

Transitional Identities: Negotiating Social Transitions in the Pacific NW 1825-1860s

Lisa Philips (University of Alberta)¹

Abstract

When one studies a specific society, hegemonic practice is so deeply rooted that it is often difficult to study it from outside that system. However, there are periods of dramatic social change when ongoing social practice in a geographic space is disrupted. On such occasions hegemonic forces can be seen, as it were, from outside of assumed practice. The northwest coast of North America provides such an opportunity. From 1818 to 1846, the British and American states shared jurisdiction over the territory with sovereignty under constant negotiation. The Hudson's Bay Company established a substantial commercial presence in the region from the 1820s to 1850s. During the 1830s and 1840s, massive immigration from the eastern United States shifted the population balance to favour those with ties to the United States. The imposition of the border across the northwest in 1846 marked a significant watershed in the evolution of social control in the region.

Introduction¹

The hegemon represents a collective consensus of what is assumed to maintain appropriate practice.² For example, when the members of a society assume the legitimacy of the courts as an authoritative body responsible for dispute resolution, judicial pronouncements assume hegemonic sway. Similarly those granted the assumed authority to speak the truth or to hold entitlement in an area of activity (to invoke precedent, or to recount history), exercise hegemonic authority. If a society shares a broad consensus on appropriate informal and formal methods of order maintenance, then the hegemon is extant and force is not contested when it is invoked to maintain that order. Instead those granted hegemonic authority are seen as having authority.

When order is challenged, or the exercise of power through hegemonic agents such as the police is shown to have been inappropriate, hegemonic structures come into play to contain the threat to systemic legitimacy either by dispute resolution processes, compensation packages, rhetorical campaigns, punishment to the person who abused his/her power, or dogmatic assertion of the established order. Through such options, the hegemon can maintain its ascendance through structural devices designed to redress incidents when power and community consensus come in conflict.

¹ Lisa Philips, Department of Anthropology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2R3
lisa.philips@ualberta.ca

These hegemonic practices are complemented by political processes which construct and reconstruct traditional values of the society so that they are seen to apply to a given contemporary context. These constructions usually form rationalizations for a side in a contested situation. They often include the transformation of meaning for broadly used terms such as equality, or the redefinition of an incident to fit the perspective of the advocate. Political constructions reflect the ebb and flow of allegiance. Hegemonic structures adjudicate those debates and pronounce their conclusion authoritatively as the embodiment of hegemonic practice. Hegemonic structures evolve and are rooted in the society. As Eric Wolf noted:

The development of an overall hegemonic pattern or “design for living” is not so much the victory of a collective cognitive logic or aesthetic impulse as the development of redundancy—the continuous repetition, in diverse instrumental domains, of the same basic propositions regarding the nature of constructed reality.

If ideology-making is social in nature, it follows that the processes through which ideologies are constructed take place in historic time and under definable circumstances.³

To sustain ideological hegemony, the defenders of orthodoxy must carry their message into an ever larger number of instrumental domains, while curtailing the ability of subaltern groups to advance viable alternatives. Where redundancy falters and ideology-making fails, the deficit may be made up by force.⁴

When one studies a specific society, hegemonic practice is so deeply rooted that it is often difficult to study it from outside that system. However, there are periods of dramatic social change when ongoing social practice in a geographic space is disrupted. On such occasions hegemonic forces can be seen, as it were, from outside of assumed practice. The northwest coast of North America provides such an opportunity. From 1818 to 1846, the British and American states shared jurisdiction over the territory with sovereignty under constant negotiation. The Hudson’s Bay Company established a substantial commercial presence in the region from the 1820s to 1850s. During the 1830s and 1840s, massive immigration from the eastern United States shifted the population balance to favour those with ties to the United States. The imposition of the border across the northwest in 1846 marked a significant watershed in the evolution of social control in the region.

The Oregon Territory from 1810 to 1853 witnessed three eras of hegemonic practice. First, the Native communities had established a refined set of alliances and practices which maintained an ordered life along the coast. When the Hudson’s Bay Company and its employees entered the region, many lived with the Native communities. Linkages to the power of England and the extensive resources of the Company added a major change to social practice—as did European diseases. A significant middle ground⁵ community developed during this period and diversity was extended to include a modest American presence as missionaries and entrepreneurs moved into the region. The third phase coincided with the introduction of American settler government and its assumptions of governing practice. These shifts marked major changes in the ordering of social life, and the social position of individuals, depending on how they were labelled by the dominant structures in each period. The challenge for many was to harness their resources to maintain their cultural capital as the social order changed. How did they survive the imposition of new identities on them? What agency did they have? What structural manifestations of social order did they encounter? In this paper, these questions are addressed by following families who moved and married into the Pacific Northwest prior to a significant American

settler presence and who remained in the region after statist order was consolidated. Using their experiences, the character of hegemonic control will then be addressed by looking at their relative social trajectories north and south of the state border after it was imposed across the territory in 1846.

Ernesto Laclau's views of the relationship between democracy and hegemony highlight some of the key issues that we have located in our study of the impact of the imposition of the border and state structures on extant communities:

... the problem of minoritization should be seen as the problem of nation construction. It's usually seen as the abnormal, the thing that didn't work, or the adjacent thing, or the accidental. *I'm saying that the construction of minorities is as much a process of nation formation as the construction of a national people.* In fact, the two may be as closely linked as I believe the emergence of modernity is to the emergence of coloniality. The effects of this would be to change the way in which we think of the citizenship of communities, interests, minorities, migrants.⁶

At the same time social history tends to be the story of ascendant hegemonies. It is difficult to break the coherence of a linear history to recognize the complexity of hegemonic transformations. As Jean Barman summarized in her history of British Columbia:

While the present leads rather easily into the past, or rather into the particular past toward which we choose to head, going from the 'actual' past to the present is a far more difficult undertaking. ... The history of Nanaimo or for that matter of any other community in British Columbia is, I suspect, not as neat and tidy as we would like, once we examine it as it was rather than as we would have it be.⁷

In order to explore the shifting social landscape on both sides of the eventual border, we began with detailed personal case studies of the leaders of the economic shifts in the Pacific Northwest and the options that were available to their descendants. The database for the analysis is comprised of the life histories of leading officers in the Hudson's Bay Company and, for a comparison of wide-ranging social indicators in the region, the personal histories of leading politicians north and south of the border in the second half of the 19th century. The specific questions addressed include the following: How did the children of the HBC gentlemen negotiate social status in their changing social milieu? How did social capital interact with social categories (labeling) as society changed? What roles did family, translocality and identity have in these processes? What were the options available to those born in, or who moved into, the region prior to the imposition of the border in 1846? The paper concludes with a contrastive comparison of hegemonic forces on both sides of the border. That contrast will provide insights into the role of individual agency and social construction in the subsequent positioning of persons as inside or outside the dominant social order.

The officers of the Hudson's Bay Company

The families selected for this study were those of John McLoughlin, James Douglas, Archibald McDonald, Peter Skene Ogden, Francis Ermantinger, and William Fraser Tolmie. McLoughlin was the head of the Columbia District, Hudson's Bay Company from 1824 until his retirement in 1845. James Douglas was McLoughlin's lieutenant on the Columbia and the officer in charge of Fort Victoria. Douglas became the Governor of Vancouver Island in 1851 and later of British Columbia in 1858. Archibald McDonald,

initially a clerk for Lord Selkirk at the Red River settlement (ca 1816), rose from the position of clerk at Astoria to become a Chief Trader in the Hudson's Bay Company. Peter Skene Ogden started with the Northwest Company, and joined the Hudson's Bay Company after the two merged. He led the Snake River trapping expeditions (1818-1822) for a number of years before being appointed to oversee the Columbia District during the period that McLoughlin was being forced out of the Hudson's Bay Company. Ogden played a significant role in negotiations over the liquidation of Hudson's Bay Company assets in the United States once the border was imposed. Francis Ermatinger was an officer in the Columbia District who arrived in the west in 1825. At different times he was in charge of various Company posts on the north coast and the Columbia River. William Fraser Tolmie was a medical officer at Fort Vancouver (1833) who served on the north coast before assuming responsibility for Fort Nisqually at the southern end of Puget Sound. These officers all played significant roles in the negotiation of Hudson's Bay Company trade and with subsequent dealing with First Nations communities on the west coast and each chose very different careers as the hegemonic context changed.

In Table 1 below, the Hudson's Bay Company officers introduced above are presented as exemplars of the variety of options available prior to and after the imposition of the border by the Treaty of Oregon (1946). Each is listed with a sketch of his personal background and of linkages to places and people that remained central to their lives. In several instances, we find the rationale for continued work with the Hudson's Bay Company was directly tied to financial responsibilities for family members in the 'east'. In all cases, though not indicated on the chart, we found that family relations were central to training and motivation for an occupation in what was then on the entrepreneurial front line.

Table 1 - Backward linkages to the 'east'

<i>Name</i>	<i>In Pacific NW</i>	<i>Training</i>	<i>Family & other connections</i>
John McLoughlin	1825 to open coastal trade	Medical training, Quebec; NWC as surgeon and trader 1803; HBC 1821	Uncles, Dr Simon Fraser and Alexander Fraser. McLoughlin remained in the fur trade after 1808 to finance his brother's medical training in Edinburgh.
James Douglas	1826 first visit; 1830 as accountant	Prep school in Scotland, Lanark	Nephew of Lt-General Sir Neill Douglas; supported sister in West Indies from 1835.
Archibald McDonald 1821 Ft George (Astoria) as accountant	1816 in Montreal with Selkirk Medicine & related subjects in London	Sent to London for education by Lord Selkirk. Clerk and agent for Lord Selkirk's Red River settlement.	
Peter Skene Ogden 1830 to NW coast	1818-1822, 1824 Snake River Some tutoring in law	Father: Isaac Ogden (UEL, jurist); brother Charles Richard, attorney general for Lower Canada 1833-41	
Francis Ermatinger	1825 Columbia District	Educated in London	3rd generation fur trade from Montreal (Swiss); nephew of C.O. Ermatinger and George Ermatinger; F. supported

William Fraser Tolmie	1825 visit; 1833 as medical officer for Columbia District	U Glasgow	his brother, Edward, in St Thomas Uncle financed education
------------------------------	---	-----------	---

Histories of Company men, often labeled ‘fur traders’ by historians, are typically written as the stories of individuals in a single generation. But, even at the most cursory glance, one finds that their lives were embedded in multi-generational social matrices with attendant expectations of proper relations, roles and responsibilities that changed with the social context and generation. Table 2 below demonstrates that the location of a wife’s relatives often determined the region in which one lived at the end of one’s life. The apparent exceptions of McLoughlin and Douglas, whose wives were members of well established and mobile fur trading families from the old Northwest, do not take into account their extensive travels out of the Pacific NW to visit their children and extended families.¹⁰

A quick glance at this table shows that a number of officers married wives who originated from the Native elite in the northwest. Archibald McDonald’s first wife Princess Raven (Sunday) was the daughter of Chinook Chief Comcomly, who died within a year after giving birth to Ranald MacDonald. Peter Skene Ogden’s second ‘wife’ and mother of five children was Julia Rivet. Julia, whose parents were both Flathead, took the name of her widowed mother’s second husband, François Rivet, who had arrived initially in the west with Lewis and Clark. Dr William Fraser Tolmie married Jane Work, daughter of John Work, a Hudson’s Bay Company officer and Josette Legacé, herself a daughter of a French trader and Spokane woman.

Others imported their wives to the region. For example, following the death of Princess Raven, Archibald McDonald married Jane Klyne. She came from Red River where her father was a (Swiss) trader and her mother was part Ojibwe. Another officer, Francis Ermatinger illustrates the continued evolution of these middle ground linkages. He married Charlotte Sinclair (age 16 at marriage, b. Rainy Lake). Charlotte’s father was William Sinclair, Jr., the son of Chief Factor William Sinclair and a Cree mother. Charlotte’s mother was Mary McKay, the daughter of Marguerite Wadin McKay and Alexander McKay, and later stepdaughter of John McLoughlin.

Table 2 – Births and Marriage

John McLoughlin	b. 1784 in Rivière-du-Loup, Québec d. 1857 Oregon City	1808? (1 son, Joseph) 1810 in Ft William to Marguerite Waddens McKay (marriage formalized 1842 in Ft Vancouver; 4 children)
James Douglas	b. 1803 British Guiana d. 1877 Victoria	1827 in Ft St James to Amelia Connolly (marriage formalized in Ft Vancouver in 1837; 4 daughters and 1 son lived to adulthood)
Archibald McDonald	b. 1790 Glencoe Scotland d. 1853 St Andrews, Lower Canada	1823 near Ft George to Princess Raven (Sunday), daughter of King Comcomly (d. 1824; 1 son, Ranald) 1825 to Jane Klyne from Red River (formalized 1853 in St. Andrews (10 sons 1 daughter lived to adulthood)
Peter Skene Ogden	b. 1790 Quebec d. 1854 Oregon City	1816 Cree woman Ft. Isle a la Crosse (d. ca.1823; two children) 1819 possibly entered into political marriage with the daughter of Cowlitz chief How How ca. 1823 Julia Rivet (Flathead) near Ft Spokane (5 children)
Francis Ermatinger	b. 1798 Lisbon d. 1858 St Thomas, Upper	1823 Cree woman Severn District, one daughter 1828 Cleopatra, Okanogan, one son

Canada	1835 Mary Three Dresses, Pend d'Oreille one daughter m.1842 Catherine Sinclair, from Red River, at Fort George, Columbia District, 1 daughter (plus another child)	
William Fraser Tolmie	b. 1812 Inverness d. 1866 near Victoria	m 1849 or 1850 Jane Work, daughter of HBC John Work and wife, Josette Legacé, in Victoria

The *final* marriage, whether formalized or not, gives us a key to understanding where these men viewed their social 'homes'. Those men who married women living in the region in which the men were working when they met, located their families and their lives in the west. Those who 'imported' wives from other areas did not stay in the west after they retired.

Dynamics of Exclusion

Political inclusion and exclusion after 1843 in the Oregon Territory

As a study of social transformations precipitated by the imposition of a state boundary, the dynamics of social inclusion and exclusion north and south of the border become central to the inquiry. By which processes were the families of the officers eclipsed in the new social order? First, in that part of the territory that would become the USA after the border was imposed in 1846, new settlers invoked principles and processes associated with American governance with which they were accustomed in the east. Representation by election, rule by the majority, and suffrage based on citizenship were major components of their system. Steps to control were incremental. First, the settlers claimed the right to organize through United States claims of joint sovereign control of the region with the British. Then when a settler, Doc Ewing, died "intestate" – despite the fact that he had a Native wife and children – a provisional government was established to probate his estate. Shortly thereafter, the American settlers convened a meeting to address the "wolf problem," an issue chosen so as not attract the attention of the Hudson's Bay Company officers to the meeting. In an effort to gain as large a representative base as possible, French-Canadian engagés living in French Prairies, the meeting place, were invited to attend and "Half-breeds" were allowed a vote ["all but the Kanakas and Indians"]. The first provisional government was designed to be inclusive of the European community. The Roman Catholic Bishop for the northwest was asked to chair the committee elected and representatives were elected from the Catholic as well as the Protestant settler community. A few Hudson's Bay Company officers were given political positions.

After the border was imposed in 1846, the character of the government changed. American citizens, almost all of whom were Protestants, held public offices. French Canadians, m/Métis, "Mexicans" and Mormons were seen as marginal citizens. Native Americans, Hawaiians, African Americans, many of mixed parentage (a.k.a., "Half breeds"), and later, Chinese and other Asians were excluded from citizenship by law.

Political inclusion and exclusion after the imposition of the border in the British colonies

North of the border, the government was intimately linked to the officers of the Hudson Bay Company through the appointment of Sir James Douglas as the governor of the colony(ies) as they emerged. His council included many Company officers. The shift from governance by the Company to governance by

colonial administrators was gradual but can be seen through a comparison to the lives of subsequent Governors, Lieutenant Governors and Premiers (after Confederation in 1871). See Appendix 1. Note especially the change in occupations following Confederation.

Economic exclusion

Processes of economic exclusion by governing communities were similar on both sides of the border: the shift in the economy from trade in fur to agriculture and mining led to a shift in the value of each enterprise. North of the border, the Hudson’s Bay Company was denigrated as an obsolete fur trading company. In fact, labeling of, and arguments against, the “Family-Company Compact” was part of the political agenda to combine the colonies of Vancouver Island and British Columbia. South of the border, the Hudson’s Bay Company was vilified as a British corporate monopoly.

At the same time there was a shift to credentialism. People associated with the Hudson’s Bay Company who had excellent credentials often witnessed those credentials denigrated or discounted. North of the border the screening of credentials was even more extreme, as illustrated by Begbie’s refusal to accept legal training in the Canadian colonies as equivalent to British legal training (see note under George Anthony Walkem in the chart above). In the territories claimed by USA, American entrepreneurs positioned former employees of the Hudson’s Bay Company as outside of the growing capitalist linkages to the eastern states.

Social Exclusion

By the early 1860s a social hierarchy had been established among those tied to the settler governments both north and south of the border that was particularly apparent along two fronts: nationality and “appropriate” marriage. A third social arena that led to exclusion was religion. The following hierarchies of preferred nationalities north and south of the border are extracted from patterns found in early historical documents in combination with laws and policies dealing with desired immigration. Not unexpectedly, the hierarchies in the British Colonies differed somewhat from that in the US territories:

Table 3 - Hierarchy of nationalities among settlers (1860s)

<i>Hierarchy of nationalities among settlers (1860s)</i>	
British Colonies	US territories
British	American citizens
Scottish (and Protestant Irish)	British
United Empire Loyalist or American	
Northern European	Northern European
Other European	Other European
French Canadian	French Canadian
Mixed	Mixed
African American	
Hawaiian	
Amerindian	Amerindian
Chinese	Hawaiian, Chinese
	African American

The most significant differences in these social hierarchies were the relative standing of American citizens and of African Americans. The status of French Canadians as marginally different from and higher than m/Métis is evident in both lists.

The determination of a socially acceptable, or “appropriate” marriage partner followed the hierarchy for immigration with the most important variable being whether or not the partner was “white”. This hierarchy was reinforced by contemporary historians including the American historian, Hubert H. Bancroft. In his history of British Columbia, Bancroft included highly derogatory comments about non-White women, including the following:

And as the light of parliament now dawned upon this dark western wilderness with ever increasing luster, at the heels of many another officer of the fur monopoly dangled the tawdry vestments of aboriginal love unsanctified by any European formula. All this must now be changed, and the Island must put on connubial purity. Those who had incased the polluted blood of their offspring in dusky coverings must repent and be baptized, then sit in social sackcloth all their days. But for those who had overcome, white wives should be the reward.”¹¹

The wives of the senior officers of the Hudson Bay Company in the region usually did not meet Bancroft’s ideal. They were high status members of the middle ground society which preceded the settler governments and their children were usually given advanced education outside the region. Many of the daughters acted as secretaries for their fathers and spoke both local and a number of European languages.

Shifting social capital: From the ‘Middle ground’ to the Pacific Northwest

In order to document the indicators of shifting social capital, we trace the two highest status families who had moved into the Pacific Northwest by the mid 1820s, the McLoughlin and the Douglas families. The history of their families in the Northwest as it changed to become a settler dominated region was a study of adaptation, external labeling and negotiation of identity. The social capital that both men held in the Hudson’s Bay Company was based on a combination of ascribed and achieved status. Both were closely related to highly successful colonial traders and land owners. In addition, both McLoughlin and Douglas married women whose parentage was equally high status in the middle ground.

Marguerite Waddens/Wadin McKay McLoughlin (b. 1775) was the daughter of Jean-Etienne Wadin(s) [Vuadens], a Dutch trader and a member of the Quebec bourgeoisie. Marguerite’s mother was the daughter of a fur trader who married the daughter of an Ojibwe chief. Marguerite’s sister, Véronique Waddin, married Rev. John Bethune, “the most honoured and respected of Canada’s pioneer Church of Scotland ministers”.¹² Amelia Connolly Douglas (b. 1812) was the daughter of Miyo Nipiy, the daughter of a Cree chief, and William Connolly chief trader of the Hudson’s Bay Company. Connolly was instrumental in obtaining Douglas’s transfer to Fort Vancouver in 1830, following a life-threatening incident among the Carrier people in which the hot-tempered Douglas was rescued by Amelia’s quick, appropriate and effective response to the fracas.

McKays and McLoughlins

All of Marguerite McLoughlin's children were born prior to arriving in the Pacific Northwest. While all of Marguerite's sons (by both Alexander McKay and John McLoughlin) moved to the Columbia District, only her youngest daughter made the move to the west coast. Marguerite Wadin McKay's first marriage was to Alexander McKay in Ft. William. They had four children, three daughters and one son born between 1795 and 1809.¹³ In 1810, Alexander McKay and their son, *Thomas McKay*, sailed to the Pacific Northwest as a partner in the Pacific Fur Company (Astor's company). Alexander McKay died shortly after arriving in the Pacific Northwest when his ship, the *Tonquin*, was blown up in 1811 in an ill-fated trading expedition. Thomas McKay, a young clerk with company, remained in the west after his father's death. Thomas married three times, the first to Chief Comcomly's daughter, Princess Timmee, with whom he had five children, *Dr. William Cameron McKay, John T., Alexander, Nancy, and Mariah*. After Princess Timmee's death (ca. 1829 or 1830), Thomas married Susan of Warm Springs, the daughter of a Cayuse chief. They had at least one child, *Donald McKay* before Susan returned to her family. In 1838, Thomas married a third and final time to Isabelle Montour, daughter of Nicholas Montour, trader, who was the son of Nicholas Montour and Sally Ainese, both widely-known traders from the Old Northwest. They had no children together, but Isabella became mother to Thomas' children by his previous marriages.

All of Marguerite's daughters with Alexander McKay were married prior to the McLoughlin's move to the west. Around 1816, *Nancy McKay McCargo* married Captain Robert McCargo, who ran a merchant freighter up and down Lake Superior. In 1823, *Mary McKay Sinclair* married Hudson's Bay Company officer William Sinclair, himself the son of an HBC officer. William Sinclair became Chief Factor in Rainy Lake District in the 1850s. *Catherine McConnick* [or] *O'Gorman*, married a Lieutenant McConnick, who died in India. While her history following the death of Lt. McConnick is a bit obscure, she may have remarried a man named O'Gorman. Catherine McConnick lived out her years in England.

John McLoughlin's oldest child, *Joseph McLoughlin*, was born in 1809 of an unnamed mother from the Kaminitiquia or Lac La Pluie region. Raised by his father and Marguerite, Joseph studied abroad and came west with his father in 1825 to serve briefly as a clerk in the Hudson's Bay Company but left to build what was considered to be the first farm west of the Willamette River. Joseph was married to Victoire McMillan, daughter of Scots trader and chief factor at Flathead House, James McMillan, and the daughter of a Clatsop subchief, but there is no record of children from the marriage. Joseph died in 1848 from the after effects of a fall over a cliff.

All but one of Marguerite and John McLoughlin's children moved to the west. The exception was Marguerite and John McLoughlin's second child, *Marie Elizabeth ("Eliza") McLoughlin*, who was born in 1814 at Lac La Pluie or Fort William on Lake Superior. Due to poor health, she moved to Quebec in 1820 to live at the Ursuline convent under the care of McLoughlin's sister, Sister St. Henry. Unlike her sister, Eliza remained in Quebec. In 1832, at age 18, she married William Randolph Eppes, officer in the British army, stationed in Canada, who died there in 1849. Eliza and William had five children (four girls and one boy), the last born shortly after Eppes' death. From 1849-1857, Eliza received monthly allotments from her father. In 1857, at his death, she inherited all of McLoughlin's considerable holdings in Riviere du Loup.

The rest of Marguerite and John's children moved west with their parents. Their oldest child, *John McLoughlin*, was born in 1812 at Lac La Pluie. He was educated in Montreal and then in Paris, training under Dr. David McLoughlin, his father's brother. John McLoughlin ultimately worked for the Hudson's

Bay Company from 1837 to 1842, when he was murdered at Fort Stikine by disgruntled trappers employed by the Company. While he may have been married, there is no evidence of his having had children.

Maria Eloisa McLoughlin Rae Harvey was born in 1817 at Ft. William. Like her sister, Eloisa attended the Ursuline Convent in Quebec (1820-1824) before joining her parents in 1825, when she took up duties as hostess for her mother at Fort Vancouver on the Columbia River. In 1838, she married William Glen Rae (b. 1809 in the Orkney Islands), chief clerk at Fort Vancouver. Eloisa accompanied her husband to Ft. Stikine in 1840 to establish the new post. In 1841, her husband was appointed manager of the HBC post at Yerba Buena (later San Francisco) where Eloisa joined him the following year. Their four children were *John Rae* (b. February 1839, Ft Vancouver), *Margaret Glen Rae* (b. March 1841, in Steamer Beaver, near Ft Stikine), *Maria Louisa Rae* (b. November 1842, Yerba Buena) and *William Rae* (b. and d. in January 1845, Yerba Buena). In January 1845, Eloisa's husband committed suicide in Yerba Buena where she and her children remained until they were brought back by a party led by Peter Skene Ogden to Oregon City in 1846. In 1850 she married Daniel Harvey (d. 1858) who ran the McLoughlin flour and sawmills in Oregon City. They had three children, *Daniel Harvey*, *James W. McLoughlin Harvey*, and *Mrs. D. F. Leahy*.

Marguerite and John's youngest child, *David McLoughlin*, was born in February 1821 at Lac La Pluie or Fort William. He received his education in Montreal, Paris and London. While in London, his father enrolled him in the East India Company Military Seminary. Employed by the Hudson's Bay Company from 1840-1849, he quit within two years of his father's retirement. He became wealthy in the California gold rush and later explored for gold on the Fraser River among other ventures. David married Annie Grizzly, (b. 1835), daughter of a Kootenay Chief around 1865. Their nine children were raised in Porthill, where David farmed and ran the customs agency on what became the Idaho-British Columbia border.

Lives in the west: the Douglas family

Unlike the McLoughlin and McKay children, James and Amelia Douglas's children (five daughters and one son) who lived to adulthood were born in the west. The Douglas's four eldest daughters were born in Fort Vancouver on the Columbia between 1834 and 1844 and their two youngest children were born in Fort Victoria in 1851 and 1854. The eldest child, *Cecilia Douglas Helmcken* (1834-1865), was married in 1852 to Dr J. S. Helmcken (b. 1824 Whitechapel, London). Helmcken had come to Fort Victoria in 1850 as an HBC ship surgeon and as an aide to Gov. Blanshard but stayed because of Cecilia. Helmcken was the first Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Vancouver Island, representing Esquimalt and Victoria (1856). Cecilia lived on Vancouver Island until her untimely death at age 30. After her death, Helmcken (and most of her children) remained in Victoria.

In 1858, *Jane Douglas Dallas* (1839-1909) married Alexander Grant Dallas (b.1816 British Guiana). Dallas was raised in Scotland, and was a businessman and a Hudson's Bay Company administrator. In 1857, Dallas was posted to Pacific Northwest to oversee Hudson's Bay Company difficulties, during which time he met and married Jane. In 1862, following George Simpson's death in 1860, Dallas was named President of Council and Governor in Chief of Rupert's Land. In 1864 Jane and her husband retired to his estates in Scotland. They had nine children: one son, *Major-General Alister Grant Dallas*, had a particularly distinguished military career in India, South African war and WWI.

Alice Douglas Good later Baroness de Weiderhold (1844-1928). In 1861 Alice eloped with Charles Good (b. England, Oxford graduate), Douglas's part-time private secretary. Their marriage was dissolved in 1868 and they divorced around 1878. In 1870, Alice and her three children went to England to stay with

Good's family at Wimborne Minster; she returned to Victoria in December 1872. In 1877, Alice moved to California with Baron Augustus [Siffken] de Weiderhold, (b. London 1841, merchant), whom she married in 1878. With money from the Connelly decision (*Connelly vs. Woolrich et al* addressed briefly below), the de Weiderholds bought and ran the Sotoyome winery in Healdsburg until it burned down.

In 1862, *Agnes Douglas Bushby* (1841-1919) married Arthur Bushby (b. 1835 in London) who came west as a private secretary to Judge Matthew Baillie Begbie. In the early 1870s Agnes went to England to live with the Bushby family. After Bushby died in New Westminster in 1875, Agnes and two of the four Bushby children moved to California with an English miner and following the death of the miner, Agnes returned to Victoria. All of the Bushby children were educated in London England.

The youngest child, *Martha Douglas Harris* (1854-1933), was educated in England from 1872 to 1874. In 1878, Martha married Dennis Harris, a civil engineer (b. 1851 Winchester England) who set himself up in private practice as land surveyor, civil engineer, architect and real estate agent in Victoria. Martha's book, *History and Folklore of the Cowichan Indians*, published in 1901 included stories told to her by her mother.

Negotiating Individual Identity

How did the children of McLoughlin and Douglas negotiate their social status in the changing social milieu of the Pacific Northwest? What agency did they have? How did they transform the social capital accrued to them by their parentage – from both their mothers and their fathers – to build their lives? The daughters formed alliances with men who had a roughly equivalent social status. Their husbands included HBC officers, British military officer, international merchants, physicians, and a civil engineer. Their choices were not necessarily those of their parents. In fact, the Dallas relationship with Douglas was adversarial and the Bushby and Good relationships with Douglas were chilly. On the other hand, McLoughlin seemed to incorporate his daughters' husbands into his already complex family. In later choices (following the death of their husbands), daughters from both families married or created alliances with men who were more integrated with the settler society (e.g., Harvey, de Weiderhold, and the unnamed miner).

The sons followed a different path. Starting in 1832, a school was opened at Fort Vancouver. David McLoughlin, William Cameron McKay, and Ranald McDonald attended.¹⁴ Following their initial schooling at the Fort, they were sent to Red River to continue their education and from there to centers in the East or in Europe for further training. The Hudson's Bay Company officers were sensitive to the need for an eastern education if their children were to find employment in the future.

Correspondence between Archibald McDonald and Edward Ermantinger, who was a member of a closely linked fur trade family, illustrate the process. Ranald, Archibald McDonald's son, was the grandson of King Concomly, one of the most powerful chiefs on the coast. An extract of a letter from Archibald McDonald to Edward Ermantinger (April 1, 1836, Ft. Colville) illustrates the anguish of parents for their children:

Taking us altogether, we are men of very extraordinary ideas—a set of selfish drones, incapable of entertaining liberal or correct notions of human life. —Our great password is a handsome provision for our children, but behold the end of this mighty provision, which we are amassing like exiled slaves; the off-spring is let loose upon the wide, wild

worlds while young, without guide or protection ... As I hinted to you before, I am very anxious to send [Ranald] down before us; by 1838, I think he ought to be qualified enough to begin the world for himself. Will you then do me a favor to take him in hand? ... He will not at the time I am speaking of be a learned lad, but with the help he can pick up with you will have knowledge enough to develop what may be in him as a man. Bear in mind he is of a particular race, and who knows but a kinsman of King Concomly is ordained to make a great figure in the new world; as yet he bears an excellent character.¹⁵

After Ranald had spent four years at the Company school in Red River, his father wrote Edward Ermantinger requesting that he oversee Ranald's further apprenticeship in St. Thomas, Upper Canada (now Ontario). In the east Ranald retained his self confidence but when rejected by a woman whom he loved, apparently because of his Aboriginal heritage, he ran away to join the merchant marines. He returned to the west coast ten years later after many world adventures including the introduction of English into Japan. On returning to the Pacific Northwest, Ranald was hired by Douglas to explore for coal on Vancouver Island for the Hudson's Bay Company. Following that and other mining expeditions, Ranald moved inland and joined others of his contemporaries, including brothers and cousins, transporting goods and farming. He never married and retired to the original Fort Colville, which had been reduced to ruin.

William Cameron McKay followed an equally uneven path. Son of Thomas McKay and Princess Timmee, another of Chief Concomly's daughters, William McKay was a contemporary of and cousin to Ranald MacDonald. The choice of William's medical school illustrates the limits of agency in planning for his future, which was, like Ranald MacDonald, thwarted by changing social mores. In 1838, Thomas McKay, who was then in charge of Fort Hall, decided to send his son, William, to Scotland to be trained in medicine, and his other sons, Alexander and John, to Wilberham, Massachusetts, where the missionary, Rev. Jason Lee, had been educated.

When they arrived at the Wailatpu mission where they were to separate, William to go by the way of Manitoba, and the others by Fort Hall, Dr. [Marcus] Whitman persuaded Thomas McKay to send William to Fairfield, N.Y., where the Whitman was educated, and "make an American of him". His course and destination were thus changed, and he accompanied his brothers by the way of Fort Hall. He stayed there five years, attending the Academy and Medical College, received a medical licence, and then returned in 1843 with the Hudson Bay Company's annual express.¹⁶

On his return to the west coast, William became a clerk in the Hudson's Bay Company store and also worked as a physician. In 1849, he went to California in search of gold and mined on the Trinity River; he returned in 1851 and established a residence on the Umatilla River. After his home was destroyed in the Indian wars of 1855, he joined the military as a guide and interpreter. He later became the physician for the Warm Springs Reservation since he was not allowed to practice medicine among non-Native settlers.

Changing times and invoking borders in law

The law became a major hegemonic device both north and south of the border once the border was imposed. Established and implemented in the eastern or colonial centers the law was crafted to meet the needs of regulation in the settler societies of the east or Great Britain. Its impact on individuals and

especially those of the “middle ground” in the northwest is found in laws of entitlement such as probate and citizenship. For example, a dispute between Peter Skene Ogden and his brother over family membership had festered since Peter had lived with a Cree woman and later with Julia Rivet, of the Flatheads. A. Binns in his biography of Ogden describes the events well:

Much as Peter [Skene Ogden] gained by being reunited with his parents there was tension regarding the Cree wife he had taken some years earlier. Since man cannot live alone, Sarah Hanson [P.S. Ogden’s mother] accepted it as inevitable that her fur trader son should have an Indian mistress and children by her. The young Livingstons of Livingston Manor had done the same, and in the process they had become men. But to Sarah Hanson it was unthinkable that such a union could be permanent: the best blood of England mixed and darkened with the blood of savages. When Peter had made his fortune he would come home, as others had, and marry a young English woman of a good family. As a gentleman he would of course provide for his concubine and her children but the Ogden name and his fortune must go to a wedded wife and legitimate white children...¹⁷

The issue continued and in 1852 Peter received a letter from his older brother, Charles Richard Ogden who was now Governor of the Isle of Man, “advising him to consider what would happen upon his death, and urging him to take steps that would prevent his Indian mistress and bastards from claiming any of his money. Ogden’s reply ended that correspondence forever.”¹⁸ Peter responded by including a statement in his will “that Julia was his wife, and her children his children.”¹⁹ Peter Ogden died in 1854. Two years later, in December 1856, Archibald and Sarah Julia [Ogden] McKinlay were served with a summons to appear at a hearing in the Clackamas County Court: For the purpose of setting aside or annulling or revoking the said alleged last will and testament of the said Peter Skene Ogden and for the further purpose of establishing the rights of the legal heirs of the said Peter Skene. Only after the intercession of George Simpson on behalf of Peter Ogden did the eastern relatives of Peter agree to let Julie and her children have half of his estate.

By 1867, a similar attempt to exclude the western family of Connolly failed. In that case a Quebec court held that the 28-year “country” marriage of Chief Trader William Connolly to Miyo Nipiy was legal, making his subsequent marriage to his British cousin, Julia Woolrich bigamous. The decision gave Connolly’s inheritance to his earlier family, including his daughter, Amelia Connelly Douglas.²⁰ The early assumptions behind the Ogden decision entrenched the settler society at the expense of its precursor. The shift in the law reduced that injustice but only after the hegemonic shift was complete.

Individual Negotiation and Identity

What social capital did the children share? If one generalizes for the group, their fathers were ranking officials of the Hudson’s Bay Company. Their mothers were the daughters of successful fur traders and/or the descendants of First Nation Chiefs. They were fluent in, at least, English, French, the language of their mothers (Cree, Ojibwe, Nez Perce, etc.) and Chinook Jargon, and they were well educated. Several of the children functioned as secretaries for their respective fathers at different times and they were raised as members of the social elite in the west prior to mass emigration of American and British settlers.

As society changed, a number of insights into the interaction of social capital and social categories (labeling) occurred: interesting examples in the complex negotiation of social categories and social capital are found in the archival record. For example, the following interchanges were recorded that present the uneasy, and often contradictory, assessments of the social positioning of the children of McLoughlin and Douglas. The first was an interchange between Agnes Douglas and a naval officer on the dance floor in the late 1850s and the second was the report of a ball, perhaps the same one, given by the officers of HMS Plumper in 1858.

When a midshipman asked Agnes for a dance at a ball ... She said, "What would Papa say if I danced with a middy?" His retort to her snobbery was, "What would Mama say if I danced with a squaw?"²¹

...Most of the young ladies are half breed & have quite as many of the propensities of the savage as of the civilized being²²

When analyzing such labeling, it is important not to trivialize the issue by deciding that race, class or gender provides the trump for the other categories. The combination of factors was extremely complex, and most of the racial labeling has been a *post facto* construction of historians beginning with settler histories in the 1860s. The social capital of middle ground status was much higher in the Pacific NW at that time than has been recognized. Individual interactions were situational, dependent on the application of relative social capital to social situations. Ties to Scotland were strong and provided a shared translocal bridge to the new constructions of the settler society. The complexity gave the children a chance to negotiate.

As a general rule, the daughters of the early entrepreneurs negotiated social status by building on social capital accrued to them by their parentage – from *both* their mothers and their fathers, forming alliances with men who had a roughly equivalent social status. They married men with well established careers including HBC officers, British military officers, international merchants, physicians, civil engineers, and ship captains.

The sons experienced a different environment. They often continued in the occupations of their fathers but with the denigration of the Hudson's Bay Company, their status in settler society was greatly diminished. They usually married local women, native, mixed or settler, or remained single. Those who married women with "settler" or "pioneer" credentials (e.g., "white") gained status, while those who married Natives or mixed background women were marginalized. Overall the status of a woman/wife was more important than that of her husband for maintaining his status during this period of transition.

Hegemonic Enforcement of Identity

Both north and south of the border immigration from the east changed the character of society on the west coast. South of the border a settler government emerged between 1842 and 1846. At first inclusive, by the 1850s it was in control of the definition of civic identity. William Cameron's life illustrates the impact of the power of external constraints on the identity of members of the middle ground community. As Laclau argued, the other side of nation building was the creation of minorities. In 1857 the Oregon government passed a Half Breed Act. Its purpose was to "enable certain Half Breeds to acquire the rights of citizenship within this Territory."

Section 1. Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Oregon. That any person, being the child of a white father and an Indian mother, and therefore disfranchised by existing laws, may be admitted to the privileges of citizenship, by the District Court, upon satisfactory proof that he is a permanent resident and land owner of the county or district, and can speak read and write the English language, and has in all respects the education, habits and associations of a white person, and would, if he were a white person, be a citizen of the United States or entitled to admission as such, and is a person of good moral character and in all respects worthy to enjoy the said privileges. ...

While the Act was later found to not fall within the legislative competence of a state, in the interim it had the capacity to give the settlers the power to determine worthy others. By 1870 the reification of half breeds became useful in a controversial election in Umatilla Township with William McKay playing a reluctant role at center stage. William McKay had voted as usual but this time his vote was challenged as invalid on the grounds that he was an Indian. When taken before the courts, it was argued that:

The plaintiff is nine-sixteenths Indian, eight of which he gets from his Chinook mother and the other one from his Canadian father. As a matter of fact, the Indian blood predominating, he is not a half-breed, as claimed in the argument by his counsel. But I cannot perceive that it is material to consider whether he is a half-breed or not. In legal contemplation he is an American Indian, by virtue of his mother being a Chinook, or a British subject, without reference to his race, by virtue of being the son of Thomas McKay, and his birth in the allegiance of the British Crown. According to the case of the *United States vs. Sanders*, (Hump. 483.) the plaintiff follows the condition of his mother and is an alien. It was held in that case that the issue of an Indian woman and a white man is an Indian, and vice versa; that the rule of the civil law—*partus sequitur ventrem*—prevailed. But the contrary is the rule of the common law in the analogous case of the issue of marriage between a freeman and a slave (2 Black. Com. 94). In such case, by that rule, the child follows the condition of the father. My impression is that the plaintiff ought to be deemed to follow the condition of his father. Congress seems to have taken this view of the matter in the passage of the Act of September 27, 1850, granting land to settlers in Oregon, commonly called the Donation Act (9 Stat. 496.) Section four of this Act grants land to each white settler on the public lands, who is a citizen of the United States, or who has or will declare his intention to become such, American half-breed Indians included, thereby excluding half-breeds, the children of alien fathers, as not American, but aliens.²³

The newly established hegemon then was harnessed by the settler community to exclude others through law as follows: “[A]n Oregon district court agreed with the Judiciary Committee and held that Indians born in tribal allegiance were not persons born in the United States and thus subject to its jurisdiction.”³¹ The court stated:

To be a citizen of the United States by reason of his birth, a person must not only be born within its territorial limits, but he must also be born subject to its jurisdiction—that is, in its power and obedience. ...But the Indian tribes within the limits of the United States have always been held to be distinct and independent political communities, retaining the right of self-government, though subject to the protecting power of the United States.²⁴ Early federal court decisions interpreted the Fourteenth Amendments

blanket grant of citizenship to all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof as excluding Indians.²⁵

The Supreme Court later adopted that reasoning, holding that an individual Indian could not free himself from his tribal status by self-help through his voluntary adoption of non-Indian ways of living.²⁶ William Cameron McKay was declared to be an Indian and ineligible for the vote—and ineligible for US citizenship, ineligible to inherit his fathers land, and ultimately ineligible to practice medicine for non-Natives.

The place of family

Throughout the period, family was pivotal and included connections with both mothers' and fathers' relatives. Fur trade officers such as John McLoughlin were generous in their support of their children whether in Scotland or Quebec or Paris. Jane Dallas, Douglas' daughter, visited her mother's mother, Miyo Nipiy, just prior to her death. Fathers took the lead in preparing sons for a career but, as seen in the case of William Cameron, those plans were subject to adjustment given advice from friends. They were placed in the east, Scotland or Paris with relatives or friends through the fur trade. Family resources were also subject to interesting ironies. Alice de Weiderhold was able to purchase a vineyard in California through money from Connolly's, estate once her mother's claim had been upheld in the Quebec courts. The family unit remained significant to the location of families as times changed. Connections were made with in-laws (in England and elsewhere) by daughters, grandchildren and the fathers while step-children were incorporated into family relations.

The role of translocality

All the daughters married men born outside the area. The daughters moved with their husbands, often ending up in their husbands' birthplace. Early marriages often resulted in daughters moving to the British Isles. Later marriages were more often located in the western region (Harris, Harvey, de Weiderhold). Identities were centered on the extended family including both mothers' and fathers' relatives. This is in contrast to the privileging of male linkages by later historians who often included them in the pioneers of northwestern society, even in Oregon where many were legally excluded.

Differences in the 'British' versus the 'American' experiences

Dr. John McLoughlin's roots were in Quebec (Canada). His daughters were educated in Quebec, where one eventually settled. His lack of a sense of British loyalty may have had some bearing on his retirement from the Hudson's Bay Company to the United States in contrast to Douglas. McLoughlin and his family located on the American side of the border, where they took out US citizenship, but he was badly treated by many American settlers because of his prior relationship with the Hudson's Bay Company. He was accepted eventually as a potential settler because he hailed from Quebec and not Britain. After marrying Daniel Harvey, his daughter, Eloisa moved into the local settler society in Oregon City, moving ultimately to Portland, where she died. Douglas and his family were able to retain social capital through his appointment as Governor of the British colony. That capital and the inclusion of Hudson's Bay Company officers in the government at first maintained a social continuity not experienced south of the border. That continuity provided agency for their children as they negotiated their social identities.

Translocal linkages and allegiances were significant north and south of the border but they were of greater significance north of the border. For example, Sir James Douglas's familial roots were in England as were all of the son-in-laws. His daughters traveled to England while educating the grandchildren, usually residing with their in-laws. Two of the grandchildren remained in England.

The shift from a Native to a settler hegemon was mediated by the fur trade era. The Company introduced economic linkages to a mercantilist world and its resources. The children of the fur trade and Native communities shared the social capital and status from both and as a result accrued capital in neither community. Within their communities, they had a stable identity. Outside of it, identity was negotiable. North of the border the association with the Hudson's Bay Company could be an asset; south of the border where there was a clear fissure between the past fur trade era and the emerging settler society. A former relationship with the Hudson's Bay Company was considered a legitimate basis for exclusion in US society. As Laclau argued, nation building includes the marginalization of the non-conforming. The William Cameron McKay experience illustrates that dynamic. On the other hand, the experiences of the daughters and step-daughters of McLoughlin and Douglas illustrate the significance and complexity of individual passage across the social transformation.

Appendix 1 – Governors of British Columbia

<i>Term</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Birthplace</i>	<i>In NW Location at death</i>	<i>Training/ Occupation</i>	<i>Occupation</i>
Governors of Vancouver Island					
1849–1851	Richard Blanshard	London 19 October 1817	arr. 1850 Left 1851, d. London		Barrister, army
1851-1864	Sir James Douglas		arr. 1829 d. BC 1877	Scotland & England	HBC officer
1864–1866	Sir Arthur Edward Kennedy	Cultra, County Down, Ireland 5 April 1809	arr. 1864 d. en route to England 1883	Trinity College, Dublin; British army	Colonial administrator: Gov. W Australia 54-62; Vanc Isl 64-66; W. Afr Settlements 67- 72; Hong Kong 72-77; Queensland 78-83

Governors of British Columbia					
1858-1864	Sir James Douglas	Demerera, British Guiana August 15, 1803	arr. 1829 d. BC 1877	Scotland & England	HBC officer
1864-1866	Frederick Seymour	Belfast, Ireland, 6 September 1820	1864 d. Bella Coola, British Columbia 10 June 1869 of dysentary		Colonial administrator

Governors of the United Colonies of Vancouver Island and British Columbia					
1866–1869	Frederick Seymour				Colonial administrator
1869-1871	Sir Anthony	St John's, Antigua	arr. 1869	Some law in	Colonial administrator:

	Musgrave	31 August 1828	d. 1888 in Queensland	England	Governor of Natal (1872–73), South Australia (1873–77), Jamaica (1877–83), and Queensland (1885–88)
1871-1876	Sir Joseph William Trutch	England 18 January 1826	arr. 1859, (via S.F.) Left for England 1899, d. 1905 Somerset		Surveyor, civil engineer, Dominion agent for CPR
1876-1881	The Honourable Albert Norton Richards	Brockville, Upper Canada 1821	1874 d. Victoria 1897		Lawyer, politician
1881-1887	The Honourable Clement Francis Cornwall	18 June 1836, Gloucestershire, England	1862 d. Victoria 1910		Lawyer, farmer, judge

British Columbia Premiers					
<i>Term</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Birthplace</i>	<i>In BC</i>	<i>Training</i>	<i>Occupation</i>
1871-1872	John Foster McCreight	Caledon, County Tyrone, Ireland 1827	1860 via Australia & San Francisco	Law, Trinity College	Lawyer
1872-1874	Amor De Cosmos	Windsor, Nova Scotia (family UELs) 1825	1858 via CA	Some King's College	Halifax: mercantile clerk; CA: photographer; Victoria, founded newspaper
1874-1876; 1878-1882	George Anthony Walkem	Newry (N. Ireland) 1834; Emigrated to Canada 1847	1862	McGill College in Montreal, law	Lawyer ("mineral law") [nb. Begbie refused to call him to the bar in BC because of his Lower/Upper Canada law training]
1876-1878	Andrew Charles Elliott	Ireland c. 1828	1859	Lincoln's Inn, London, 1851-54	Lawyer, establish county court system
1882-1883	Robert Beaven	England 1836; Emigrated with family to Upper Canada 1843 (fa. Academic in TO)	1860s gold rush	Upper Canada College, Toronto	Real estate & insurance interests; commission agent; retail clothier and outfitter.
1883-1887	William Smithe	Matfen 1842	1862	Local schools at Whittington	Early: merchant trade in England; BC: farmer
1887-1889	Alexander Edmund Batson Davie	Somerset, England 1847	1862	First person to receive his entire law education in British Columbia, called to bar 1873	Lawyer, politician

Endnotes

- ¹ The author wishes to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for a research grant which made this project possible and to Allan McDougall for invaluable and significant input into the paper.
- ² Gramsci's notion of hegemonic dominance as an all pervasive acceptance of underlying social appropriateness is an example.
- ³ Page 388, *Race, rhetoric, and the postcolonial* edited by Gary A. Olson, Lynn Worsham. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, c1999.
- ⁴ Page 330, *Race, rhetoric, and the postcolonial* edited by Gary A. Olson, Lynn Worsham. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, c1999.
- ⁵ Many of the members of the Hudson's Bay Company fit Richard White's 1991 description, if not definition, of 'middle ground' community (*The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, Cambridge University Press). We are using the concept in its broadest sense for any non-local people, regardless of original heritage, who built kin alliances along with economic alliances in new areas, such as the Pacific Northwest under joint British and American jurisdiction.
- ⁶ *Hegemony and the Future of Democracy: Ernesto Laclau's Political Philosophy*, Lynn Worsham, Gary A. Olson 129: based on Laclau's interview in 1999, *Race, rhetoric and the postcolonial*, edited by Gary A. Olson, Lynn Worsham. Albany: SUNY Press, italics added.
- ⁷ Barman 2004:1
- ⁸ Gramsci's notion of hegemonic dominance as an all pervasive acceptance of underlying social appropriateness is an example.
- ⁹ Page 330, *Race, rhetoric, and the postcolonial* edited by Gary A. Olson, Lynn Worsham. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, c1999.
- ¹⁰ Many of the members of the Hudson's Bay Company fit Richard White's 1991 description, if not definition, of 'middle ground' community (*The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, Cambridge University Press). We are using the concept in its broadest sense for any non-local people, regardless of original heritage, who built kin alliances along with economic alliances in new areas, such as the Pacific Northwest under joint British and American jurisdiction.
- ¹¹ Page 249, H. H. Bancroft *History of British Columbia 1887*
- ¹² E.A. McDougall, "John Bethune," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*. <<http://www.biographi.ca/EN/index.html>>
- ¹³ For the story of the McKay family and its evolution see Lisa Philips, *Thomas McKay and the Shifting Local Landscape*, presentation for the American Society for Ethnohistorical research conference, 2007.
- ¹⁴ Woolworth, Stephen, 'The School Is Under My Direction': The Politics of Education at Fort Vancouver, 1836-1838. *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 104.2 (2003): 47
- ¹⁵ Page 27-8, MacDonald, Ranald. 1923. *Ranald MacDonald: The Narrative of his early life on the Columbia under the Hudson's Bay company regime; of his experiences in the Pacific Whale Fishery; and of his great Adventure to Japan; with a sketch of his later life on the Western Frontier 1824-1894*. Edited and annotated by William S. Lewis and Naojiro Murakami. Eastern Washington State Historical Society. Spokane: The Inland-American Printing Company.
- ¹⁶ Gilbert, Frank T. 1882. *Historic Sketches of Walla Walla, Whitman, Columbia and Garfield Counties, Washington Territory, and Umatilla County, Oregon*. Portland, OR: Print. and Lithographing House of A.G. Walling, p. a25.
- ¹⁷ Page 72, Binns, Archie 1967. *Peter Skene Ogden: Fur Trader*. Portland: Binfords and Mort.
- ¹⁸ Page 350, Binns 1967.
- ¹⁹ Page 356, Binns 1967.

²⁰ Connolly v. Woolrich and Johnson et al. (1867), 17 R.J.R.Q. 75 (also reported: 11 L.C.Jur. 197), Quebec Superior Court, Monk J., 9 July 1867

²¹ Page 136, John Adams, *Old Square Toes and His Lady: The Life of James and Amelia Douglas*, Horsdal and Schubart 2001.

²² (*ibid*)

²³ Gilbert, Frank T. 1882. *Historic Sketches of Walla Walla, Whitman, Columbia and Garfield Counties, Washington Territory, and Umatilla County, Oregon*. Portland, OR: Print. and Lithographing House of A.G. Walling, p. a25.

²⁴ (Wolfley, Jeannette. 1990. "Jim Crow, Indian Style: The Disenfranchisement Of Native Americans" *American Indian Law Review* [Vol. 16 No.1], pp. 167-202, fn 31)

²⁵ McKay v. Campbell, 16 F. Cas. 161, 165 D. Or. 1871)

²⁶ McKay v. Campbell, 16 F. Cas. 161 (D. Or. 1871) (No. 8840) and Cross, Raymond. 2000. "Tribes as Rich Nations" *Oregon Law Review*, Vol. 79: 893, f4.)