was ordered by the Army to evacuate it. He refused and reported the incident to John Work. The Army then began to tear the house down around him and so he finally left. Taking up refuge a safe distance away, he watched as they burned down his home (Klan 43). Shortly thereafter the remaining HBC employees moved to the Victoria headquarters.

Also living off-and-on in Kanaka Village was John Coxe/Cox (Naukane), a member of King Kamehameha’s extended family (Koppel 15). Coxe had been sent as the king’s agent in 1810 to watch out for the Hawaiians’ interests. He was traded to the Northwest Company who took him across the continent and back to the Columbia by ship (Keith and Jackson 56). In 1814 he returned to Hawaii. Naukane/Coxe had then sailed to England with the royal family in 1823, where misfortune struck with the death of King Kamehameha II. In about 1827 he returned to the fur trade at Ft. George. After several years he retired, only to come out of retirement a few years later to become a swineherd at Ft. Vancouver (Koppel 27). He was living in Kanaka Village in 1849 when Reverend Damon made a visit to Fort Vancouver. There is no record that he married but he is reported to have been succeeded in the company by Naukanna, whom Tom Koppel stated may have been a son or nephew (28). Naukanna would later become leader of the Gulf Island community after the Hawaiians removed from Oregon (Koppel 115).
Hawaiians had been signing on as hands on ships since the arrival of Captain Cook (Chappell 94). They began to sign on as fur trade labor with the arrival of the Pacific Fur Company in 1810. Jean Barman and Bruce McIntyre Watson stated that they “were able to piece together the work lives of some 400 indigenous Hawaiian employees” (Preface xi; Chappell 95). The Hawaiians signed on with the fur trade for a salary that included both cash, which “varied between $10 per month and $100 annually,” clothing and food (Barman and Watson 45-46). At Astoria the meager supplies ran out before the return of the Tonquin (the supplies were blown up with the ship) resulting in the Astorians having to live off the land, primarily fish. The Hawaiians adapted well to the fish, especially the oily salmon, but the other employees did not do as well many becoming ill (Barman and Watson 47; Koppel 15). Without knowledge of the local fare the company soon began to show signs of scurvy. A Native woman would probably have added something simple, like white pine needle or bark tea to their diet to provide the necessary vitamin C. 38 As more outposts began to raise their own food local Indians were often hired at the various jobs. Women, for instance, were hired to do the weeding at the northern posts. In the 1840s Indian men were hired at the agricultural stations. They were paid “four to eight pounds per year” compared to the Kanakas seventeen pounds per year (upper end of the scale) and the British sheepherders thirty-five pounds (Koppel 49).

In 1824 the Hawaiians were salaried at £17 a year- the minimum wage for servants of the lowest rank. Other employees resented the Hawaiians’ elevation to salaried status… [which] was therefore reduced to £10 a year,” the same pay as the uneducated French Canadians (Klan 39). In 1828 a sawmill was built at Ft. Vancouver and its eight-man crew of Hawaiians was paid £17

38 Other plants might have included cranberries, pawpaws, persimmons, currents, and cherries. Pioneers ate rosehips.
plus food (biscuits and salmon) (Koppel 22). Over time the HBC had established a hierarchy which evolved into nine gradient ranks, with the laborers or engages being at the bottom.\footnote{Paid £6 a year increasing to a £14 maximum in 40 shilling increments. Though initially the Hawaiians had little or no education, they saw to it that later generations took advantage of educational opportunities when they were available (Barman 17,19).}

Generally those with some education started out as junior officers, mostly clerks, but also interpreters or postmasters.\footnote{Neither Newman nor Stern stated how much an apprentice clerk received, but they did state that guides, interpreters and postmasters were paid £15.} Angus McDonald signed on to the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1838 as a laborer even though he was an educated man with relatives in the trade. He rose to the position of a clerk and was later made manager of the Colville district. According to T.M. Devine, Scots were well suited for fur trade life because of the “rigorous curricula of the Scottish burgh grammar schools, in which they would spend five or six years after leaving the parish system at the age of eight or nine.” This training was far more than the French system at that same time and when Scottish students were finished they were fluent, both in writing and speaking Latin (Devine Ends 30).

The other grades included craftsmen/tradesmen (£36), clerks, and chief traders. The highest were chief factors (factors/governors), who were paid £100 to £300 in the eighteenth century (Newman 152-53,148; Stern Chiefs & Chief Traders 98-99). It was difficult to reach these last few levels as the numbers were restricted. Alexander Ross immigrated to Canada where he taught school for a while before signing on with Astor in 1810. He never made it above a clerk even though he stayed on with the Northwest Company after Astoria was sold, opening a number of posts in the Columbia District. He also worked for the Hudson’s Bay Company for a few years after the merger before relocating his family to the Red River Settlement where he again taught school.
As the fur traders became more entrenched within the Pacific Northwest Hawai‘i became both a port for recruitment and receiving shipments of food and trade goods. About 1833 the Hudson’s Bay Company established an agency in Honolulu.\(^{41}\) Through this port the company shipped supplies to its West Coast outposts and they in turn sent them on to London. As other ventures developed at Ft. Vancouver additional commodities were also shipped through Hawai‘i including wool, lumber, flour and fish, especially salmon (Lomax 10). It was from these shipments that Lomi Lomi Salmon began, evolving into a luau staple. During this same time Ft. Nisqually and the Puget’s Sound Agricultural Company (PSAC) were established to fill the increased demand for flour (Sage 39). With agricultural stations at Cowlitz and Forts Vancouver and Nisqually more Hawaiians were needed. In 1842-43 Ft. Nisqually employed ten kanakas to work with its sheep and cattle herds. In 1844-45 Cowlitz employed sixteen kanakas out of twenty-six employees. The PSAC employed twenty Hawaiians at its Belle Vue sheep farm on Sand Juan Island from 1853 until the end of the Pig War in 1872 (Koppel 68). These numbers gradually dwindled as unmarried men were moved around and outposts closed. One married man, John Kalama, married into the Nisqually tribe. Mary Martin was one of five daughters of the local chief (Koppel 49-50). Their legacy is the city of Kalama, Washington. The men on Sand Juan moved to the Gulf Islands, after the island was given to the Americans, where they established a small community that became known as “Little Hawaii.”

By necessity Hawaiians wore European clothing and, at least the first year, received clothing as part of their pay. Annually everyone at the fort received new clothing and any replacement articles could be purchased ready-made. Scots favored Scot Bonnets and other

\(^{41}\) Barman stated that the HBC had an agent in Honolulu from 1829 until 1850 (12) and that the Kingdom of Hawai‘i had maintained consular offices abroad, until it was annexed by the U.S. in 1898, three of which were in British Columbia (16).
articles of traditional dress and some were even known to sport kilts. Not only was this a means of identification in the diversity of the fur trade, but after the 1746 Act of Proscription restricted the wearing of Highland dress, there were only two way Scots could continue to wear the plaid. One was serving in the military and the other was by immigrating to North America where the Dress Act and Disarming Acts were not enforced. In the region around Hudson Bay Native women even included the Scottish thistle design in their bead arts and crafts. Native women in the Pacific Northwest had had access to European trade goods along the west coast since before the protohistoric era. These early items were generally dismantled and used as dye or embellishments on traditional clothing. To transform the traditional buckskin dress into a trade-cloth dress (T dress) gave the woman wearing it presage and meant that her husband was quite wealthy; much like Sacajawea’s blue bead belt. Native women could not create a blue dye and so blue beads were highly sought out until they saturated the market. Once everyone was wearing the trading-cloth dress, women looked for ways to return to the traditional buckskin dress.

At fur trading posts Native women who were the wives of fur traders, not the women who lived in the home guards, wore European fashions. In the 1820s the mixed-blood women of the Northwest Company were wearing what was referred to as “the ‘Canadian’ fashion” which combined the European high-waisted (Josephine style) dress, long sleeved jacket, and a scarf to cover the low neckline, with Indian styles of leggings and moccasins, and topped off with a shawl or blanket that served as both coat and hat (van Kirk 101). At Ft. Vancouver the wives were again distinguished from the home guard Indian women through fashion. All the wives wore European styles, while the laborers wives combined them with Indian leggings and moccasins. Women learned about fashion from magazines provided by the officers and from

---

42 Ships had been arriving since the 1540s while the protohistoric period was considered from 1700 until the 1810s.
what they saw European women wearing because there were European women at both Ft. George (Jane Barnes) and Ft. Vancouver.

While there were a few Hawaiian women on the west coast, for the most part, Hawaiian men had few options for marriage partners. According to Tom Koppel, “At least eight Kanaka men formally married Indian women between 1838 and 1842” (26). In the summer of 1838 seven children from Hawaiian-Indian unions were baptized. Archibald McDonald encouraged his men to marry Indian women which served two purposes, 1) calm hostilities with the Natives and 2) get the men to renew their contracts (Koppel 45, 46, 47-8, 56). Just as the French Canadians and their Indian wives had created a hybridized society that developed into the Métis culture of the 1860s and 1870s (Métis Rebellions of 1870 and 1885) the Hawaiian’s contributed cultural traditions to their mixed-blood families, including their method of fishing known as *hukilau* and the luau which, on the Gulf Islands, became a moveable feast (Koppel 116, 117). In the early 1900s the first generation, the men born in Hawai’i who had signed on with the HBC, began to die and slowly the connections to Hawaiian traditions and culture became part of the past. Then Paul Roland began to investigate his ancestry and in the 1970s contacted his Naukana family in Hawai’i which led to an all-expenses paid visit to Hawai’i. The news media found out about the small enclave and the “found colony” became big news for a while. The community caught on to the excitement, renewing their interest in their kanaka past.

In summary, Scots created a new “imagined community” in the fur trade. They had exported their militarism to armies all over Europe and that militaristic upbringing had found a
home on the North American frontier. They continued to wear Scottish regalia even after the 1746 Dress and Disarmament Acts restricted their usage in Scotland. Scottish officers continued to speak Gaelic to each other, even in the face of such extermination measures as the placement of SSPCA missions in the Scottish Highlands for the education of children, in English.\textsuperscript{43} However, the language of the fur trade remained French (Canadian) and, in the Pacific Northwest, Chinook Jargon which was spoken throughout the region by Indians, fur traders, and settlers alike.\textsuperscript{44} The language was a combination of Indian, European, and Hawaiian languages. Scots combined their form of contract marriage with that of the local natives to create the ‘Scottish Model’ of country marriage, also known by the French as à la façon du pays.

By “marrying-in” to Indian tribes on the frontier and French trade houses in Montreal they created networks which served not only the fur trade, but also established a system of loyalty much like that observed by the clans in their native Scotland. They educated their sons so that they were better placed for employment in the fur trade. Those sons then “married-in” to the tribes to further cement trade relations. Their daughters were married-off to new-comers (newly arrived Europeans as well as those from settler schemes, such as that of the post-French and Indian War) thereby creating a new loyalty bond within this new or quasi-clan system. Officers who did not want to marry Native women or had lost a wife often married across both ethnic and class lines. Their wives then had fathers from such ethnic backgrounds as English, Irish, Scottish, and French Canadian, many of whom were from the laboring classes, especially of French Canadian-Indian matches. Through this system of marriage they were able to extend their

\textsuperscript{43} Scottish Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge  
\textsuperscript{44} Also known as Tsinuk Wawa, is a pidgin language spoken by the Northwest Indians which incorporated European languages, such as English, from coastal traders and Canadian French and probably Hawaiian from the Astorians. The language continued to grow with the fur trade and, according to George Gibbs, was the language used by American and French Canadian settlers so as to understand each other.
network horizontally across the North American continent. In 1806 the Northwest Company passed an edict limiting marriage to Indian women in established areas which gave their daughters a more secure future. While they did not formally object to the Indian custom of “turning-off” of wives at the end of an employee’s contract, fathers began to give dowries and Fur Trade Company(s) began to insist that the couple be married by a Justice of the Peace whenever a church service was unavailable, the latter of which was to be performed as soon as it was available. Officers of the fur trade continued to encourage their employees to marry Native, mixed-blood, or métis women as it tied them down with families and caused the men to renew their contracts. Both the French Canadians and Hawaiian kanakas created hybrid cultures and settled into distinct neighborhoods or communities.

As agriculture took off in the Pacific Northwest more couples (missionaries, dairy workers, teachers, etc.) were sent over by the HBC home office. At other fur trade outposts’ colonial settlements began to be established. Fur trade employees began to look towards “civilization” for their wives with laborers taking wives from the Swiss and Scottish settlements on the frontier. Officers, on the other hand, began to seek replacement wives in Great Britain, some without even the curtsy of “turning-off” their current Indian wives. Fur traders, at least of the officer class, expected to retire wealthy men and therefore left wills in the care of fellow fur trade officers. At their deaths many of those wills were contested in court (both Connolly and Ogden) as European relatives tried to have Indian wives and half-breed children disinherited. The effectiveness of these claims depended on the attitudes of the time as the Connolly cases bear out. The Connolly case, which took place in the 1860s, was upheld as the judge felt that all the parameters of a marriage had been fulfilled, but in the 1880s attitudes had changed as it was felt that savages could not grasp such a complex concept as the institution of marriage.
Fathers, fearing for their daughters futures in this new climate, sought to isolate them from their Native mothers and began to send them off to school whenever they could. The London based HBC had long supported education for male children but was opposed to the education of female children. In Scotland, however, all children were encouraged to have a basic education, to at least be able to read and interpret the Bible for themselves. This turning away from native cultures, which were seen as uncivilized, and toward European based cultures, that were seen as civilized was the first step in rendering the very culture(s) the fur trade depended on invisible. By providing European fabrics, pattern books and magazines, and accessories or embellishments, both the fathers and the HBC that employed them, had contributed to the assimilation of Native women, wives and daughters, in advance of the arrival of colonial settlers in and around fur trade outposts. Newly arrived women censured the daughters of the country insisting that they behave according to the guidelines of ‘True Womanhood.’ Under this system the daughters of the country lost the autonomy that their mothers had enjoyed and became dependent on men.

Just as Canada (British North America) had had to develop laws pertaining to fur trade marriage and society, so did Oregon Territory. By upholding these mixed-race marriages (*Vandolf v. Otis*) Native women and their daughters became the property (chattel) of men. As married women they were eligible, under the 1850 Donation Land Claim Act, to apply for a homestead whereby their claims fell under the purview of their husbands. This allowed the government to move Indian lands into the public domain. Whereas European men had “married-in” to Native communities in order to carry on the fur trade, and subsequent marriages to the daughters has been used to anchor new employees within that system, the new, invading society appropriated that marriage pattern, dictating that the daughters had “married-out” of their culture
group(s) and into European based societies in order that they might classify these women as assimilated on the basis of establishing land title.

Further attacks on Native women included Canada’s 1876 Indian Act which stipulated that Native women who married non-status men (Indian, métis, or white) lost their Indian status, while Indian men could transfer Indian status to their wives (Indian, métis, or white). In the U.S. assimilation was spread across the board through blood quantum’s introduced in the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act. Today many government documents require affiliation with a recognized tribe before the respondent can check Indian in the race box. Those who are not so affiliated are considered part of the assimilated mainstream. For those of us seeking to solve the mystery of who we are, the paper trail (documents and genealogy) and DNA are but tools that follow the trail of a ghost, the ghost of our Indian ancestry. Assimilation renders our Indian ancestry invisible and isolates us from an Indian culture we can only visit as tourists and can never truly navigate.
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