1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service - Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

THÈSES CANADIENNES

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

Si manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

THE GENESIS OF FACTIONALISM AMONG THE INDIANS

OF THE SAUGEEN TERRITORY, 1843-1857

by

Sylvia Coral Waukey

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

May 13, 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-33414-2

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis

"The Genesis of Factionalism Among the Indians
of the Saugeen Territory, 1843-1857"

submitted by Sylvia Coral Waukey, B.A.,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts.

Bessie Cox
.....
Thesis Supervisor

John Harp
.....
Chairman, Department of
Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
May 13, 1986

ABSTRACT

This study deals with the rise of factional politics among the Indians of the Saugeen Territory of Ontario during the period 1843-1857. Chapter I serves as an introduction to the study. Chapter II discusses theories of factionalism, with emphasis on viewing factionalism as a type of political process, to be located within a general theory of political anthropology. Chapter III presents background information about the Indian groups involved, as well as on the Wesleyan Methodist Church, whose missionaries were active in the Saugeen Territory during this period. The role of the colonial government, through the Indian Department, is discussed. Chapter IV discusses and analyses a series of disputes which occurred between 1843 and 1857. These disputes are related to the theoretical considerations outlined in Chapter II. The significance of the activities of the Wesleyan Methodist Church and of the Indian Department is elucidated. It is hypothesized that it is the government's control of local political power, through the Indian Department, that was the key factor in permitting factionalism to develop and persist. Chapter V summarizes the study and draws conclusions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	THEORY	8
3	BACKGROUND	20
	APPENDIX TO CH. 3	47
4	FACTIONALISM	48
5	CONCLUSION	79
	MAPS	86
	REFERENCES	

I: INTRODUCTION

The present study is concerned with the origins of local level factional politics. We will discuss the rise of factional political activity among the Ojibwa and Potawatomi Indians of the Saugeen Territory of Ontario during the mid-nineteenth century. Our study will be ethnohistorical in nature in that it will detail the rise of factional behaviour through the analysis of available archival and published material. We will also examine the wider social and political context in which the Indians of the Saugeen Territory were placed, showing how factors of this type bear upon factional disputes. We will discuss the impact and roles of government and missionary personnel, showing how their own attitudes and beliefs led them to play an often significant part in the development of factionalism. Factionalism in the Saugeen Territory will be related to the more general pattern of factional behaviour which was common in Indian communities in southern Ontario in the nineteenth century.

The nature of relations between Indian groups, the Colonial government of the day, and Christian missionary groups influenced factionalism in crucial ways. In particular, the Colonial government, through the Indian Department, wielded control over Indian groups to such an

extent that Indians were not able to effectively resolve disputes to their own satisfaction. This factor is central in creating the conditions which allowed factionalism to develop.

It will be shown that factionalism in the Saugeen Territory during the nineteenth century is part of a more general pattern of factionalism in Indian communities in Ontario (Upper Canada) during that period. As a result, explanations advanced to account for factionalism in the Saugeen Territory must be related to the general pattern of factionalism during this era in Ontario. We will contend that the same factors and considerations which gave rise to factionalism among the Indians of the Saugeen Territory and the Whites involved in their lives were also to be found in other parts of Ontario during the pre-Confederation period.

Factionalism in the Saugeen Territory took the form of a series of ongoing disputes, beginning around 1843-1844, involving tribal leaders and their followers in the newly-founded Newash Village, near present day Owen Sound, north of Toronto. Protagonists in disputes were usually aligned, in varying configurations, according to tribal origin and religious denomination. Religious personnel (i.e. missionaries) and government agents played a part in disputes, either, in the case of missionaries, in instigating disputes, or, in the case of government employees, attempting to decide disputes in favour of one

side or the other.

A significant shift in the demographic makeup of the Saugeen Territory also was of importance in the rise of factionalism. Starting around 1837 and continuing into the late 1840s there was a major influx of Indians from other areas, especially of Potawatomi Indians from the United States, who had been forced to surrender their lands in the American Midwest south of the Great Lakes (Clifton 1975). Although other groups of Indians, including Ojibwas, also migrated to the Saugeen Territory, the Potawatomi migrations are of particular significance since prior to their arrival the area had been dominated by Ojibwa groups. The arrival of the Potawatomi gave rise to the possibility of inter-tribal difficulties. The likelihood of tension was increased by the fact that the incoming Potawatomi quickly came to outnumber the original residents, at least at Newash Village.

As well, divisions along religious lines also made a contribution to factional behaviour. During the period in question the religious composition of the natives of the Saugeen Territory was not yet definitively settled. The Wesleyan Methodist Church was especially active in missionary work in the area, although the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches were also represented. The conflict in which the religious groups were involved was heightened by the strong personalities and attitudes of some of the individuals

involved. Among these were David Sawyer, a native Methodist preacher. Sawyer's strong personality and his political influence make him a key figure in the political life of the Saugeen Territory during this period. Other important individuals entered into factional disputes at this time. Reverend Conrad VanDusen, a Methodist minister in the area during the 1850s figures largely in factional disputes. Another significant individual was Peter Kecedonce Jones. Kecedonce Jones was a chief at various times during this period and was involved in numerous disputes with Sawyer and VanDusen.

Also relevant to the rise of factionalism was that during this period extensive land surrenders were taking place, with government officials pressing Indian groups to surrender part or all of their land holdings, in order to make them available for White settlers. In the case of the final two major surrenders in the Saugeen Territory in 1854 and 1857, the factional groups were opposed on the question of whether to assent to these surrenders. Only the leader of the Potawatomi faction was in favour of the surrender. It may be significant that the Ojibwa of the Newash Village area of the Saugeen Territory were in a sense doubly dispossessed, since they lost land through the land surrenders and also came to be outnumbered by the Potawatomi newcomers.

In this study factionalism is viewed as being a

fundamentally political process, and as such is in large part concerned with access to and use of political power. As a result, although we will spend a good deal of time laying out the details of the various conflicts which constituted factionalism in the Saugeen Territory, it will always be our aim to understand these events in the light of theories of political anthropology.

Factionalism may be conceived of as a process of political activity involving organized conflict over political power. Specifically we use the term to refer to those conflicts which traditional mechanisms of conflict resolution are not able to deal with, for some reason or other, or to which traditional mechanisms do not apply. Often the matters over which factional conflict may occur can appear relatively minor or even trivial, at least to outside observers, and thus in principle should be resolvable. Factional conflict is often found in situations involving rapid social change, as in the case under discussion.

Having proposed that factionalism is a political process, it is necessary to determine which groups are involved in that political process. A striking characteristic of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory, and part of the more general pattern of factionalism in Ontario Indian groups is the extent to which non-Indian groups and their representatives were key components in the overall

picture of factional behaviour. The activities of these groups played a crucial role in the development of factionalism. The two most important groups in this respect were Christian missionaries and officials of the colonial government. What is significant about these two groups is that they were also participants in factional conflict, although in somewhat different roles.

Granting that factionalism is a form of conflict over political power, it will be seen in the course of the study that the missionaries, and particularly the representatives of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, were themselves part of the pattern of factional conflict. It will be seen that their motives for participating in factions were exactly the same as the Indians: they wanted access to power. In the case of the Methodists, their concern was in gaining power to influence the way of life of the Indian groups they were ministering to. It will be shown that to achieve their ends they engaged in factional conflict much like any other participant in factional politics.

The Methodists lacked direct access to political power. As a result they acted through the medium of the converts they made, influencing the attitudes their converts held towards the government, and influencing local political events.

The relationship of the government and its agents to

the general situation was somewhat different. Although there were cases where government officials were directly involved in factional disputes as participants, the significant aspect of the government's role was that it controlled the political power which disputants were seeking access to. At the same time government officials were frequently appealed to for assistance in settling disputes. Although they might adjudicate in particular disputes which were brought to their attention, they rarely if ever had a long term positive impact in situations involving factionalism. Because the mechanisms for resolving conflicts were in effect out of the hands of the disputants, conflicts would usually continue unresolved. Thus the subordinate position in which Indian groups were placed by the government was crucial both in the genesis and the perpetuation of factionalism.

II: THEORY

We shall treat factionalism as a process of local level political behaviour, ultimately analysing it as a type of political conflict in which traditional mechanisms fail to resolve the dispute(s) in question. This focus on factionalism as political activity entails that we should endeavour to locate activities considered to be instances of factionalism within the context of a general theory of political anthropology. Although such a theory has not yet been advanced (I believe), nonetheless some gains have been made which help to give some idea of the kind of framework which is required in order to understand the political organization of the types of societies which anthropologists study. This framework will be of assistance in helping analysts to make sense of factionalism rather than simply treating factionalism as a bizarre or exotic form of behaviour.

Swartz et al (1966) have emphasized that political processes involve public activity relating to the attainment of public goals. What is of importance therefore is that participants in political activities are concerned with achieving goals which are of significance to the group as a whole (Swartz et al 1966: 4-5).

To achieve political goals is to attain or to

implement 'power', however we wish to define this. Since different individuals or groups engaged in political activities have differing goals which they wish to achieve, the net result is what may be called "differential possession of power", which is the result of "differential behaviour concerning political goals" (Swartz et al 1966: 6,7).

Bailey (1968: 283) has noted that political activity "...is the pursuit of certain valued ends which cannot be attained by everyone. The ends are culturally defined as being in short supply...". Since these goals are a kind of cultural 'scarce resource', they will be highly valued by those involved in political activity.

This approach to political activity may conveniently be summarized as follows: "The study of politics...is the study of the processes involved in determining and implementing public goals in the differential achievement and use of power by the members of the group concerned with those goals" (Swartz et al 1966: 7).

Swartz and his co-authors note that the approach which they take emphasizes the central importance of politics as a process. They assert that the nature and composition of the groups which are engaged in political activity is peripheral or of secondary importance. This is the case because for example political activity could move across group boundaries without necessarily (or ever)

changing the nature of the political activity involved (Swartz et al 1966: 8). Although this downgrading of the groups involved in political activity may seem extreme, it is probably defensible at least to the extent that it forces analysts to concentrate on political processes. Nonetheless in our study we shall attempt to study the groups involved as closely as possible, in part for reasons of completeness, but also because we wish to show that the origins of the groups in question were an important factor in the political activity we are studying.

The anthropological literature contains numerous references to "factions" and "factionalism". Studies of native American communities are filled with these terms. It is safe to say that factions and factionalism are to be found in many of the societies which are studied by anthropologists. Nonetheless, although there is a kind of intuitive understanding of the meaning of the term 'faction', there has been relatively little consensus on what the significance of this term is, or how it relates to other aspects of political or social behaviour which are of concern to anthropologists.

Factionalism is sometimes conceived of as a kind of aberrant political behaviour. French (1938: v), discussing factional disputes among Pueblo Indians of the American Southwest, suggests that they "may be considered examples of political pathology". In a similar vein, Siegel and Beals

(1960a: 115) state that "...factionalism appears to be one of the more common maladaptive reactions to stress", and further describe factionalism as "...a particular type of non-adaptive inter-personal conflict" (Ibid: 107).

Siegel and Beals emphasize the counterproductive nature of factional conflict: "...factionalism...takes place between sub-units of a group in a manner which does not conform to expectations and which does not maintain but disrupts the cooperative enterprise. It has a tendency to intensify and to interfere in ever increasing degree with the ability of the group to achieve its goals" (Siegel and Beals 1960a: 108).

In their definition of factionalism Siegel and Beals (Ibid: 108) take account of the perceived negative consequences of factionalism, suggesting that factionalism be defined "as overt, unregulated (unresolved) conflict which interferes with achievement of the goals of the group" (their emphasis).

As the previous paragraphs indicate, some anthropologists perceive factional behaviour primarily in terms of negative attributes, as do some of the people involved in such activity (cf. e.g. French 1918: v; Siegel and Beals 1960b: 395, 396). Factional behaviour may be thought of as rather negative, since it is often viewed as an unproductive and time-consuming form of political action. Since members of factions are usually recruited on an

individual basis by faction leaders, assembling and maintaining a faction typically requires the deployment of a good deal of political energy which in principle at least could be more profitably used in more conventional political pursuits (Nicholas 1966: 56).

This feeling that factionalism is undesirable is in tune with the non-technical use of the term 'faction', which tends to mean something along the lines of 'groups which are opposed (for partisan reasons)', and usually has rather negative connotations. As Bailey puts it, "...no one will glory in being a faction fighter. It is always the other side which goes in for faction fighting" (Bailey 1969: 51).

A number of authors have emphasized that factional behaviour may, given time and the right circumstances, often evolve into more 'normal' types of political action. Thus Firth (1957: 294) suggests that "as more normal political institutions develop, factional organizations will be inclined to wither". In a similar vein Bailey (1969: 53) suggests that factionalism is a stage of political behaviour through which some groups pass, comparing it to a 'troubled adolescence'. By implication factionalism is a kind of transition stage which political groups may pass through on the way to political maturity.

It is our intent to place our view of factional politics within the context of an overall theory of political anthropology. Thus we agree with Nicholas,

Clifton and others who have emphasized the nature of factionalism as a political process. Clifton, in the course of his study of factionalism among the Prairie Potawatomi, characterizes factionalism in the following terms:

...factionalism is one of several types of conflict, but the reference is to a condition of a socio-cultural group...Factionalism thus is characterized as a type of overt unregulated conflict within a given social system, a type of conflict which persists long enough so that traditional control mechanisms can be brought to bear. Factionalism differs from other types of conflict in that these control mechanisms fail, so that the dispute continues unresolved and unregulated...factional conditions are defined as one sort of consequence of the stresses of culture contact situations, for the kinds of issues which lead to persistent unregulated conflict seem to be especially frequent at the intersection of different cultures...the view taken here of factional conflicts is that they are overt unregulated disputes resulting from the stresses of acculturation situations (Clifton 1970: 186).

Clifton's view of factionalism draws to a large extent on the work of Siegel and Beals (1960a, b) and French (1938, 1962), who view factional behaviour as a kind of aberrant political behaviour arising out of the stress and strain of situations of socio-cultural change, although it is worth noting that Clifton emphasizes the processlike nature of factionalism much more than those authors do. Boissevain (1977) has argued that factionalism does not always take place in the context of social change. Thus it may be the case that social change is not a defining characteristic of factional activity. On the other hand it will become evident in the case under consideration at least, factionalism did take place in this context, and

implicit in our study is the assumption that the situation in which the Saugeen Indians found themselves plays a role in the genesis of factionalism there.

Nicholas (1966: 52) considers factionalism to be organized conflict over political power. He regards factionalism as

primarily a political activity or phenomenon. By "political activity" I mean organized conflict over public power. "Power" is control over resources, whether human or material. In every society some control over resources is private and some is public, applicable to the entire society and allocated according to a set of rules. Participants in political activities attempt to expand their control over resources.

This type of approach to factionalism clearly emphasizes its nature as a political activity, thus allowing for factionalism to be integrated into a general theory of political anthropology. The unfavourable attributes often associated with factionalism may then be interpreted as consequences of the details of particular situations, rather than being seen as essential to the understanding of factionalism.

Although we have seen that factionalism is considered by some to be aberrant behaviour, it has been argued, convincingly I believe, that factionalism may in fact be an adaptive mechanism for dealing with certain situations. Thus Nicholas (1966: 55) points out that formation of factions may in some cases be a more efficient means of participating in political processes, than for

instance traditional means of political organization based on kinship, which might not be particularly well adapted to new and evolving political circumstances (cf. also Firth 1957: 293; J. Smith 1973: 11-12; Nicholas 1965: 57).

We have noted that some anthropologists have asserted that factional systems may evolve into more normal political systems. It has also been observed that factionalism is in many instances very long-lived (Silverman 1980: 1). This is certainly true of factionalism in many North American Indian communities, including the one under consideration here. We will suggest that this is a function of the nature of the relation between Indian groups and the governments which dominate them.

Firth (1957: 293-294) has suggested that factionalism is of significance in situations where "full political representation is denied" to the parties in question. Cox (1970: 97) has suggested that this gives a clue as to the reason for the formation of factions. He proposes that "factions are particularly likely to form where legitimate political authority is the monopoly of a particular group...those without access to established means of political power must establish their own special-purpose groups or 'quasi-groups'" (Cox 1970: 97). Thus conflict is between the 'haves' and 'have-nots' in terms of access to political power.

Cox (1970: 96) also notes that Firth and others have

implied that the goals over which factional disputes are waged are often of minor importance, i.e. it is the conflict in itself which takes on the most importance. It is this characteristic of factionalism which, in part, gives it its often aberrant appearance. This of course goes against our conception of political activity, of which factionalism is a subtype, namely that politics is a process pertaining to the achievement of goals. Cox also notes that while some of the disputes over which factional conflict are waged may appear to be of minor importance to outsiders, or to involve relatively trivial matters, they are likely to be of considerable significance to the disputants themselves. Thus the often superficial nature of factionalism is more a matter of perception than of substance. In the case of factionalism among the Saugeen Indians, it will be seen that many of the cases of factional dispute to be discussed are of precisely this character.

Students of factionalism have often noted that factions are distinct from corporate groups such as clans, lineages, etc (Nicholas 1965: 27). Perhaps the most significant characteristic of the structure of factions is the nature of the relationship between the faction leader and his followers. Adherence to a given faction is not a matter of ideological commitment (Bailey 1969: 27). Rather, faction members are usually recruited by a leader, who offers certain advantages to the recruit, in return for this

individual's support in matters of concern to the faction leader. Bailey (1969: 52) describes this as a transactional relationship. As is often noted, followers of a given faction leader are recruited according to diverse principles (Nicholas 1965:27; Firth 1957: 292). Thus a faction may recruit one member on the basis of a certain commitment and another member on some other basis. Since the faction has no corporate existence, the follower owes his allegiance only to a particular leader through a transactional relationship, not to a particular party or any other group. Because there is no ideological commitment, it will be easy for a follower to withdraw his support from a leader who is perceived as not having kept his promises toward his followers. As well, followers of a particular leader may readily change sides, shifting allegiance to another faction leader. These shifts of allegiance also play a role in making factional politics seem anomalous.

Similarly one would expect that if the faction leader were to withdraw from political activity, or to lose his political influence for some reason, a realignment of leaders and followers would likely ensue, with new configurations of leaders and followers arising.

One of the implications of the approach to factionalism taken here is that in some cases groups referred to in the anthropological literature as 'factions' do not in fact display the attributes of factionalism as

have characterized it. We treat factionalism as a political process in which traditional means of conflict resolution do not have any effect. Many of the cases described in e.g. Fenton (1955) as involving factions need not be so described since they involve successful resolution of conflict (cf. also French 1938; Linton 1936: 229; Bujra 1973). For example, Fenton remarks (Fenton 1955: 330-331):

There is some evidence that...factions existed in pre-Columbian America. The very existence of moieties, and the dual divisions, which frequently have ceremonial functions and operate to drain off aggression between halves of the tribe, suggest that the system of reciprocating sides may have had its origin in an effort to control factionalism...when men of authority and prestige failed to attain unanimity in the face of persistent factionalism, tribes segmented into bands of smaller units.

Here it is evident that the principle of band fission produces a satisfactory result, since conflict is resolved by splitting the tribe into smaller entities. Hence it is not necessary to regard this case as involving factionalism. It is likely that this type of conflict resolution by group fission is a very common means of dealing with conflict among groups with little formal political structure (Lee and DeVore 1968: 9).

In sum, therefore, we have proposed that factionalism be viewed as a political process involving organized conflict over political power, in which disputes fail to be resolved. This approach emphasizes that despite the seemingly anomalous appearance of factionalism, it is

nonetheless a type of political process and should be analysed as such.

III: BACKGROUND

Here we outline some of the contextual factors and the individuals which are relevant to analysing the development of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory. Among these are: land surrenders, pressures of acculturation, population movement, social and political organization of the groups involved, and the nature of relations between Indian groups, missionaries, and the colonial government. We also present biographical information on some of the important individuals who figure in the development of factionalism, as well as information about the Wesleyan Methodist Church, the most important Christian denomination active among the Saugeen Indians.

Factionalism in the Saugeen Territory developed between the years 1843-1857 in the context of certain important factors. There was a series of land surrenders involving almost two million acres of excellent land, in 1836, 1851, 1854, 1857, and 1861 (Indian Treaties and Surrenders 1891: 113, 169, 195-196, 213-214, 133-234). The government's methods of obtaining the assent of the Indians involved in the surrenders caused a great deal of dissatisfaction, and the legality of several of the surrenders is questionable (Schmalz 1977: Chapters III-VI; Surtees 1982: 211-230).

At the same time the natives of the Saugeen Territory were being pressured by the Indian Department (the arm of the Colonial government responsible for Indians) to give up their nomadic lifestyle based upon fishing and hunting and settle down, become Christians, take up agriculture, educate their children in White schools and generally become civilized, that is, assume the values of European culture (cf. Surtees 1967, Graham 1975 for discussion). These changes, which were being thrust upon the Indians by government officials and missionaries, must at the very least have been stressful. The Saugeen Indians had little or no prior experience with agriculture. During this period, hunting and fishing, which had been their primary traditional sources of food, became less reliable due to the decrease in their land base, as well as because of overfishing. On a number of occasions during this era famine was averted only by obtaining requisitions of pork and flour from the government (Schmalz 1977: 116). There was also tension over the government's desire to have parents send their children to a residential school. The Indians were often in debt to neighbouring white merchants (cf. e.g. Public Archives of Canada, Record Group 10, Vol. 131, Darling to Jarvis, Jan. 29, 1843; Ibid, Vol. 139, Pt. I, Wahbahdick to Jarvis, Feb 4, 1844; Ibid, Vol. 410, Sawyer

to Anderson, Nov. 15, 1848)¹. Consumption of alcohol provided by whites was also a problem (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 132, Herkimer to Jarvis, Dec. 20, 1843; Province of Canada, Report, 1845, Section III, Appendix 44 (Rev. T. Williams re Saugeens)). The Indians were also under pressure from white settlers in the area who were starting to encroach on Indian lands (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 120, Wabbandick to Governor General, June 10, 1843). The white population of the area increased dramatically after the late 1840s (DeMille 1971: 221). Subsequent to the 1836 land surrender the Indians were anxious with regard to their territory, fearing future surrenders and even the possibility that they would lose all their land (Province of Canada, Report 1845, Sect. III, Appendix 44 (Rev. T. Williams re Saugeens)). And in fact after the 1836 surrender some government officials wanted them to move to Manitoulin Island, in the middle of Lake Huron. This was a proposal which they strongly resisted (Surtees 1982: 221).

Starting in the 1830s there was a major influx of Potawatomi migrants from the United States, a factor which played a significant role in the development of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory. The Saugeen Village community, on

1 Henceforth, references to Public Archives of Canada, Record Group 10 (Indian Affairs) will be abbreviated as PAC, RG 10.

the west side of the Bruce Peninsula, was, and is, essentially homogenous both from ethnic and religious points of view. Most residents were Ojibwa, and Methodism was the main Christian religion. It was primarily at Newash Village, near present day Owen Sound, that factionalism split the community. This study is primarily concerned with Newash Village. This latter group was ethnically mixed, with large numbers of Potawatomi migrants residing among the original Ojibwa inhabitants. Although Methodism was the largest single Christian religion, others were represented, mainly the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. A number of Potawatomis had converted to Catholicism prior to coming to Canada (Vanderburgh 1977: 6; Clifton 1975: 14). As well, Charles Keeshick, a Potawatomi who was an important figure at Newash Village during the 1850s, was a member of the Church of England. By the 1850s the Potawatomi and other migrants at Newash Village (and later at Cape Croker, where the Newash Village Indians moved in 1857-1858) had come to outnumber the original inhabitants by about six to one (Schmalz 1977: 14). Exact figures on tribal origin of Saugeen Village residents are not available, but it appears that there were only a handful of Potawatomi who settled there permanently.

The movements of the Potawatomis migrants during this period in the Lake Huron area are very complex; they are not included in any detail in Clifton's otherwise very

helpful' study of Potawatomi migration in Canada (Clifton 1975). However it appears that there were many small highly mobile groups of Potawatomi, moving about from place to place until they could find a group which would accept them on a permanent basis. I will not pursue this any further other than to remark that a study of the available records is called for.

There were also other minor migrations into the area. A small group of Ojibwa from Coldwater, near Penetanguishene, settled at Colpoy's Bay, a small reserve to the northwest of Newash Village. The Colpoy's Bay reserve was surrendered in 1861. These people came to reside with the Newash Village Indians after their move to Cape Croker. A small group of Mohawks from Caughnawauga settled north of Newash Village during the 1850s. However most of them left after a few years, with a few families ending up at Cape Croker. Occasionally small groups or individual families moved to the Saugeen Territory on a sporadic basis, but they do not appear to have been significant in number.

Aboriginally the Potawatomi lived in the Lower Michigan Peninsula, later moving to the Door Peninsula in Lake Michigan around 1665, subsequently expanding their territory to the south and east of this area. They lived by hunting and fishing, combined with some growing of corn. Fishing had an essential place in their economy, although this was lessened somewhat by the acquisition of horses,

which broadened their hunting range (Clifton 1978: 726-727).

The Ojibwa of the Saugeen Territory had probably resided there since some time in the late 1600s after defeating Iroquoian groups in battle and driving them from the area (Schmalz 1977: Ch. I). Originally these Ojibwa were residents of the north shore of Lake Superior and/or Lake Huron. The Ojibwa had a culture broadly similar to that of the Potawatomi, with subsistence involving hunting, fishing, and gathering of berries, maple syrup, etc. Although they did raise some corn, it was a relatively minor part of their diet; in their original habitat north of the Great Lakes unpredictable weather made farming unreliable as a source of food. The Ojibwa and Potawatomi show many similarities of culture. The Ojibwa and Potawatomi speak distinct although closely related languages, both being of the Algonquian family (Clifton 1978: 726). Potawatomi-Ojibwa bilingualism was common (Rhodes 1982). Despite the points of similarity between the Ojibwa and the Potawatomi, it must be borne in mind that they are and were two distinct peoples.

It might be thought that linguistic differences and differences of kinship organization could have played a role in the development of factional conflict. Some space will be devoted to reviewing these factors here. It would be reasonable to assume that if the Ojibwa and Potawatomi who were co-resident in the Saugeen Territory were not able to

communicate with each other (and were forced to rely on interpreters - a relatively cumbersome and inefficient procedure), one could readily imagine this contributing to the inability of the two groups to co-exist, compounding and magnifying the differences between the two groups.

Potawatomi and Ojibwa are members of the Algonquian language family. They are related to other members of the same language family such as Fox, Cree, Menominee, Shawnee, and so on. It should be noted that Ojibwa and Potawatomi are distinct languages. It is true that they are very closely related (in linguistic terms), but nonetheless are distinct. This means that speakers of Ojibwa cannot understand Potawatomi and vice-versa (Clifton (1977: 29-30) provides a brief but useful discussion of this).

However, it should be emphasized that speakers of Algonquian languages around the Great Lakes (Ojibwa, Potawatomi, Menominee, Fox) have been in continuous and sustained contact with each other during the last three hundred years and perhaps even longer (Clifton 1977: 30). This has meant that many speakers of Algonquian languages have been bilingual in another Algonquian language. An invaluable discussion of this phenomenon is found in an article by Richard Rhodes entitled "Algonquian Trade Languages". As the title implies, Algonquian Indians were involved in trade ventures, especially the fur trade. This of course required that traders be able to communicate with

various groups in the area. Although there was probably some use of interpreters in trade ventures, there is good evidence that native bilingualism in the area was quite common. It is reasonable to assume that native bilingualism preceded the fur trade era, but there is no direct evidence on this that I am aware of.

In his article Rhodes notes that it is commonplace for present day Potawatomi to be bilingual in some dialect of Ojibwa (Rhodes 1982: 4, 5). He notes that at least some of the Potawatomi living west of Lake Michigan ('Forest Potawatomi') also spoke a dialect of Ojibwa. He also points out that during the nineteenth century the missionary Friederich Baraga working on the Michigan Peninsula had available to him liturgical material in Ojibwa. This material was used by several tribes: the Ojibwa, the Ottawa, the Algonquian (these three all being mutually intelligible dialects of Ojibwa), as well as by Potawatomi converts (Rhodes 1982: 5). As well, Rhodes make the following citation from the title of Baraga's grammar of Ojibwa, published in 1850:

A Theoretical and Practical Grammar of the Otchipwe Language, the Language Spoken by the Chippewa Indians: Which is Also Spoken by the Algonquian, Ottawa, and Potawatomi Indians; for the Use of the Missionaries Living Among the Indians of the Above Named Tribes.

Rhodes' remarks on the significance of this citation are as follows:

Of course statements about language use by pre- 20th

century writers are often dismissed by modern linguists as simply naive, but in the case of Baraga, whose description of Ojibwa is so good, his evaluation of the situation cannot be taken lightly. Furthermore his view is made all the more believable by the fact that in modern times, all speakers of Potawatomi in contact with another Algonquian language speak another Algonquian language...it is almost certain that in Baraga's day the Potawatomi were also speaking dialects of Ojibwa (Rhodes 1982: 5).

Taken cumulatively, these little pieces of evidence make it a virtual certainty that nineteenth century Potawatomi Indians spoke a dialect of Ojibwa, in addition to Potawatomi. Relevant also is Rhodes' observation of an asymmetry in Algonquian native bilingualism: native speakers of Ojibwa rarely or never learn another Algonquian language, while speakers of Menominee learn Ojibwa, and Potawatomi learn Ojibwa or Menominee. This makes it unlikely that Ojibwa Indians in the nineteenth century would have learned Potawatomi (Rhodes 1982: 8).

It is therefore a virtual certainty that the Potawatomi Indians who migrated to the Saugeen Territory were already fluent in a dialect of Ojibwa, or at the very least some of them were. Thus language barriers per se were not likely to have been a direct factor in contributing to factionalism in the Saugeen Territory, although the significance of language as a symbol of tribal identity cannot be overlooked.

It might also be thought that differences in kinship organization may have contributed to the rise of factional

conflict. This is particularly significant in light of the well-known view expressed in the writings of Gluckman (cf. e.g. Gluckman 1956, 1965), that in at least some societies with little formal authority, traditional methods of conflict resolution depended upon the structure of kinship organization. That is, conflict resolution depends in such societies upon the constraints imposed by an interlocking series of cross-cutting kinship ties.

If it were the case that the Ojibwa and Potawatomi had significantly different systems of kinship organization, logically, these differences would increase the difficulty of these groups being able to resolve conflicts. It seems quite reasonable that kinship structure was relevant for conflict resolution in the case both of the Potawatomi and the Ojibwa, since both groups had little formal political structure beyond loosely organized bands. Thus the role of kinship was bound to be important. However, Callender (1962, 1978), in what are probably the two most complete discussions of Algonquian kinship structure and its functions, makes no mention of the role of kinship ties in conflict resolution (However, J. Smith (1973) has emphasized the significance of kinship for political organization in a modern Ojibwa community). For the moment therefore, this hypothesis about the role of kinship structure in conflict resolution among Algonquian groups does not appear to be confirmed or disconfirmed, barring the discovery of new

evidence:

Concerning the question of differences of kinship structure between the Ojibwa and Potawatomi, it is not my intention to review all the evidence here. However, the two systems are broadly similar, and show the same basic organization (see Hockett 1964 and Morgan 1871 for lists of Ojibwa and Potawatomi terms). In many cases equivalent terms in the two languages are linguistic cognates. Both Potawatomi and Ojibwa show distinct terms for cross-aunt and cross-uncle and cross-cousin (there appears to be no Potawatomi term for male cross-cousin). On the other hand terms for parallel aunt and uncle are usually derived from other terms in both languages. On the basis of the close structural parallels in Potawatomi and Ojibwa kinship organization, I conclude that differences of kinship organization were not likely to have been a factor contributing to factionalism among the Saugeen Indians. As mentioned above however, the exact role of kinship ties in the regulation of conflict remains uncertain; this is an area where more investigation is warranted.

I will now make a few remarks about the political structures prevailing in the Saugeen Territory during the mid nineteenth century. Traditionally the Ojibwa and Potawatomi were nomadic hunter-gatherers, with a relatively undifferentiated political structure and a basically egalitarian social organization. There is disagreement

among ethnohistorians about Ojibwa social structure in the pre-contact and early contact eras. It is highly likely that contact with Europeans had a profound impact on social structure and political organization.

As well, the variations in political organization which are found among various Ojibwa groups show considerable sensitivity to ecological factors. Thus there is consensus that relatively northern groups (i.e. north of the Great Lakes), with lower population density, had less developed political structures, while southern groups (i.e. in southwestern Ontario and Minnesota), where population density was higher, show more elaborate political structures. These variations of population density and elaborateness of social organization correlate with ecological zones.

The office of chief appears to have been hereditary, and was determined by patrilineal descent (Rogers 1978: 762). It is possible that in some instances individuals could attain the chieftainship by virtue of achievement. The chief's authority was limited (Smith 1973). It should be noted that in many areas one of the effects of European contact was to increase the power of the chief, and also in some cases to create new categories of chief (Smith 1973).

The practice of having chiefs and other officials chosen on the basis of regularly occurring elections came later in the nineteenth century, at the requirement of the

colonial, and later, Canadian government. At both Saugeen Village and Newash Village during the 1840s and later there was a council consisting of two chiefs and a few councillors, as well as a secretary and/or interpreter. The secretary was responsible for handling correspondence to and from the Indian Department. Since the chiefs often had no knowledge of English, communicating with the Indian Department usually crucially depended on the secretary. This task might be performed by a literate Indian, or if necessary, by a non-Indian. Often the resident missionary would handle official correspondence (Graham 1975: 63).

Rarely, the Saugeen Village and Newash Village councils would join together in a General Council (the small band at Colpoy's Bay usually also formed part of such Councils), but on the few occasions that this occurred in the 1850s, it was for purposes of political manipulation by the factional parties (an instance of this will be discussed in Chapter IV).

It appears that the councillors and the secretary/interpreter were appointed by the chiefs, subject to the approval of the Indian Department. The power of the chiefs and the council during this period were, relatively speaking, rather limited. They were responsible for the spending of annuity money. This was a fund of money allotted annually to Indian groups as compensation, on a per capita basis, for lands surrendered to the Crown. It was

partly paid out in cash. As well, the annuity money could be drawn upon, subject to the Indian Department's approval, in order to buy supplies, food, farm equipment and animals, pay debts, and so on. The chiefs were also responsible for the distribution of presents, given annually to Indian groups as recognition for past military service. This latter practice was gradually discontinued in the late 1840s and 1850s. Other than these duties, the chiefs did not wield a great deal of power. As we shall see in Chapter IV, hereditary chiefs could be dismissed from office, or suspended. In actual fact, it was the Indian Department which held the real power in this relationship; it had the final say in any matter relating to Indians. Nonetheless, what power there was available to the chiefs certainly represented an attraction for office-holders, since they could ensure that their friends and followers received a good share of the annuity money, as well as positions on the council.

The question arises as to why the Indian Department, if it had ultimate control of political power, was not capable of stopping or controlling factionalism, which, as will become evident in Chapter IV, it did not consider to be desirable. A number of factors are pertinent. One is that the government did not have absolute power over the Indians. Rather, the government in effect constrained the political actions of the Indians, limiting their options and decision

making capacity, rather than dictating to the Indians in an absolute fashion. In effect the Indians could make their own political decisions, but always subject to the limits imposed by the Indian Department. Thus for example an Indian group might propose that a certain individual be made chief, but this decision had to be approved by the Indian Department. If the Indian Department disapproved of him for some reason, the request could be denied. Even relatively trivial decisions, such as purchasing equipment with the Indians' own annuity money, required Indian Department approval.

It is also relevant that although the Indian Department officials had the final say in the decision making process, they were not truly part of village level politics. Decisions made by Indian Department officials were taken to promote and protect government interests and policies. Their impact on Indians was a secondary consideration. This lack of integration between local level considerations and those of the Indian Department helped make factionalism possible, since for example a decision made by Indian Department officials with the Department's interests in mind could have a very different effect on Indians. It may be worth stating that there is no evidence that the Indian Department deliberately set out to create factionalism. However, that was the net effect of its actions, due to the nature of the relationship between the

Department and Indian groups.

We now turn to a consideration of the various religious groups operating in the Saugeen Territory at this time. The Wesleyan Methodists were the most active of the Christian missionary groups in the Saugeen Territory, as indeed they were throughout southern Ontario during the nineteenth century (Graham 1975). There was some activity by the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church, but certainly not to the same extent as the Methodists. Methodist activities in the area started as early as 1827 or 1828 with the visit of a party of missionaries led by Peter Jones, a convert of mixed Mississauga and White blood (Christian Guardian, Dec. 23, 1829, p.43; Ibid, Feb. 27, 1830; Ibid, Jan. 22, 1831, p. 41; Ibid, Aug. 1, 1832).

The Methodists were unique among missionary groups of the nineteenth century in the extent to which they made use of native missionaries and 'exhorters', or lay preachers. This undoubtedly helps to explain the relative success of the Methodists among Indian groups during this period (see Graham 1975 for a general assessment of Methodist activities in Southern Ontario during this period).

It was apparently at the inducement of the Methodist missionaries that some of the Indians who had pursued a nomadic lifestyle within the Saugeen Territory formed a permanent settlement at Saugeen Village, at the mouth of the

5

Saugeen River, in 1831 (Christian Guardian, July 23, 1831, p. 146). Shortly afterwards a school was established at Saugeen with the arrival of the first permanent Methodist mission in the area (Ibid, p. 146). The first permanent settlement at Newash dates from around 1842 (Report, 1845, Sec. II, p. 44). However it is worth mentioning that throughout this period the Saugeen Indians were still highly transient, moving from location to location within the Territory, according to the season and the subsistence activity associated with it (i.e. fishing, gathering maple sap, etc.; cf. DeMille 1971 for discussion).

The Indians living at Saugeen Village were always primarily Methodist from this time on. At Newash Village, other churches were active, in particular the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. They did not establish permanent missions there, unlike the Methodists, although a permanent Catholic mission was established at Cape Croker in the twentieth century (Schmalz 1977: Ch. IX). Of the three major church groups, the Church of England was always the weakest among Indians in the Saugeen Territory, and it eventually faded away in the latter half of the twentieth century.

The significance and impact of missionary activities upon Indian groups goes far beyond religious matters. Although there are differences of emphasis among the various denominations, missionaries played significant roles in the

lives of the Indians they ministered to. Their influence affected belief systems, religious organization, social organization, education, politics, economic activity, and indeed all aspects of the lives of their converts (Graham 1975: 5).

The Methodist missionaries played a significant role in the rise of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory. They pursued their goals aggressively, as is expressed by their attitude towards other Christian denominations. In scanning through issues of the *Christian Guardian*, an influential Methodist newspaper published in Toronto during the nineteenth century, one notes the hostility of the Methodists to Catholicism. In the newspaper one finds accusations that Catholic priests were involved in burning the Bible, warnings of the disasters that would befall the United States if Catholicism were to become widespread, etc. (*Christian Guardian*, Jan. 24, 1843, p. 54, "Burning of Bibles"; Ibid, April 27, 1842, p. 103, "Warnings to the American People, From the Confessions of a Catholic Priest"). The Methodists took pleasure in reporting the conversion of Indians from Catholicism to Methodism (*Christian Guardian*, May 18, 1842, p. 118, "Conversion of an Indian", by George Copway; Ibid, Jan. 25, 1843, p. 50, "Letters from W. Herkimer to P. Jones"). They complained about Catholic priests who attempted to discourage Indians from converting to Methodism (*Christian Guardian*, May 25,

1842, p. 122, "Missionary Intelligence From the Northwest", by B.T. Kavanagh).

This kind of interdenominational hostility was evidently mutual, however. Similar kinds of attitudes expressed by Church of England ministers may be found in Beaven (1844) and Waddilove (1838).

It is not surprising, in the light of this kind of attitude, that the Methodists played a role in the growth of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory. Several Methodist personnel were key participants in factional conflict in the Saugeen Territory; far and away the most significant in this regard were David Sawyer and Conrad VanDusen. Their careers will be discussed in Chapter IV.

It is likely that missionaries needed to be aggressive in their dealings with Indian people in order to win converts among native peoples, who, after all, had their own sets of beliefs and were not always convinced of the value of the new ones being advanced by missionaries (cf. e.g. Graham 1975: Ch. II). For example, on Manitoulin Island in the 1840s the Roman Catholic priest there was relatively active and was rewarded with a significant number of converts. On the other hand, the Church of England missionary there was less vigorous and had far fewer converts (Surtees 1967: Ch. V). Similarly, when an aggressive Catholic priest arrived at Cape Croker in the early twentieth century, he attracted a large number of

converts (Schmalz 1977: Ch. IX).

Throughout the nineteenth century the Methodists in Ontario were frequently involved in controversy. They took an active part in the political debates of the day, with their views often being at odds with those of the government. The Methodists in the nineteenth century viewed themselves as proponents of civil and religious liberties, with much of their energy being spent on advancing the cause of a more representative form of government, as well as on opposing attempts to make the Church of England into the official state religion (cf. French 1962 and Sutherland 1904). Egerton Ryerson, one of the most influential Methodist leaders of the period, contended that Methodist ministers "taught doctrines which lay at the foundations of a country's freedom", and that Methodism was the "first and the most effective promoter of civil and religious liberty for the entire country" (cited in French 1962: vii).

Many of the Methodists in Ontario during the early part of the nineteenth century were Americans, members of the Methodist Episcopalian Church. They were viewed with suspicion by members of the government, who, with memories of the War of 1812 in mind, suspected them of spreading pro-American ideas. After 1835 Canadian Methodists were primarily members of the British Wesleyan Methodist Church.

With respect to Indian affairs the Methodists often disagreed with the government. For example, they proposed

that Indians be given legal title to reserved lands, with alienation being possible only under certain conditions, one which was the approval of the local minister.

During the 1850s when the government was placing strong pressure on the Saugeen Indians to make further land surrenders, the Methodist missionary at Newash Village, Conrad VanDusen, was an active and aggressive opponent of the government. He authored numerous petitions directed to government officials. A collection of his efforts may be found in *Enemikeese* 1867, a volume which he wrote under a pseudonym.

The Methodists argued that Indians in Ontario were concerned that they had no clear legal title to their land and as a result were in danger of losing it, a concern which we have mentioned previously (cf. also Graham 1975: 27).

The government of the day was strongly opposed to any proposal that the Indians have legal documents validating ownership of the land they resided on. Lieutenant-Governor Sir Francis Bond Head, in a statement that is revealing of his general attitude toward Indians, remarked in 1839:

The Methodist Ministers might just as well declare, that when wild beasts roar at each other it is to complain of the Want among them of Marriage Licences, for animals understand these "Documents" just as well as Indians understand Title Deeds (Graham 1975: 27).

The Lieutenant-Governor also accused the Methodists of attempting to sow discord among the Indians, asserting

that if there were Indians unhappy over land tenure, it was only in locations where they were tended to by the Methodists (Graham 1975: 27).

Disputes between missionaries representing various denominations were common, as were disputes between missionaries and government officials. In this respect the situation at Newash Village was not exceptional. Church of England missionaries were often united with government officials in competition against other denominations. This was the case, for example, at the Walpole Island reserve in the 1840s, where the government agent there actively promoted the Anglican Church and discouraged the efforts of Catholic missionaries there (Graham 1975: 44-45).

A similar situation obtained on Manitoulin Island in the late 1830s and early 1840s, where the Indian Department had undertaken to start up a settlement where Indians from various parts of Upper Canada could come and reside. This scheme had been proposed by Lieutenant-Governor Bond Head in the 1830s (Graham 1975: 26). An Anglican minister was installed there as part of the government sponsored settlement, despite the existence in the nearby village of Wikwemikong of a previously established Catholic missionary. Superintendent Anderson, the Indian Department official residing at the settlement, was convinced that the Catholic priest, Father Proulx, was trying to create difficulties for the government settlement (Surtees 1967: 136-157). As a

result Anderson was reluctant to take actions which would imply support for the Catholic missionary, such as building him a house at government expense, as had been done for the Anglican minister (Surtees 1967: Ch. V).

Officials of the Indian Department were usually politically conservative sympathizers of the ruling Tory government, who for the most part were members of the Church of England (Leighton 1981). As a result, it would not be surprising if Indian Department officials tended to be unsympathetic to the Methodists and the Roman Catholics.

In one instance an Indian Department official, Chief Superintendent Samuel P. Jarvis, overstepped the bounds of official neutrality on religious matters. In 1838 Jarvis told Catholic Indians living at Wikwemikong on Manitoulin Island that they should embrace Anglicanism, since the Queen had ordered that a minister of the Church be sent there so that the Indians could gain a "true knowledge of the Scriptures". Jarvis also felt compelled to note to the Indians that their "Great Mother the Queen" was herself a member of the Church of England. Jarvis was reminded by his superior that Catholicism was not in any way disapproved of by the government (Surtees 1967: 159). Note that even though individual government officials were evidently biased on this matter, the government did not wish to be thought biased.

The Methodists often resented the Indian

Department's activities, in part because in many instances the Methodists had been active among the Indians before the Indian Department (cf. e.g. the remarks in *Enemikeese* 1867: 135). This was true in the Saugeen Territory, where the Methodists had been sending missionaries since the late 1820s, as was discussed above. By comparison, the Indian Department had virtually ignored the Indians of the Saugeen Territory until some years later. With a few exceptions there is no mention of the Saugeen Indians in Indian Department correspondence until 1843-1844.

In the Saugeen Territory, Methodist personnel and the Indians who had converted to Methodism were frequently in conflict with government officials, particularly Superintendant Anderson, the Indian Department official responsible for dealings with the Saugeen Indians after 1845.

Thomas G. Anderson started his career in the Indian Department in 1815 as a clerk, interpreter, and storekeeper. He was promoted to Superintendant in 1830 (Millman 1972). He was responsible after 1845 for the overall administration of the Department as well as being directly responsible for the affairs of certain groups of Indians, including the Saugeen Indians. Surtees (1967: 77, 78) describes Anderson as the most competent of the Indian Department employees during this period, although he suggests that in general "the Indian agents were, in many instances, men of second

rate ability".

As noted in the previous paragraphs there was often a close relationship between Church of England personnel and government officials. Anderson was typical in this regard. His sympathies toward the Church of England have a bearing not only on the situation in the Saugeen after 1845, but were also in evidence in the regions where he had worked prior to that period. Anderson had repeated problems involving religious conflict at Coldwater, an Indian Department settlement where he was in charge in the mid 1830s, and also on Manitoulin Island, as mentioned above (cf. also Surtees 1967: Chs. IV, V). It is significant that he was embroiled in controversy not only with the Methodists at Coldwater, but also with the Catholics there, and later with the Catholics on Manitoulin Island. Subsequently, in the Saugeen Territory it is significant but hardly surprising that he was perceived as opposing the faction controlled by the Methodists (cf. e.g. Enemikeese 1867: 79, 91, 95, 98-100). However it should also be mentioned that while working on Manitoulin Island, Anderson came to be dissatisfied with Frederick O'Meara, the Church of England minister there, because of his lack of long term success in converting the local Indians (Surtees 1967).

In general, Anderson had little of a favourable nature to say about the Methodists;

...the persons employed by the Methodist society were

the most active in the promotion of discontent with [in] the tribe (PAC, RG 10. Vol. 10, Anderson to Bruce, Sept. 5, 1853).

...it is a pity that those who are employed to instruct the Indians should be the cause of discord among them, and that too in direct opposition to the wishes of the Department (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 216, Anderson to Bury, Mar. 27, 1855)<2>.

The Methodist Ministers and school teachers are generally men of inferior attainments. The Church of England Ministers and school teachers, are I believe duly qualified (Province of Canada, Report 1858, App. 29).

Anderson's feelings about the Methodists found expression in other ways as well. On the occasion of a visit to the Owen Sound area, Anderson contrasted the poor food and drink he received in the home of a Mr. Frost, a Methodist 'exhorter' (as well as commenting negatively on the character of Mr. Frost's wife), with the fine food and congenial company he enjoyed at the home of Reverend Mulholland, a minister of the Church of England (Public Archives of Ontario, Diary of Thomas G. Anderson, Sept. 5, 1849, p. 34).

It should be clear that there is a strong and continuous thread of antagonism towards representatives of the Methodist and Roman Catholic Churches which runs through Anderson's career in the Indian Department. This fits into

2 Anderson was remarking on a petition which Conrad VanDusen, Methodist minister at Newash Village, had sent to the Indian Department.

the general pattern of conflict between the government of the day and the Methodists which we discussed earlier. In itself this was perhaps not a decisive factor in the genesis of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory, but it was a significant one. The genesis of factionalism was a result of the nature of relations between the government and Indian groups, and Anderson's position as an Indian Department official who represented a particular dominant view helps us explain the extent to which he was in conflict with Methodist personnel.

APPENDIX

INDIVIDUAL

BIOGRAPHY

GROUP

Thomas G. Anderson

Indian Department official responsible for Saugeen Indians 1845-1858.

Indian Department

William Herkimer

Methodist missionary at Newash Village 1843-1844, Saugeen Village 1850.

Methodist Church

Peter Kegedonce Jones

Ojibwa, leader of Potawatomi faction, 1850s.

Potawatomi faction

Charles Keeshick

Potawatomi, secretary at Newash Village, 1850s.

Potawatomi faction

David Sawyer

Ojibwa, Methodist missionary, leader of Methodist faction.

Methodist faction

J.T. Wahbandick
("White Deer")

Ojibwa chief; attacked by Methodists in 1840s; switched to Methodist faction during 1850s.

Ojibwa Indian

Conrad VanDusen

Methodist Missionary at Newash Village, 1850s.

Methodist Church

IV: FACTIONALISM

We will now review some of the events which occurred during the period 1843-1857, as they relate to the development of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory. The opening date is that of the first recorded instance of a factional dispute in the Saugeen Territory. In 1857 the Newash Village Indians surrendered their land and were preparing to move north to the land which the Indian Department had reserved for them at Cape Croker. By that time factionalism had developed and taken root among the Saugeen Indians at Newash Village; when they moved, the process of factionalism was transferred to their new place of residence.

In developing a narrative account of events in the Saugeen Territory I will inevitably be framing my account in terms of the actions of individuals and their followers. This procedure is of course necessary, yet may run the risk of misleading some readers into concluding that the genesis of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory is largely a function of the actions of specific individuals. Arriving at this conclusion would only be possible if one were to ignore the historical reality that similar cases of factionalism occurred time and again during this period in Indian communities in Ontario, and indeed in Indian

communities across North America (cf. e.g. Abler 1969, Clifton 1970, Graham 1975, Walker 1970). In each case the individuals and the details are different. What is constant is the nature of factionalism as a political process, in tandem of course with the contextual factors which we have discussed. To consider factionalism only in terms of the individuals involved would be to ignore the common ground which different instances of factionalism share. Hence in many cases Indians, missionaries, and government officials, each group with its own interests and goals, are to be found in conflict. It is the interaction of these 'interest groups' which is found in many different communities.

In late 1843, William Herkimer, the Methodist missionary at Newash Village, started an attack on John Thomas Wahbahdick (this name is spelled in various way in documents), a hereditary chief of that band, accusing him of various irregularities, misuse of band funds, drunkenness, immorality, opposing the wishes of the Indian Department, permitting "French half-breeds" to live on Indian land, and so on. Herkimer, himself an Ojibwa Indian, was the Wesleyan Methodist missionary at Newash Village approximately during the period 1843-1844; he was subsequently missionary at Saugeen Village during 1850 (Cornish 1881: 274, 346). He suggested to Indian Department officials that Wahbahdick be replaced by another chief (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 132, Herkimer to Jarvis, Dec. 20, 1843; Ibid, Vol. 132, Herkimer to Jarvis, Mar. 26, 1844; Ibid, Vol. 132, Herkimer to Jarvis, Apr. 1,

1844; Ibid, Vol. 133, Herkimer to Jarvis, 19, 1844). Herkimer's letters to Civil Secretary Jarvis (the Civil Secretary was also the chief Superintendant of the Indian Department until 1845) were followed by a series of petitions from village residents charging Wahbahdick with financial irregularities in the use of band funds, abusing his position for personal gain, and other misdeeds. These petitions also requested Wahbahdick's dismissal (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 133, Chief Newash et al to Jarvis, Sept. 19, 1844; Ibid, Vol. 121, Saugeen Chiefs to Governor-General, Oct. 17, 1844; Ibid, Vol. 133 (?), Peter Saco and John Jones to Jarvis, Dec. 6, 1844, pp. 76013-76014; Ibid, Vol. 139, Pt. II, Speech by Ka-ba-gau-bo to Jarvis, Dec. 18, 1844; Ibid, Vol. 509, Jarvis to Wahbahdick, Dec. 23, 1844; Ibid, Vol. 133, Peter Saco and John Jones to Anderson, Mar. 8, 1845).

Although there was probably a basis of truth to the charges against the Chief, as similar ones had been made some years before (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 127, Saugeen Chiefs to Jarvis, Aug. 29, 1838), it appears that Herkimer's desire to see him replaced was essentially motivated by religious considerations. Wahbahdick was a traditionally oriented hereditary chief. He contended that the drive to have him replaced was due to his unwillingness to convert to Christianity, and more specifically to Methodism (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 139, Pt. II, Wahbahdick to Jarvis, Jan. 18, 1845). Wahbahdick also contended that "Revd. Mr. Herkimer John Jones and some few others...have through their Bigotry and

fanaticism driven many of the most respectable and well disposed of the Indians from the village and compelled many others through fear of being expelled to become nominal Methodists" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 139, Pt. II, Wahbahdick to Jarvis; Jan. 28, 1845).

The conflict between Herkimer and Wahbahdick was such that Francis Burford, a White man who worked on the band's behalf as a secretary for Wahbahdick (i.e. writing official correspondence, etc) felt himself obliged to leave Newash Village because of the "religious differences which have latterly led to such unpleasant consequences among them" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 144, Burford to Jarvis, June 15, 1845).

Similarly, Wahbahdick stated, a few months after the charges against him had first been made, that he could not solicit Herkimer's aid in filling out some Indian Department forms, as "there is such a want of confidence between myself and the resident missionary here (who is the only person capable of interpreting) that I shall have to defer doing so until I send for an interpreter" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 139, Pt. II, Wahbahdick to Jarvis, May 5, 1845)<3>.

Wahbahdick himself did not feel that members of the

3. It is unclear who wrote this letter for Wahbahdick; the significance of the quote is that it displays Wahbahdick's perception of the state of relations between Herkimer and himself.

band should be obliged to adhere to any particular Christian denomination (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 410, Wahbahdick to Jarvis, Aug. 22, 1845). He was also resentful of the fact that the petitioners were attempting to remove a hereditary chief from office. He contended that there was no mechanism for doing so and that he had an inherent right to his position: "...this land belongs to me and my people, my fathers before me have always been chiefs here...and...it is the opinion of other chiefs my friends, as well as my own that there is no competent authority by which I can be removed from office except force" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 139, Pt. II, Wahbahdick to Jarvis, Jan. 28, 1845). It also upset him that John Jones, one of the people proposed to replace him as chief, was not an original member of the band, but was an Ojibwa who had moved there from Coldwater (Ibid).

Disputes at Newash became more intense with the arrival of David Sawyer in 1845. Sawyer was the son of Joseph Sawyer, chief of the Mississauga of the Credit band, near present day Toronto. David Sawyer had converted to Methodism in the 1820s and his connection to that Church continued up until the time of his death. He arrived in Newash Village during the summer of 1845 as missionary, schoolteacher, and interpreter for the band (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 144, Newash Chiefs to Jarvis, July 25, 1845). It should be noted that Schmalz 1977 erroneously states that Sawyer moved to the Saugeen Territory in 1833 (Schmalz 1977:

27). It is true that Sawyer spent a year there (approximately 1832-1833) acting as interpreter and helper to the Methodist missionary there (cf. e.g. Jones 1860, Enemikeese 1867). However his permanent residence there dates only from 1845. Similarly, Donald Smith (1982: 474) dates Sawyer's residence in the Saugeen Territory as commencing in 1847. However, it is clear from the pattern of correspondence from Sawyer to the Indian Department that he was living at Newash Village by the summer of 1845.

Sawyer was comparatively well educated for his day. His ability to read, write and speak English gave him a major advantage over most Indians, and helped him to very rapidly gain influence in the Saugeen Territory. Sawyer was involved in controversy virtually from the time he arrived in the Saugeen Territory, a pattern of behaviour that continued up until the time he permanently left the area around 1860. That Sawyer was bound to be a figure of controversy is not surprising when one learns that he on the one hand criticized other missionaries for being unwilling to go out into the backwoods in order to gain converts among the natives, and on the other criticized Indians for being too lazy for their own good (Smith 1982: 473-474).

Sawyer must have made a considerable impression in the Saugeen Territory, for, shortly after his arrival, Superintendent Thomas Anderson (who by now was the Indian Department official responsible for the Indians of the

Saugeen Territory during this period) decided not to dismiss Chief Wahbahdick on the charges raised by Herkimer and the villagers. Instead he appointed a committee consisting of Wahbahdick, Peter Sacko, and David Sawyer to run the band's affairs (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 268, Anderson Report re Wahbahdick, etc., Oct. 10, 1845)<4>.

Because of his fluency in English Sawyer was responsible for writing letters, transacting official business, etc., and soon came to perform the same tasks for the Saugeen Village band. This gave him a considerable amount of personal power, as he was probably one of the few people, or perhaps the only person, capable of performing these duties. However, Anderson was of the opinion that the appointment of Sawyer was an expedient until a band member capable of doing the job could be found (Schmalz 1977: 28). Sawyer in fact filled this position at Newash for a number of years until he moved to Saugeen Village as missionary in late 1851 (he returned to Newash Village about a year later). It is significant to note that both the Saugeen Village and Newash Village bands made requests, as soon as qualified people were available, that Sawyer be replaced (these will be discussed shortly).

4 Peter Sacko is listed as a chief on many of the early petitions for Wahbahdick's dismissal; on documents after about 1847 he is no longer listed as a chief, and does not figure in any significant way in subsequent factionalism.

During late 1845 and continuing into 1846 Sawyer started another campaign to have Wahbahdick removed from office (William Herkimer, the Methodist missionary who started the first campaign against Wahbahdick, had by this time left the area). Sawyer sent petitions and letters to Anderson and other government officials, but yet again Wahbahdick was not removed from office. The attack on Wahbahdick was again motivated by religious considerations, as he had allied himself with a Roman Catholic priest who had apparently been ministering to the "French half-breeds" who Herkimer had previously accused Wahbahdick of letting live on the band's land (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 122, Owen Sound Chiefs to Governor-General, Jan. 20, 1847; cf. also Ibid, Herkimer to Jarvis, Vol. 132, March 26, 1844). Sawyer complained that Wahbahdick gave land to this priest for a church or cemetery without the band's knowledge (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 409, Sawyer to Anderson, Nov. 7, 1845). Supposedly this priest was holding "private council with Wabatik" and generally creating dissension, as well as agitating against Sawyer and the Methodists (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 161, Pt. I, Sawyer to Varden, Nov. 17, 1846; Ibid, Vol. 410, Sawyer to Anderson, Nov. 17, 1846).

Sawyer was rather blunt when it came to describing what he perceived to be Wahbahdick's shortcomings: "Wahbaticks ignorance, dishonesty, want of industry, giving the people no good examples, his great selfishness, and want

of common sense in every thing make him quite unfit to be a chief" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 410, Sawyer to Anderson, Nov. 17, 1846). These are rather strong words, especially when one considers that Sawyer had only lived at Newash for little more than a year.

Not surprisingly, Superintendent Anderson came to be dissatisfied with Sawyer, and in 1846 apparently ordered Sawyer to stop corresponding on the subject of Chief Wahbahdick. Even then, Sawyer could not refrain: "...Altho you told me not to say anymore about Wabatick, I cannot help it but to inform you ...we have heard that Roman Priest wrote petition to Governor General about having built a Roman Church at this place...which we are very much against. Ever since that the Priest came here he hold private council with Wabatick" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 410, Sawyer to Anderson, Nov. 17, 1846).

Superintendent Anderson became critical of Sawyer, considering him a negative influence on the Saugeen Indians:

...from the conversation I had with Mr. Sawyer I am induced to believe that he excites improper feelings in the minds of the Indians (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 166, Sept. 21, 1847).

...unfortunately Mr. Sawyer is not a person who can set a good example in habits of industry and feelings of distrust have arisen...a division has been caused in the band by it...(PAC, RG 10, Vol. 191, Sept. 11, 1851).

It was believed that if Mr. David Sawyer was appointed to act for them [the Saugeen Indians] all would prosper, but it soon turned out that his object was of a private nature and ill adapted to promote the welfare of his people (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 203, Anderson to Bruce, June 14,

1853).

The relationship between Anderson and Sawyer fits into the general pattern of relations between government officials and the Methodists. In the first instance, government officials were suspicious of what they perceived as the attempts of the Methodists to interfere in political matters (Graham 1975: 27-28). In the second instance, the Methodists felt compelled to disagree with the Indian Department in a matter in which the Indian Department had the final say, in this case the suitability of Wahbahdick to act as chief, motivated in part by their hostility to Wahbahdick's Catholic allies.

However it was not just Anderson who expressed unhappiness with Sawyer. We noted earlier that Sawyer had been acting as secretary and interpreter for the band at Saugeen Village, as well as the Newash Village band. Starting in 1849, the Saugeen Village Indians requested on at least two occasions that he no longer fill this post:

... we wish to employ Moses Madwayosh as schoolteacher and interpreter and to do our business for us in the situation which David Sawyer now holds... (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 410, Saugeen Indians to Anderson, May 17, 1849).

We have also unanimously agreed not to employ David Sawyer anymore to do our writing neither do we wish him to break open our letters and we wish our letters to come separate from those to Owen Sound. Mr. Herkimer has kindly agreed to act as Interpreter; by this arrangement we will be saved a great deal of trouble (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 186, Pt. I, Saugeen Village Chiefs to Anderson, Jan. 6, 1850).

Moses Madwayosh, who was proposed as a replacement

for David Sawyer, in the first citation immediately above, was the son of Alexander Madwayosh, one of the Saugeen Village chiefs. He had been educated at Upper Canada College, a prestigious private school (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 172, Anderson to Civil Secretary, Sept. 19, 1848). William Herkimer was the Methodist missionary stationed at Saugeen Village during 1850 (Cornish 1881: 346). It is not clear whether or not Sawyer was dismissed on either or both of these occasions. Although these citations do not go into any detail, the implication is clearly that Sawyer's role and influence in the affairs of the Saugeen Village Indians was undesirable in the view of village residents.

Returning now to Sawyer's attacks on Chief Wahbahdick, there may well have been some genuine dissatisfaction among the Newash Village Indians about his leadership, but undoubtedly the missionaries channelled this into calls for his dismissal in order to further their own goals. In effect they manipulated existing conflict for their own ends. The missionaries fostered the values of Euro-Canadian society: agriculture, sedentary lifestyle, school education, Christianity. A victory over Wahbahdick would signal a victory for these values. Wahbahdick of course recognized that his power as chief was being challenged. His alliance with the Roman Catholic priest represented a response to the threat posed by the Methodist preachers. It was likely that the new converts to Methodism

represented by Herkimer and Sawyer felt shut out from positions of political power and influence by the traditionally oriented Wabwahdick. Attacking Wabwahdick by means of petitions would be their primary means of reacting to this situation. We have discussed earlier (Ch. III) the observation that formation of a faction is likely to be a response of those who feel themselves shut out from power; such is the case here.

It is interesting to note that at this point there is in effect only one factional group, namely that of the Methodist personnel and their converts. This is in line with the observation made in Cox 1970 that in many instances factional disputes may involve only one faction, i.e. consisting of those people denied access to political power.

It is also relevant to note that in this case the fact that the Methodists and their converts were excluded from power meant that the Methodists' goal of influencing the lives of the Newash Indians could not be validated by political authority in village politics. Hence in effect the implementation and validation of Methodist goals remained limited to the personal influence of the missionary.

Trouble started up again in 1851 when Peter Kecedonce Jones (not to be confused with Peter Jones, Methodist missionary; he is unrelated to John Jones, mentioned earlier during discussion of the initial attack on

Wahbahdick), who had been appointed second chief at Newash around 1847, decided to dismiss David Sawyer as band secretary and replace him with Charles Keeshick, Kegedonce's brother-in-law. Keeshick was a Potawatomi whose family had moved to the Saugeen Territory. Although this appointment was an act of nepotism, Keeshick was well-qualified for the job, since he had been educated at Upper Canada College, the exclusive private school where Moses Madwayosh, son of the Saugeen Village chief Alexander Madwayosh, had also been educated (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 172, Anderson to Civil Secretary, Sept. 19, 1848).

Sawyer attempted to counteract the appointment of Keeshick by circulating a petition for the removal of both Chiefs Wahbahdick and Kegedonce (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 190, Minutes of Council at Newash, June 25, 1851; Ibid, Newash Petition to Anderson, July 9, 1851). In fact, Chief Wahbahdick was suspended from office for one year, 1851-1852, for various irregularities, among which were misuse of band funds and drunkenness. Sawyer lost his position as secretary in 1851; he moved to Saugeen Village in late 1851, and returned to Newash Village about a year later.

This dispute was somewhat more complex than the previous ones, since it involved both religious and tribal factors. It is worth mentioning that prior to this dispute there is no recorded instance of questions of tribal origin.

having played a role in factionalism at Newash Village. Keeshick, the new secretary, was a member of the Church of England, as well as being a recent immigrant. Since he was better educated than Sawyer was, the latter's power and influence would likely be diminished, as far as band affairs were concerned. It should be noted that Keeshick's style of English, in his official correspondence, is always very idiomatic, with few errors of grammar or spelling. This is in contrast with Sawyer's written English, which is evidently not that of a fluent native speaker, and contains numerous spelling errors. By losing his position as secretary, Sawyer would be deprived of a good deal of influence, and it would also mean the loss of an important means of furthering the aims of the Methodist Church.

Motives were confused and clouded by the introduction of other factors. Chiefs Wahbahdick and Kegedonce contended that the circulators of the petition for their removal were not true members of the band and thus had no right to demand the removal of the chiefs:

Your petitioners have also to say that some of the Indians who made complaint against them don't belong to the tribe, particularly David Sawyer and George Arthur Tabegwun, who have in sufferance been allowed to interfere in the affairs of the tribe. George Arthur, he is an American Pottawattami Indian, not a member of the tribe, and has no right to interfere in it's affairs at all, and therefore no right to be chief over true Chippewas..." (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 191, Newash Chiefs to Governor-General, July 24 (?), 1851).

David Sawyer also raised the same issue about his

opponents, contending that some of the chiefs' supporters had not been adopted into the tribe, although he evidently considered himself a band member. The following passage shows that Sawyer was still concerned with the religious dimensions of the dispute as well:

The opposit side are chiefly pagans Roman Catholics and some who were once professors of Christian religion and now worse than pagans...because they are more pagan than Christian, some have no business with it [i.e. dispute over leadership] they have no concern in it and were never adopted in the tribe as we are tho they draw presence [i.e. presents] here. These things must be fairly understood...I did not know whether they are properly in the tribe or not and I am doubtful yet (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 410, Sawyer to Anderson, July 25, 1851).

Concerning Sawyer's status, it should be noted that there are several references to Sawyer having been made a member of the Newash Village band, and that he was given a tract of land by the Indians, who also paid for the construction of his house (cf. Enemikeese 1867: Ch. VIII; PAC, RG 10, Vol. 183, Pt. II, Anderson to Bruce, Oct. 4, 1850; Ibid, Vol. 410, Sawyer to Anderson, July 9, 1851). Enemikeese (1867: 36-38) cites an 'Indian Deed', granting Sawyer title to twenty five acres of land as well as paying the cost of constructing a house. This deed was ostensibly signed by the Newash Village Indians. However such a document would have had no legal value as far as the Indian Department was concerned. Peter Kegedonce Jones signed some but not all of these documents (e.g. he did not sign the petition of Sept. 23, 1850 cited in Enemikeese 1867: 32-33).

It is likely that the various documents concerning title to Sawyer's land and house are part of the overall factional maneuvering but it is to be noted that there are no communications opposing the decision to grant title for land to Sawyer. One significant aspect of this matter is that Indians could not receive title to individual pieces of land, a fact that Sawyer and other Methodist personnel certainly would have been aware of. Hence for Sawyer to attempt to obtain title to land fits into the general pattern of the Methodists' opposition to the government on political matters, especially Indian affairs.

Returning now to the question of band membership, during this period the procedures for becoming a band member appear to have been rather informal. On occasion one finds requests in official correspondence that individuals or families be integrated into a band (cf. e.g. PAC, RG 10, Vol. 190, pp. 111054-111057). The request would usually originate with the chief of the band in question and often involved transfer of annuity payments. There does not appear to be any correspondence which would indicate that the Potawatomis in the Saugeen Territory were ever formally integrated into the band at Newash Village. Nonetheless their right to live there was never contested by the Indian Department, and they did draw annuity money and received presents (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 536, Anderson to Owen Sound Chiefs, Oct. 9, 1852).

A good many of the Indians in the area were still semi-nomadic; the notion of formal membership in a band may not have been very relevant to them. In any event, the lax procedures certainly allowed disputants in the present case to accuse each other of not being true members of the band.

By the time of this dispute in 1851 religious and tribal factors were becoming intertwined. Keeshick, whose appointment as secretary was the original reason for the attempted removal of the chiefs, was a Potawatomi, and a member of the Church of England. Chief Kegedonce would come to be viewed as the leader of the Potawatomi faction, and opposed to Sawyer, even though Kegedonce was a Methodist and his step-father was an Ojibwa chief (for references to Kegedonce's step-father, see Jones (1860: 239, 240, 267, 284))<5>. At the same time it should be borne in mind that Kegedonce had kinship ties to the Potawatomis: Keeshick was his brother-in-law.

At the same time, when Sawyer had circulated his petition for the removal of the chiefs, he had nominated

5 Schmalz (1977: 24) asserts that Kegedonce Jones had "Roman Catholic leanings", basing himself on unsubstantiated statements by the Roman Catholic priest at Cape Croker in the late 1960s or early 1970s, as well as on a document written by Kegedonce's grandson (which I have not seen). I find this unlikely, although not impossible; Kegedonce's 'leanings' would almost certainly have been mentioned by Sawyer in his petitions, or by Enemikeese 1867, who never missed a chance to criticize Kegedonce.

George Arthur Tabegwun, a Potawatomi, as a replacement. In fact, Tabegwun did become second chief when Wahbahdick was suspended from office. This latter appointment caused discontent among the Ojibwa, since both Kegedonce and Tabegwun were viewed as adherents to the Potawatomi faction, and opposed to Sawyer and the Methodists. As a result of Sawyer's maneuverings the native Ojibwa were unrepresented at the level of the chiefs (Schmalz 1977: 32-33). Sawyer was aware of the problem he had created, and, after having been the originator of the petition to have Wahbahdick removed from office, he subsequently proposed that Wahbahdick be reinstated:

...I would also beg leave to observe that J.T. Wahbahdick is a suitable one to be appointed chief and is also one of the old settlers, and therefore they wish him appointed instead of other Indians that came in among them for they will not agree that other Indians should come to rule them in Council if there is any fit for the office among the original settlers...In making this observation they have no fault to find with the chiefs that are not original settlers but wish that when any are to be appointed the original settlers should be appointed if they are fit for the office and therefore wish J.T. Wahbahdick head chief over the tribe (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 198, Pt. II, Sawyer to Bruce, Aug. 21, 1852).

Subsequently, Wahbahdick sided with Sawyer and the Methodists, his old rivals, as factionalism became more clearly aligned along tribal lines, with the Methodists being primarily identified with the Ojibwa. By this time Wahbahdick's hostility was aimed at the Potawatomis, who had in effect 'taken over', usurping his power.

Controversy continued in late 1851 when the Newash

Indians decided to dismiss their schoolteacher, who had been appointed by the Methodists. Their stated reason for doing so was that the personnel chosen by the Methodists were invariably of low calibre, a judgement with which Superintendant Anderson agreed (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 196, C. Keeshick to Anderson, Apr. 6, 1852; Ibid, Vol. 196, Anderson to Bruce, May 12, 1852; Province of Canada Report, 1858, App. 29, Anderson to Pennefather, Aug. 19, 1857).

The Indians wished to appoint a Mr. Winter, who was apparently well-qualified academically, but who was a member of the Church of England. It should be noted of course that Charles Keeshick, the new secretary, was a member of the Church of England; the proposal to appoint Mr. Winter as schoolteacher may as a result be perceived as part of the maneuvering for power which typifies factionalism.

The appointment of Mr. Winter was not acceptable to the Methodist missionaries, and they agitated for his removal to the point of the Methodist Superintendant of Missions Reverend Enoch Wood, being reported as having asserted that it was his right to decide who would teach the Indians (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 196, C. Keeshick to Anderson, Apr. 6, 1852; On this controversy see also: Ibid, Vol. 196, Keeshick to Anderson, Apr. 30, 1852; Ibid, Vol. 200, Owen Sound Chiefs to Anderson, Dec. 8, 1852; Ibid, Vol. 411, Carney to Anderson, Jan. 14, 1853; Ibid, Vol. 203, Anderson to Bruce, June 14, 1853; Ibid, Vol. 205, Council at Owen

Sound, Aug. 16, 1853; Ibid, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Carney to Anderson, Apr. 21, 1855).

Although Mr. Winter had indicated his willingness to defer to the Methodist missionary in matters of religious instruction, this was not sufficient, and he eventually resigned rather than attempting to continue in the face of such decided opposition.

The Methodists were willing to go to considerable lengths in order to assert their control over affairs at Newash Village. After the departure of Mr. Winter, the Methodists decided to pay the schoolteacher out of their own funds rather than have him paid out of band funds, as had been the practice (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 205, Anderson to Bruce, Oct. 1, 1853). This meant that they could appoint who they wished without having to undergo the influence of the Indian Department, or the Indians. And in fact, George Blaker, the person appointed by the Methodists to take Winter's place, reportedly refused to be examined to see if he was qualified for the position, as Superintendant Anderson had requested, saying that "The Indian Department or Captain Anderson have nothing to do with me" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 200, Keeshick to Anderson, Dec. 13, 1852). In early 1853 Charles Keeshick decided to open his own school (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 412, Keeshick to Anderson, Mar. 8, 1853).

One of the key figures in this dispute was Reverend Conrad VanDusen, who arrived at Newash as Methodist minister

in 1852. He was instrumental in forcing Winter's departure and figures largely in ensuing controversies (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Carney to Bury, Apr. 21, 1855). At various times throughout the 1850s VanDusen and Sawyer were the driving forces behind diverse attempts to get Peter Kegedonce Jones and Charles Keeshick dismissed from office. VanDusen wrote a book about David Sawyer, under the pseudonym Enemikeese (Enemikeese 1867). This book is a useful but decidedly selective account of Sawyer's activities in the Saugeen Territory (and indeed of VanDusen's), and hence touches on many of the factional disputes at Newash Village, particularly those that occurred in the 1850s. A biography of VanDusen may be found in French 1972.

VanDusen's career at Newash Village, up until the time of his departure around 1857 (Cornish 1881: 343), was marked by a pattern of involvement in all aspects of the life of the Newash Village band. Richard Carney, a prominent resident of the Owen Sound area during this period, remarked that "...as soon as Mr. VanDusen came he aimed at the whole and sole control of the whole of the Indian affairs in all the Bands [i.e. Saugeen Village, Newash, and Colpoy's Bay]" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Carney to Bury, Apr. 21, 1855).

VanDusen was openly hostile to other religious denominations, in particular the Roman Catholic religion.

In this respect his attitude is similar to that earlier attributed to the Methodists in Chapter III:

...we found four families of Indians encamped at this place, chiefly Roman Catholics and appeared filthy and degraded as in the pagan state...(Christian Guardian, C. VanDusen, "Voyage on Lake Superior", Oct. 18, 1854).

Among the pagans we found several who had been baptized by Jesuits but we found no difference in morals, or appearance, between them and the genuine Pagans, nor did they appear any more enlightened or happy in mind. No pampered imagination can make the Pagan happy. The circumferaneous Jesuits that wander on the North shores of Lake Superior excite considerable attention among the pagans by their mummary and dazzling array. But the Roman Catholic Litany is so full of sickly unction and babyish prattle, that the dim light in which the Gospel is represented by them, though it may at first attract, it cannot fail ultimately to create disgust...(Christian Guardian, "Lake Superior North Shore", C. VanDusen, Oct. 18, 1854, p. 6).

VanDusen was perceived by the Indians as manipulating Chief Wahbahdick (discussed below). Wahbahdick came to be aligned with the Methodist faction, yet was by all accounts not a Christian, notwithstanding his alliance in the 1840s with a Catholic priest. Richard Carney described Wahbahdick by stating that "he and his immediate adherents are if anything pagans; they have said they were Roman Catholics..." (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Carney to Bury, Apr. 21, 1855). However despite VanDusen's harsh words about nonMethodist Indians, he and David Sawyer were evidently willing to manipulate Wahbahdick for their own purposes. Richard Carney described the situation as one in which Wahbahdick "is sustained by Mr. VanDusen, and it is through him that Mr. VanDusen can carry out his intrigues"

(Ibid). Carney also considered VanDusen "not generally liked by the Indians" (Ibid), and felt that there was a "kind of perpetual strife maintained by the scheming and intriguing of the Revd. gentleman" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 230, Carney to Pennefather, Nov. 1, 1856).

The Indians also complained of the actions of VanDusen. Thus John Johnson, a supporter of Peter Kegeponce Jones and his faction, complained to Superintendant Anderson that "David Sawyer and Revd Mr. VanDusen are two of those who cause the trouble they have taken from us our chief J.T. Wahbahdick and make him do as they wish" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. II, Anderson to Bury, May 24, 1855).

There is evidence that on one occasion VanDusen dictated a letter suggesting that the Indians of the region not send their children to the residential Alnwick Industrial School (near Peterborough), as the Indian Department wished them to do. Wahbahdick was apparently persuaded to sign this letter without understanding its contents, or so he claimed (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 205, Anderson to Bury, Sept. 5, 1853). Copies of this letter were sent to the various Indian groups in the region, much to the displeasure of the Indian Department (Ibid).

The Methodists were strongly opposed to the residential school at Alnwick, since the various denominations would be mixed. The Methodists were attempting to persuade the Indians to pressure the

government to build permanent manual schools on each reserve. The Methodist missionary Peter Jacobs delivered speeches against the Industrial school to various Indian groups (Ibid).

This incident is significant in that it shows how the Methodists would attempt to influence the decision making process through the medium of the Indians. Since they did not have direct access to the decision making power vested in the Indian Department they were obliged to act through their Indian converts and other factional allies. Note that while Wahbahdick was a part of the Methodist faction by this time, he was not a convert. This shows the non-ideological basis of the faction. Wahbahdick joined the Methodist faction, because he likely thought that it would be the best way of protecting his interests.

No doubt VanDusen would have liked to have been able to assert his influence over Peter Kecedonce Jones, the leader of the Potawatomi faction. Despite the fact that Kecedonce was a Methodist and attended VanDusen's church, VanDusen was not capable of influencing him. The following passage illustrates a certain frustration and shows some grudging admiration for Kecedonce Jones: "This...chief is a member of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Newash over which I am the pastor, and though he can scarcely say anything in English, and has no intelligence, yet I respect him for his energy of character..." (Enemikeese 1867: 63).

Superintendent Anderson came to perceive VanDusen as a troublemaker who interfered in the affairs of the Indians and caused difficulties for the Indian Department. Writing to Civil Secretary Bury, his immediate superior, about some of the complaints the factional parties were making about each other, Anderson remarked:

The petition which I had the honor to submit to you on 22 December last was to all appearances got up by Keeshicks and his friends for party purposes - the one under consideration appears to me to emanate from the pen of Rev. Mr. VanDusen for the same purpose and does not exhibit more if so much Xtian [sic] forbearance, and forces upon the department the annoyance of interfering in matters of an incoherent and shameful nature that should not exist...(PAC, RG 10, Vol. 536, Anderson to Bruce).

VanDusen frequently involved himself directly in the affairs of the Newash band. Often he would forward petitions directly from the Indians to the Civil Secretary (Anderson's immediate superior), thus bypassing Anderson, whom he disliked. This procedure was irregular in that Indian Department protocol required that correspondence from the Indians go first to Anderson, although this rule was frequently ignored. VanDusen would usually include a cover letter explaining the purpose of the petition, and offer his own opinion, which was usually an amplification of the subject of the petition. It is evident that many of these petitions were in fact dictated by VanDusen, as Anderson suspected, since the grammar and spelling are far more polished than in the petitions written by Sawyer. On one of

VanDusen's letters to the Civil Secretary, someone (possibly Civil Secretary Lord Bury) has written in the margin "The interference of Mr. VanDusen as a Minister of the Gospel seems uncalled for" (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 216, VanDusen to Bury, Feb. 28, 1855).

A characteristic of VanDusen's correspondence concerning the Indians is the extent to which he emphasizes the ethnic differences within the Newash community. In several of his letters he lists the tribal origins of band members, identifying members of the faction led by Peter Kegedonce Jones as 'foreigners' (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. I, VanDusen to Bury, April 16, 1855). In one of his letters to Lord Bury he felt it necessary to point out that Peter Kegedonce Jones was a "descendant of a Sou", but neglects to mention that he had apparently resided in the area since childhood and that his stepfather was a hereditary chief (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 218, Pt. I, VanDusen to Bury, June 30, 1855).

VanDusen's letter-writing activities led to complaints from Peter Kegedonce Jones, who was the target of most of these petitions (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 216, Kegedonce to Bury, March 7, 1855). During the spring of 1855 there was a series of communications to the Indian Department from the two factions complaining about each other (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Kegedonce et al to Bury, April 3, 1855; Ibid, Vol. 217, Pt. II, Saugeen Council to Bury, Apr. 10, 1855;

Ibid, Vol. 217, Pt. I, VanDusen to Bury, Apr. 16, 1855; Ibid, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Anderson to Bury, Apr. 25, 1855).

In April of 1855 Wahbahdick and David Sawyer refused to cooperate with Kegedonce Jones in the preparation of a census, and in fact the two parties each submitted their own census (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Kegedonce et al to Bury, Apr. 3, 1855).

On April 10, 1855, a General Council of the Indians was called by Sawyer and VanDusen, by which Kegedonce was removed as chief, and David Sawyer was nominated in his place. Charles Keeshick was also removed from office. Complaints were made at this time against Kegedonce and Charles Keeshick (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. II, Saugeen Council to Bury, April 10, 1855). There were a number of irregularities surrounding the General Council, in particular that Kegedonce and his followers were not present, and indeed had not been informed of the meeting (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. I, Carney to Bury, Apr. 21, 1855). It was suggested later by John Johnson, one of Kegedonce's supporters, that Sawyer had made the minutes of the council appear as if all the chiefs and 'principle men' had been present (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. II, Anderson to Bury, Apr. 21, 1855). The removal of Kegedonce and Keeshick was not recognized by the Indian Department. In any event decisions regarding choice of officials were supposed to be made by each band on its own, not in a General Council (PAC,

RG 10, Vol. 200, Owen Sound Chiefs to Governor-General, Dec. 6, 1852).

Superintendent Anderson decided that Kegedonce and Keeshick were not guilty of any irregularities, although he did dismiss Wahbahdick for drunkenness (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. II, Anderson to Bury, May 19, 1855). Regardless, a few days later each of the chiefs submitted requisitions to Superintendent Anderson for the Chiefs' salaries (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 217, Pt. II, Anderson to Bury, May 30, 1855). Only that of Kegedonce was recognized.

A few months later a similar situation arose. Some White men, the Mackenzies, had been authorized to cut wood on the Newash band's land, with fees to be paid to the band council at Newash Village. David Sawyer went to the Mackenzies, telling them that the money should be paid to himself and Wahbahdick, and that if they paid it to Kegedonce, they would have to pay it again to Sawyer and Wahbahdick, who were the only ones authorized to collect it. VanDusen also told the Mackenzies to do the same (PAC, RG 10, Vol. 411, Carney to Anderson, Sept. 17, 1855). It was noted that Sawyer "assumes the air of a chief" even though the Indian Department had refused to confirm his appointment (Ibid). Eventually the Mackenzies were told to pay the money to Kegedonce. Not surprisingly, by this time Anderson was suggesting that the Indian Department might find it necessary to remove VanDusen as missionary (PAC, RG 10, Vol.

220, Anderson to Bury, Sept. 22, 1855).

The incidents just discussed (census, removal of Kegedonce Jones; submission of salary requisitions, dispute over timber fees) are unified to a considerable extent in that each involves conflict over attempts to attain and validate power. The Methodist faction attempted to gain power by holding a council and deposing Kegedonce and his followers. Their efforts in this regard were not approved by the Indian Department, which had the final say in this matter. The other incidents represent attempts by the Methodist faction leaders to validate their position as community leaders. Again these were of little use, since the Indian Department held the ultimate power.

During the 1850s the Saugeen Indians were involved in two major land surrenders, the first in 1854 and the second in 1857 (there were also two other surrenders in 1851 and 1856; these are not relevant for our purposes). In the 1854 surrender, some 450,000 acres were surrendered (Schmalz 1977: 234). In the 1857 surrender 10,000 acres in the area surrounding Owen Sound were surrendered (Newash Village was immediately adjacent to Owen Sound). These surrenders were undertaken by the Indian Department in order to accommodate the rapid increase in White population which this area was undergoing (Schmalz 1977: Ch. IV). After the 1857 surrender the Newash Village Indians were obliged to move to Cape Croker, a relatively isolated and rather barren area in the

northeast of the Bruce Peninsula.

In the case of the 1854 surrender, Anderson's original proposal for a surrender was strongly opposed by the Methodist Indians (including those at Saugeen Village), but supported by the Potawatomi faction. Nonetheless a surrender was eventually obtained in October 1854 by L. Oliphant, the Civil Secretary. It was signed by the leaders of both factions: J.T. Wahbahdick, David Sawyer, Peter Kegedonce Jones, and Charles Keeshick.

The 1857 surrender was signed by the chiefs Peter Jones Kegedonce and George Tabegwun, as well as Charles Keeshick, all aligned with the Potawatomi faction. The only member of the Methodist faction to sign was J.T. Wahbahdick, although he is not listed as a chief (contrary to the unsupported claim in Schmalz (1977: 105) that the Indian Department reinstated Wahbahdick as chief solely so he could sign the surrender in that capacity; see Indian Treaties and Surrenders 1891: 213). David Sawyer was apparently away on business at time of the surrender (Enemikeese 1867: 114). Reverend VanDusen was not able to oppose the surrender, because it was apparently signed when a small group of Indians went to Toronto (Ibid). Schmalz (1977: 105) points out that of the seven individuals who signed the surrender, only two were native to the area (including Kegedonce).

It is not my purpose to examine the motivation for the surrenders, or why and under what circumstances the

Indians participated in them (for which see Schmalz 1977: Chs. IV, V), other than to remark that they have an air of inevitability to them: the government wanted the land for settlement, and a few Indians could not halt the development of colonization. The Saugeen Territory surrenders were only part of a province-wide system of land surrenders and must be viewed as a part of that system (for which see Surtees 1982).

Significant for our purposes however is the fact that the Potawatomi faction was in favour of the 1854 surrender and that the 1857 surrender was signed primarily by members of the Potawatomi faction. It is quite likely that the Potawatomi leaders felt they had little to lose, having no long-term attachment to the area, and perhaps even recognizing the inevitability of the process. Note that by virtue of this process, the Ojibwa native to the area had lost their land, having already lost their predominant position in the area due to the Potawatomi migration.

V: CONCLUSION

By the time of the 1857 surrender polarization of the two factions at Newash Village was complete. It would probably be most accurate to say that the faction centring around the Methodist leaders was opposed to the rest of the band. By 1852 Chief Wahbahdick had thrown in his lot with the Methodists. This represents of course a reversal of his position in the 1840s. This was primarily due to the fact that the Methodists were mostly Ojibwa, and he did not wish to associate with the Potawatomis. As well he no doubt felt that he had a better chance of retaining what influence and power he had if he sided with the Methodists. David Sawyer was of course a key member of the Methodist faction, while Conrad VanDusen appears as a kind of not very subtle 'power behind the throne'. We have already seen that Sawyer and VanDusen manipulated Wahbahdick for their own purposes.

The opposing faction consisted primarily of Potawatomis, representing various religious denominations. They were led by Peter Kegedonce Jones, who was a Methodist, and an Ojibwa by adoption, but who as we have seen would not be influenced by VanDusen. It would appear that by the 1850s the conflicting groups were aligned primarily according to tribal origin, with religious affiliation being a secondary issue. As we have noted, the Potawatomi

migrants had come to outnumber the original inhabitants by a considerable margin. The net result of this was that inevitably the influence of the Ojibwa in village politics would decrease. At the same time it seems reasonable to conclude that the religious leaders exploited this split in the community for their own purposes. VanDusen wished to advance the position of Methodism and the Methodist faction. Note that not only did he wish to see non-Methodist Indians removed from positions of power, he also wished to see the removal of non-Methodists who had no vested personal interest in the factional disputes, such as the schoolteacher Winter.

In the case of David Sawyer, he was of course also interested in advancing the cause of Methodism. But he was also interested in personal power, such as his appointment as secretary, and his later attempts to have himself named chief.

Many of the disputes which arose during the formative period of factionalism in the Saugeen Territory were, relatively speaking, fairly minor, as is often the case in factional disputes (although they were certainly of great importance to the individuals and groups involved). They should have been resolvable in an orderly fashion, yet they obviously were not. On many occasions we have seen that the Saugeen Indians were not able to resolve disputes for themselves, being obliged to turn to the Indian

Department for adjudication. In a sense, traditional mechanisms were not able to resolve the disputes we have discussed, and many related ones which arose during this period, because they were not designed to deal with the type of question which arose during this era. Prior to the influx of Potawatomis from the United States, the area had contained only one native tribe, the Ojibwa; questions of necessary co-existence within the same area were a novel problem. Note that the traditional process of conflict resolution by group fission discussed in Chapter II could not be applied here because the Indian Department's practice was to consolidate Indian groups on increasingly smaller plots of land, not to encourage groups to split up and hence take up more land⁶.

Similarly, before the arrival of Christian missionaries, questions of religious affiliation did not arise. Being faced with a variety of Christian groups, all purporting to present the true interpretation of one and the same God must have been puzzling, and there was certainly no traditional mechanism for dealing with religious conflict.

Most significantly, however, native groups were

6 There is evidence, in a letter written by Richard Carney, that the Potawatomis at Newash did ask the government to let them form their own village around 1852, but I have not been able to confirm this in any other communications. Cf. PAC, RG 10, Vol. 411, Carney to Anderson, May 10, 1855.

limited in their ability to act in solving disputes by virtue of the power which the Indian Department held over them, limiting their ability to act independently. This in fact brings the discussion back to the issue of power. In Chapter II we proposed to consider factionalism as a process of political behaviour involving conflict over public power. The disputes in the Saugeen Territory can best be interpreted in precisely this way, with the formation of factions being the best way for the disputants to gain access to power.

Thus, considering the various attempts to depose the chiefs at Newash Village discussed in Chapter IV, these were in effect attempts to gain access to the economic and decision making power which holders of that position wielded. The chiefs could appoint candidates of their choice to positions on the Council, controlled the distribution of annuity money, were responsible for expenses made for the common good, represented the band to the government, ensured distribution of the annual allotments of presents, etc. Similarly, the controversy over the appointment of the schoolteacher was in effect a conflict over political power - indeed one with far reaching consequences given the potential ideological influence which a schoolteacher would possess.

No less significantly, power also lay behind the motivations of the Methodist missionaries. They wished to

have the power to make decisions about the direction the lives of the Indians they ministered to should take. As we have discussed, the missionaries were themselves part of the political process in that they were vying for power over the Indians they worked with; because they lacked direct access to political power, they were obliged to act through their converts and other factional followers.

As well as the missionaries, the Indians themselves were trying, as best they could, to have some degree of control over the direction their lives were taking. But it was the government - through the Indian Department - which controlled the power and effectively limited the decisions the Indians (and the missionaries) could make. It is this superordinate control wielded by the Indian Department which was central in permitting factionalism to develop and continue. The Indian Department could approve or deny the Indians' requests for money from their annuity funds, could approve or turn down an individual proposed for chief or other offices, could suspend a chief, decide on band membership, and so on.

We see that the struggles for power involved not only the Indians but also various missionary groups, and, overriding them, the government. In this type of situation power becomes a scarce resource, and competition for it will be fierce (Graham 1973).

As discussed in Chapter II, Bailey has suggested

that factionalism tends to evolve over time into more 'normal' types of political structures, where decision making becomes more rational (Bailey 1969: 53). In effect factionalism is a stage through which a community may pass on its way to political maturity.

What is noticeable in the Newash Village case, however, is that this more mature stage never seems to have arrived. Thus after the rise of factional disputes one might have expected the evolution of more rational political structures. However, after the removal of the Newash Village Indians to Cape Croker, factionalism continued into the twentieth century (Schmalz 1977). This type of more or less permanent factionalism appears to be the norm in a significant number of Amerindian communities (cf. e.g. Smith 1973).

It is the nature of the existing political structures which is the ultimate cause of the failure of factionalism to disappear. Because ultimate power lay in the hands of the government it was not possible for the disputants simply to let their disputes play themselves out, with one side eventually triumphing and coming to represent the majority viewpoint.

In sum, the distinguishing characteristic of the factional disputes at Newash Village was that in most of them it was necessary to appeal to a higher authority - the Indian Department. In effect, because the villagers did not

themselves have any real control, the process of continually appealing to the Indian Department meant that the possibility of resolving disputes on a local level did not exist. We have seen that Indian Department decisions had a major impact on village politics, yet in a very real sense the Department and its officers were foreign to the local level political activity taking place in Newash Village. At the same time, the fact that the Indian Department did not wield absolute power meant that it was not in a position to prevent or control factionalism.

MAPS

From: Peter Schmalz, The History of the Saugeen Indians

THE 1836 AND 1851 SURRENDERS

From Peter Schmalz, The History of the Saugeen Indians

REFERENCES

Abler, Thomas

1969. Factionalist Dispute and Party Conflict in the Political System of the Seneca Nation (1845-1895): An Ethnohistorical Analysis. PhD in Anthropology, University of Toronto.

Archives of Ontario, Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, Toronto. Diary of Thomas Gummersall Anderson.

Bailey, Frederick G.

1968. "Parapolitical Systems". Pp. 281-294 in Marc J. Swartz (ed.), Local-Level Politics: Social and Cultural Perspectives. Chicago: Aldine.

Bailey, Frederick G.

1969. Stratagems and Spoils. New York: Schocken Books.

Beaven, James

1844. Memoirs of a Long Vacation. London: James Burns.

Boissevain, Jeremy

1977. "Of Men and Marbles: Notes Towards a Reconsideration of Factionalism". Pp. 99-110 in Marilyn Silverman and Richard F. Salisbury (eds.), A House Divided? Anthropological Studies of Factionalism. Social and Economic Papers No. 9, Institute of Social and Economic Research. St. Johns: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Bujra, Janet

1973. "The dynamics of political action: A new look at factionalism". American Anthropologist 75: 132-152.

Callender, Charles

1962. Social Organization of the Central Algonkian Indians. Milwaukee Public Museum Publications in Anthropology 7. Milwaukee.

Callender, Charles

1978. "Great Lakes-Riverine Socio-Political Organization". Pp. 610-621 in Bruce Trigger (ed.), Handbook

of North American Indians, Vol. 15, Northeast. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Christian Guardian. Toronto.

Clifton, James

1970. "Factional Conflict and the Indian Community: The Prairie Potawatomi Case". Pp. 184-211 in Stuart Levine and Nancy O. Lurie (eds.), The American Indian Today. Baltimore: Penguin Books (revised edition).

Clifton, James

1975. A Place of Refuge For All Time: The Migration of the American Potawatomi into Upper Canada 1830 to 1850. Canadian Ethnology Service, Mercury Series Paper No. 26. Ottawa: National Museums.

Clifton, James

1977. The Prairie People. Lawrence: The University of Kansas Press.

Clifton, James

1978. "Potawatomi". Pp. 725-742 in Bruce Trigger (ed.), Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 15, Northeast. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Copway, George

1847. The Life History and Travels of Kag-ge-gah-Bowh. Albany: Weed and Parsons.

Cornish, George

1881. Cyclopaedia of Methodism in Canada. Two Volumes. Toronto: Methodist Book and Publishing Company.

Cox, Bruce

1970. "What is Hopi Gossip About? Information Management and Hopi Factions". Man 5: 88-98.

DeMille, Mary Susan

1971. Ethnohistory of Farming: Cape Croker 1820-1930. M.Phil. in Anthropology, University of Toronto.

Enemikeese [Conrad VanDusen]

1867. The Indian Chief: An Account of the Labours, Losses, Sufferings, and Oppression of Ke-zig-ko-ene-ne (David Sawyer) A Chief of the Ojibbeway Indians in Canada West. London: W. Nichols, printer.

Fenton, William

1955. "Factionalism in American Indian Society". Pp. 330-340 in Actes du IVE Congres International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques, Tome II. Vienna: Verlag Adolf Holzhausens.

Firth, Raymond

1957. "Introduction to Factions in Indian and Overseas Indian Society". British Journal of Sociology 8: 291-295.

French, David

1938. Factionalism in Isleta Pueblo. Monographs of the American Ethnological Society 14. New York.

French, David

1962. "Ambiguity and Irrelevancy in Factional Conflict". In Muzafer Sherif (ed.), Intergroup Relations and Leadership. New York.

French, Goldwin

1962. Parsons and Politics: The Role of the Methodists in Upper Canada and the Maritimes from 1780 to 1855. Toronto: The Ryerson Press.

French, Goldwin

1972. "VanDusen, Conrad". Pp. 692-693 in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. X, 1871-1880. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gluckman, Max

1956. Custom and Conflict in Africa. London: Basil Blackwell.

Gluckman, Max

1965. Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society. Chicago: Aldine.

Graham, Elizabeth
1973. Strategies and Souls. PhD dissertation in Anthropology, University of Toronto.

Graham, Elizabeth
1975. Medicine Man to Missionary. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates.

Hockett, Charles
1964. "The Proto Central Algonquian Kinship System". Pp. 239-257 in Ward H. Goodenough (ed.), Explorations in Cultural Anthropology: Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdock. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Indian Treaties and Surrenders. 1891. Ottawa: Queen's Printer. Reprinted 1971, Coles Canadiana Collection, 3 volumes.

Jones, Peter
1860. Life and Journals of Kah-ke-wa-quo-na-by (Rev. Peter Jones) Wesleyan Missionary. Toronto: Anson Green.

Jones, Peter
1861. History of the Ojibway Indians. London: A.W. Bennett.

Lee, Richard and Irven DeVore
1968. "Problems in the Study of Hunters and Gatherers". Pp. 3-12 in Richard Lee and Irven DeVore (eds.), Man The Hunter, Chicago: Aldine.

Leighton, Douglas
1977. "The Manitoulin Incident of 1863: An Indian-White Confrontation in the Province of Canada". Ontario History 69: 113-124.

Leighton, Douglas
1981. "The Compact Tory as Bureaucrat: Samuel Peters Jarvis and the Indian Department, 1837-1845". Ontario History 73: 40-53.

2

OF/DE

2

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

Leslie, John

1985. Commissions of Inquiry Into Indian Affairs the Canadas, 1828-1858: Evolving a Corporate Memory For The Indian Department. Ottawa: Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Linton, Ralph

1936. The Study of Man. New York: D. Appleton-Century.

Millman, Thomas R.

1972. "Anderson, Thomas Gummersall". Pp. 11-13 in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. X, 1870-1880. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Morgan, Lewis Henry

1871. Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge 17. Washington.

Nicholas, Ralph

1965. "Factions: A Comparative Analysis". Pp. 21- 61 in Michael Banton (ed.), Political Systems and the Distribution of Power. ASA Monographs 2. London: Tavistock.

Nicholas, Ralph

1966. "Segmentary Factional Political Systems". Pp. 49-60 in Marc Swartz, Victor Turner and Arthur Tuden (eds.), Political Anthropology. Chicago: Aldine.

Province of Canada

1845. Report on the Affairs of the Indians in Canada, Laid Before the Legislative Assembly 20 March 1845. Sections I and II. Sessional Papers, Appendix EEE (Section III submitted 1847; Sessional Papers, Appendix T).

Province of Canada

1858. Report of the Special Commissioners to Investigate Indian Affairs in Canada. Sessional Papers, Appendix 21, Vol. 6.

Public Archives of Canada. Record Group Ten. Indian Affairs. Ottawa.

Rhodes, Richard

1982. "Algonquian Trade Languages". Pp. 1-10 in William Cowan (ed.), Papers of the Thirteenth Algonquian Conference. Ottawa: Carleton University.

Rogers, Edward

1978. "Southeastern Ojibwa". Pp. 76-771 in Bruce Trigger (ed.), Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 15, Northeast. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Schmalz, Peter F.

1977. The History of the Saugeen Indians. Ontario Historical Society, Research Publications No. 5. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society.

Schmalz, Peter F.

1985. The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario. PhD.dissertation in History, University of Waterloo.

Siegel, Bernard J., and Alan R. Beals

1960a. "Conflict and Factionalist Dispute". Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 90: 107-111.

Siegel, Bernard J., and Alan R. Beals

1960b. "Pervasive Factionalism". American Anthropologist 62: 394-417.

Silverman, Marilyn

1980. Rich People and Rice: Factional Politics in Rural Guyana. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Silverman, Marilyn, and Richard Salisbury, eds.

A House Divided? Anthropological Studies of Factionalism. St. Johns: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Smith, Derek

1975. Canadian Indians and the Law: Selected Documents, 1663-1972. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Smith, Donald

1976. "Kahgegahbowh" [George Copway]. Pp. 419-421 in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. IX, 1861-1870.

Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, Donald

1980. "Kezhegowinninne" [David Sawyer]. Pp. 473-475 in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. XI, 1881-1890. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, James

1973. Leadership Among the Southwestern Ojibwa. Publications in Ethnology, No. 7, Canadian Ethnology Service. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.

Surtees, Robert J.

1967. Indian Reserve Policy in Upper Canada 1830-1845. M.A. Thesis in History, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Surtees, Robert J.

1982. Indian Land Cessions in Ontario, 1763-1862: The Evolution of a System. PhD dissertation in History, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Sutherland, Alexander

1904. Methodism in Canada: Its Work and its Story. Toronto: Methodist Mission Rooms.

Swartz, Marc J., Victor Turner, and Arthur Tuden

1966. "Introduction". Pp. 1-41 in Marc Swartz, Victor Turner, and Arthur Tuden (eds.), Political Anthropology. Chicago: Aldine.

Swartz, Marc J., ed.

1968. Local-Level Politics: Social and Cultural Perspectives. Chicago: Aldine.

Vanderburgh, Rosamond

1977. I Am Nokomis, Too. The Biography of Verna Patronella Johnson. Don Mills: General Publishing.

Waddilove, William, ed.

1838. The Stewart Missions. London: J. Hatched and Sons.

Walker, Deward E.

1970. Some Limitations of the Renaissance Concept in Acculturation: The Nez Perce Case. Pp. 236-256 in Stuart Levine and Nancy O. Lurie (eds.), The American Indian Today. Baltimore: Penguin Books (revised edition).

END

0|8.0|8.8 7

FIN