

Métis Identity: Problems and Possibilities

Jennifer Hayter, University of Toronto

Christopher Adams, Ian. Peach, and Gregg Dahl, eds. *Métis in Canada: History, Identity, Law & Politics* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013). 640 pp. \$65.00 Paperback.

Chris Andersen, *“Métis”: Race, Recognition, and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2014). 284 pp. \$95.00 Hardcover.

Métis in Canada and *“Métis”* are two new books that explore the complex issue of Métis identity. While both offer examples of cutting-edge scholarship, there are deep disagreements among the authors about the seemingly simple question: who are the Métis? This is a debate not isolated to the ivory tower but mirrors current conversations in wider Canadian society. The publication of these books offers an opportunity to reflect from a historian’s perspective on these debates about the nature, origin and identity of the Métis. How do these debates affect our ability to do history—especially history that is anti-racist and anti-colonial? How can history contribute to these discussions? I contend that historians, particularly Canadian historians and especially readers of this journal who might consider themselves “left historians,” have an obligation to pay attention to these kinds of conversations.

Practically speaking, we cannot write a history of people we cannot identify in the sources. It can be a challenge to find the Métis in the archives, due to the bewildering assortment of Métis-related terminology: Métis are only sometimes called Métis, they are at other times called Country Born, Métifs, Bois Brulés, Mixed Bloods, and Half Breeds (though the terms mixed bloods and half breeds equally as often refer to non-Métis people of mixed heritage). These two books offer some examples of the various approaches historians have used to identify Métis in the sources. Although the lack of consensus about Métis identity may be frustrating for the researcher, it also opens up new possibilities. British colonial administration and then the Canadian state worked over the last two centuries to define and legislate Indigenous identities, but they were not always successful; they never completely managed to overwrite Indigenous forms of social identification. Current debates regarding Métis identity has emancipative potential, as people work to define themselves. Historians have much to contribute to these debates; unlike most peoples whose origins are far in the distant

past, Métis ethnogenesis is relatively recent, and can be studied historically. Historians have a limited but real voice and can have some influence on public perceptions of the Métis. For example, Historians have been used as expert witnesses in court cases, including the highly significant Supreme Court Decision *R v. Powley* (2003), which stir debate amongst Canadians and have real material consequences. These two books, read together, can provide a good sense of the current debates about Métis identity, ethnogenesis and history. Historians would be well served to read them both.

Historians will find the variety of perspectives in *Métis in Canada* particularly helpful. Edited by Christopher Adams, Gregg Dahl and Ian Peach, this is a multidisciplinary collection with a strong historical emphasis. It not only offers several different views on the nature and definition of the Métis, it also provides some examples of the newest and freshest approaches to Métis history. The book consists of twelve chapters on: the material culture of the mixed populations in nineteenth century Great Lakes area (Gloria Jane Bell, Chapter 1); the connection of stories and identity (Laura-Lee Kearns, Chapter 2); a consideration of English speaking Half Breeds in Red River (Gregg Dahl, Chapter 3); a new political history (Darren O'Toole, Chapter 4) and an alternative economic history (Liam J. Haggarty, Chapter 5); the transcription, translation and interpretation of four newly discovered pieces of Louis Riel's writings (Campbell and Flanagan, Chapter 6); commentaries on Métis rights jurisprudence (Ian Peach, Chapter 7 and Jeremy Patzer, Chapter 8); the evolution of Métis self-government (Kelly L. Saunders, Chapter 9 and Janique Dubois, Chapter 11); the development of Métis political organizations (Siomonn P. Pulla, Chapter 10); and political tools and strategies (Christopher Adams, Chapter 12). As stated in the introduction, the twelve authors share no single definition of the Métis, but a majority see the Métis as both a distinct and diverse Aboriginal people (or peoples).¹

Though written by a sociologist, *"Métis": Race, Recognition, and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood* also has value for the historian. This book is a corrective to what most historians, indeed most Canadians, believe about the Métis: that they are at their foundations a mixed population. The author Chris Andersen wants us to expunge completely the vocabulary of "mixedness" in our characterizations of the Métis. The book builds on his previous work, and is worth reading for its thorough and systematic argument.² His basic thesis is that all Indigenous peoples are mixed, Métis no more than any others, so this fact should not be seen as an essential part of their identity. Despite their self-perception as a post-racist society, Canadians persist in viewing the Métis through the lens of mixedness, which he argues is a sign of the deeply and persistently racialised nature of Canadian nationhood. This notion of mixedness runs so deep it has grown roots even among the Métis themselves. The problem as he see it is that if Métis are mixed they are therefore less Indigenous, but they are also "not quite or not yet 'white'."³ Mixed can be synonymous with diluted, ille-

gitimate, inauthentic, impure, and un-whole and it is true that all of these ideas have been connected with the Métis at times in Canadian history. Andersen argues we should instead reorient our thinking to focus on the peoplehood or nationhood of the Métis. This is a political identity, and rather than half or part something, the Métis must be recognized as a whole people or nation with a political relationship to the Canadian state.

Andersen's book can be seen as the culmination of a process of deracialisation of Métis history over the last several decades. The earliest histories of the Métis, written by non-Métis historians (such as Harold Innis, George Stanley, Marcel Giraud, and E.E. Rich) in the mid-twentieth century, were generally ethnocentric and filled with racial stereotypes. These historians took for granted that the Métis were a cultural and biological mixture of races, or in the case of Giraud and Stanley, a product of the clash between civilized and primitive forces.⁴ In the 1970s and especially the 1980s the rise of Indigenous pride movements and the inclusion of the Métis in the Constitution sparked new interest, particularly among social historians. The centrality of race mixing to Métis identity was rejected as historians realized that intermarrying of peoples happened everywhere colonial contact occurred, but it was only in the particular historical circumstances of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century British North America that a new people was forged. These new historians focused on the unique social, cultural and political conditions of Métis ethnogenesis, trying to move beyond the racial notion of the Métis—though not entirely successfully according to Andersen, since they still took the mixedness of the Métis as a given.

In *Métis in Canada*, Liam J. Haggarty's chapter "Métis Economics: Sharing and Exchange in Northwest Saskatchewan" builds on social historians' work on economic identity and kinship. Since the late 1970s, social historians, in their effort to move beyond the characterisation of the Métis as biologically mixed, began to identify the Métis through a class or occupational identity. They saw the fur trade as the origin of the unique conditions that created a new people—the Métis—out of a mixed population.⁵ An intercultural fur trade society formed the milieu in which the Métis came into being; their identity began as an occupational class or particular role in the fur trade, which later became ethnicised.⁶ Haggarty argues that it is too simplistic to view the Métis as a fur trade people, but he does see the unique economic system and social organisation of the Métis in Northwest Saskatchewan as central to their identity. While older Métis fur trade history was told as a tragic tale of post fur trade decline, he finds that the Métis had a hybrid, flexible economy that allowed for remarkable resilience, adaptation and continuity in the face of the major changes that have taken place in the twentieth century.⁷

Social historians have also shown family exchange networks, kinship, and cooperation to be central to the fur trade economy and therefore to Métis identity.⁸ More recently, they have made remarkable use of genealogical methodologies to demonstrate that despite their contextual and fluid social identities, there remains a strong core of Métis identity due to kinship relations.⁹ Haggarty shows how these Northwest Saskatchewan Métis adapted earlier Indigenous economies in which economic activities targeting enemies (raiding) and distant relatives (trading) were less important to daily life than sharing or redistribution, the economic activity that occurred among kin. Their sharing-based economy was not primarily for the purpose of altruism or even social welfare, but social control, encouraging proper behaviour, organizing status and power, and cementing collective identities.¹⁰

Another method historians have used to identify people is through their cultural traits. In contrast with Marcel Giraud, who thought Métis culture was impoverished and derivative, more recent scholarship recognizes the distinctive music, art, language, clothing and other forms of cultural expression that bind Métis people and communities together.¹¹ Laura-Lee Kearn's chapter "(Re)claiming Métis Women Identities: Three Stories and the Storyteller" demonstrates the importance of sharing stories as a way of strengthening Métis identity and pride. She says this can even encourage those who have not yet claimed their identity to feel some cultural pride and perhaps move towards asserting their identity. As encouraged by elders she invites "multiple interpretations of the narratives," something perhaps difficult for academics raised in the positivist tradition who want to find the one correct answer or at least the best interpretation.¹² But it is really important. Postcolonial historian Dipesh Chakrabarty argues history cannot contain the unmanageable excess of life.¹³ It is true that history is a sort of artifice, attempting to fit the infinitely complex richness of real life into some sort of framework or narrative, which necessarily involves simplifying and abstracting. Kearn prints these stories (as found poems) in part to provide counter-narratives, to interrupt what she calls silencing totalitarian colonialist discourse, and encourage people to reclaim their voice. Her chapter is a useful corrective to the typical academic discourse, which can sometimes seem divorced from real life. It reminds us that real people lived, with their laughter and tears, the histories we are writing.

Culture can also help reveal who is *not* Métis. In her chapter "Oscillating Identities: Re-presentations of Métis in the Great Lakes Area in the Nineteenth Century," Gloria Jane Bell studies the material culture, specifically clothing, of the culturally mixed (small-m métis) populations of the Great Lakes, concluding that these populations were not in fact a distinct (big-m) Métis people. Bell is taking a position here in the debate over the nature and existence of Great Lakes M/métis. Most historians agree that there was a culturally hybrid (sometimes called small-m métis) fur trade population around the Great Lakes

from the eighteenth century, but they disagree as to whether that population developed into a distinct people, the (big-M) Métis. One of the reasons for this disagreement is that the paucity of written sources makes this history difficult to access. Bell analyzes depictions of clothing in painted and written works to demonstrate that the clothing styles of this mixed population tended to vary widely based on vocation, family ties and personal choice, and they did not consciously dress to represent themselves as members of a distinct group. She argues this reveals that there was no single, stable Métis identity in the region.¹⁴ Since it is arguable whether a common style of attire is necessary to a shared ethnic identity, this chapter is unlikely to end the debate, but it is worth reading for her unique methodology.

In the last decade or so, political history has made a comeback, but as we see in these books, it is in a new form that is sensitive to social and cultural factors. Darren O'Toole, for instance, sees social and cultural history as necessary but not sufficient for explaining Métis ethnogenesis. In his chapter "From Entity to Identity to Nation: The Ethnogenesis of Wiisakodewiniwag (Bois-Brulé) Reconsidered," he argues Métis is a political identity requiring political history's explanatory power. The class or occupational niche theories have little resonance for Métis people; they certainly did not feel like a people—like Métis—because of their subordinate positions in the fur trade. He contends that the mixed population in the Great Lakes never achieved national consciousness or a political identity. Therefore he argues, like Bell, that they were never really (big-M) Métis. By contrast, in Red River a common threat was able to bind the Métis together. The 1816 Battle of Seven Oaks has often been seen as that moment, though O'Toole disagrees with older historians who believed it was the fur trading North West Company that essentially created Métis identity. He argues this would not have happened without a pre-existing cultural and social identity for the "triumphant political moment" to build on.¹⁵ Whether one agrees with this perspective or not, he does make a compelling case.

Kelly L. Saunders, in "No Other Weapon: Métis Political Organization and Governance in Canada" also takes a political approach, arguing that the Métis have always seen themselves as a self-governing sovereign people, and have been willing to organize and use whatever necessary tools to protect their rights and communities, and to fight for self-determination. There are many historical examples of such self-governance, including the provisional governments and the organizing that took place around the buffalo hunt. Saunders sees continuity when she looks at current forms of organization in Métis politics, which blend forms of traditional Métis values with European models of governance for a modern, hybrid experience. Not only does she see a political aspect to Métis ethnogenesis, but she recognizes the continuity of their political identity.¹⁶ She offers fairly thorough descriptions of both nineteenth century and current Métis forms of self governance, but the sparse (though tantalizing) examples of self

governance in between those two periods is not enough evidence for its continuity, particularly through the early twentieth century when there is a significant gap in our historical knowledge.¹⁷ More research may well confirm her thesis.

Andersen takes these arguments a step further. He would argue that both Saunders and O'Toole, as most people do, take as given the supposedly foundational mixedness of the Métis. Although both see the Métis as more than their mixed blood, both count it as one essential part of their identity. O'Toole describes the Métis as a people with national consciousness that evolved from a mixed "entity"; they began as mixed race people. Saunders believes hybridity defines Métis self-governance. Andersen argues that we are just habituated to using notions of mixing and hybridity when we think about the Métis. Because all forms of modern governance are hybrids (since all adopt and adapt methods from other systems in other times and places), of course we see hybridity when we look for it in Métis governance. He argues we need to deracialize our thinking so that we forget about the supposed mixedness of the Métis, and simply take them as a people—full stop, with a distinct political identity and political history. For Andersen peoplehood and nationhood is a powerful political position because the state is obligated to deal with peoples and nations through formal political relationships rather than as minorities or as social problems.¹⁸

Not everyone agrees, however. Christopher Adams, for instance, in his *Métis in Canada* chapter "Government Relations and Métis People: Using Interest Group Strategies" actually argues the Métis are best understood as an interest group. Though he recognizes they are not *only* an interest group since they aspire to self governance of their own nations, he argues they are currently without governmental powers and they fit three of the four characteristics of interest groups: they operate with formal structures, they aggregate and articulate the concerns of their members, and they operate within the political system to influence policy (they do not display the fourth characteristic, not pursuing self-governance, since they do seek to exercise some form of independent governmental responsibility).¹⁹

Andersen's argument may also alienate many Métis themselves, who often view their 'mixedness' or hybridity as an important part of their identity. Andersen essentially dismisses this (stating those Métis "should know better")²⁰ using two concepts, Bourdieu's *habitus* and Richard Day's "seductive integration," to explain Indigenous peoples' own "deep internalization" of colonial racial categorisation. He acknowledges his position may be viewed as "blunt, even harsh," especially by the many mixed ancestry and disenfranchised Indigenous people who he claims "misrecognize" themselves as Métis.²¹ Certainly historians such as Karl S. Hele would take issue with this. Hele has elsewhere argued that the term Métis has been monopolized for the "political priorities of one group" which "is itself a form of internal colonialism."²²

It is clear even in this small sample that there is no consensus as to what and who constitutes the Métis and how they can be recognized and identified. So what is a historian to make of these significant differences? Although it might be frustrating that there are no simple answers, the lack of consensus and the intensity of the debates can also be invigorating. They tell us these definitions *matter* more than ever. The stakes are higher, and the possibilities greater. And historians have a role to play. For one thing, in the 1982 Constitution, the Métis are named as a rights-bearing Aboriginal people.²³ But since the Constitution did not define Métis, a small space was created for the Métis to fight for their rights, and for self-definition. And they have been doing so, quite vigorously. The national and provincial Métis organizations have been working on developing relationships with various levels of government, including channels through which the government can fulfill its duty to consult. Siomonn P. Pulla's chapter "Regional Nationalism or National Mobilization? A Brief Social History of the Development of Métis Political Organization in Canada, 1815-2011" offers a historical overview of the development of Métis political organizations since the nineteenth century, specifically concentrating on the changing relationships with both the government and other Aboriginal organizations.²⁴ Janique Dubois, in "From Service Providers to Decision Makers: Building a Métis Government in Saskatchewan," narrows in further, detailing Saskatchewan Métis' trailblazing efforts to achieve a measure of self-governance, successfully adopting a constitution and being recognized by the government of Saskatchewan. History, in teaching us about the historical relationship between the government and the Métis, can and does inspire today's movements.²⁵

One of the best examples of the current significance of history and the consequences of historical arguments is the landmark ruling in *R v. Powley*, in which the Supreme Court decided the Métis of Sault Ste. Marie have an Aboriginal right to hunt in the area. In 1993, Steve and Roddy Powley shot a moose without a license near Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. The illegal hunting charges were dropped when the Ontario Court of Justice decided that they were exercising their Aboriginal right to hunt as members of the Métis community of Sault Ste. Marie. The Supreme Court of Canada upheld the decision in 2003. Although the Crown in its argument claimed that this community had disappeared after 1850, the judge affirmed its continued existence, stating that the contemporary Métis community exhibits continuity of practice, custom and tradition with the historic community. Both the Crown and Defence mobilized history; the case featured historians as expert witnesses and abundant use of archival documents as evidence. In general, Métis organizations and Indigenous activists have viewed *Powley* as a great victory, since it provided state recognition and material benefits to and affirmed the rights of a previously invisible and disempowered group, and further helped to reinvigorate and reinforce the collective pride of Métis people across the country.

In his chapter “The Long, Slow Road to Recognizing Métis Rights: Métis Aboriginal Rights Jurisprudence” Ian Peach argues *Powley* was a conceptual breakthrough, because it was the first time the courts recognized the Métis as a distinct rights-bearing community with its own history and culture. Prior to this, the Métis suffered from a lack of state recognition and were therefore denied collective rights. Whatever Métis rights had been acknowledged were derived from First Nations’ Aboriginal rights. The few cases previously tried hinged on whether Métis were Indians and to what degree: did they live the “Indian mode of life” and/or did they have enough “Indian blood”? If nothing else, *Powley* changed the terms of the argument so that the question was no longer whether Métis were Indians, and their rights were no longer derivative. Peach agrees with the majority and sees this as a victory.²⁶

Jeremy Patzer, on the other hand, problematizes the *Powley* decision, arguing in his chapter “Even When We’re Winning, Are We Losing? Métis Rights in Canadian Courts” that it reduced Métis identity to essential characteristics. He contends that *Powley* was no breakthrough, but simply a continuation of the courts’ use of the cultural rights approach to Aboriginal issues. The need to prove one’s identity by passing a cultural test is a continuation of the colonial exertion of power over Aboriginal people; this test of authenticity demands “the successful performance of the colonizer’s restrictive notions of Aboriginality.”²⁷ In Patzer’s view, the *Powley* decision thus perpetuates the authenticity discourses that position Aboriginal culture as an unchangeable thing of the past. This is particularly problematic, he argues, for the Métis because they are especially diverse, with fluid identities founded on hybridity, adaptability and change. *Powley* demanded continuity, only acknowledging rights for a very narrow group of people to be exercised only in the same area they historically resided, also a problem for the historically mobile Métis.

Andersen agrees with much of what Patzer argues, though he takes issue with the notion that hybridity, adaptability and change are somehow at the core of Métis identity. Andersen’s book offers a detailed analysis of *Powley*, demonstrating that nearly all of the arguments and testimonies on both sides took mixedness, a racialised colonial construct, as their starting point. Although he sees glimpses of alternative arguments based on the peoplehood of the Métis, these were essentially foreclosed as either the court dismissed them or witnesses censored themselves, preferring to speak in terms that were more likely to resonate successfully with the court. The racialised understanding of the Métis is so deeply entrenched it is very difficult for jurisprudential discourse to move beyond it. However it is not impossible; Andersen constructs a non-racialised alternative basis for the recognition of the Sault Ste. Marie Métis, one that focuses on the *ongoing* historical connection of the Sault and Red River to show that they are one people.²⁸ Though deriving from different arguments, his alternative narrative could still have led the judge to recognize the Sault Métis. In the end

this is not simply semantics, argues Andersen. Aside from the specific material consequences to the involved parties, there were, and continue to be, wider effects from *Powley*. The Supreme Court holds a tremendous amount of symbolic power and the decision re-entrenched the outmoded notion of Métis-ness as mixed. Academics (even ethnohistorians) are now using the decision as a starting point or as a given description of reality.²⁹ *Powley* clearly demonstrates why historians must pay attention to the current debates regarding Métis identity.

These books can help a historian come up to speed on the current debates, which also reflect back upon the challenges we face in the archives. Archival sources refer unreliably and inconsistently to Métis, half breeds, mixed bloods, bois brûlés, Métifs, Voyageurs, Canadiens, Creoles, chicots, gens libres, and Coureurs de Bois, and other related terms. There is a risk that researchers, especially non-specialists, may assume they know who the document creators meant when they employed these terms. Seeing these terms in a document, modern researchers may simply replace them with “Métis,” assuming it is the politically correct synonym, a different word for the same people. It is true that at times these words have been used as synonyms, but not always. Indeed, these are and were extremely contested terms, and their usage was full of ambiguity and contradictions. How we approach these documents will therefore have significant consequences for the nature of the history we write. And as Chris Andersen would argue, historians replicate the colonial racialisation of Indigenous peoples when they include in the same category people historically labeled as half breeds, mixed bloods, bois brûlés and Métis.

This lack of precision has other consequences too. For example, a historian might end up writing about people widely (though not unanimously) agreed not to exist, such as Labrador Métis—Chris Andersen’s final chapter looks at this Inuit group that temporarily claimed Métis identity. Or a historian may lump Métis and mixed race peoples together so that “half breeds” are all assumed to be the same people. Not only might this produce significant historical inaccuracies, but considering the legal battles being fought over such identities, there can be serious material consequences to such questionable histories as well. Unfortunately there is no guide for researchers to follow, no simple glossary or decoder that helps us determine who exactly is being referenced in archival documents. These various terms meant different things depending on the context: there was virtually no agreement even by the document creators. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, government officials, census enumerators, missionaries, and travellers were often flummoxed about how to define, identify and categorize the Métis and people of mixed ancestry, who did not easily fit into their repertoire of social categories. It is important to keep in mind that this difficulty, as Chris Andersen reminds us, has nothing to do with the nature of the Métis themselves but is a consequence of the narrowness of European racial categories and more generally the impossibility of precise human classification.³⁰

As these volumes demonstrate, history and historians also have something to contribute to these debates. We saw how archival evidence was key to the recognition of Métis Aboriginal rights in *Powley*. Historians are frequently asked to serve as expert witnesses in court cases regarding Aboriginal rights.³¹ Most recently are the landmark cases *Manitoba Métis Federation Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (2013) and *Daniels v. Canada* (2013), though the impact of these decisions remains to be seen. History is also, of course, a fundamental constituent of nationalism. The Métis are currently in an active phase of nation-building, working to decolonize and re-imagine themselves as a nation. History helps tell us who someone is by telling us where they came from, though in his chapter Gregg Dahl comments on “idealized antiquity” and Métis mythology, arguing that “nationalistic aspirations are not always conducive to historical accuracy.”³² Of course *all* histories are problematic, all are simplified and limited but they all have their uses.³³ Historians have a key role in determining *how* these stories are told. How we tell our past-narrative, our history, impacts how we imagine ourselves, our present, and our future. Remembering key moments in history can help strengthen the Métis nation. People can rally behind the mighty battle of Seven Oaks in which Métis military might prevailed, or the keen intelligence of the Métis who forced the Canadian government to negotiate Manitoba’s place in Confederation. This sort of history is a key component of nation building.

Historically, Canada as a colonial country attempted to legislate Indigenous administrative categories, deciding *for* people which category they belonged in, allowing little space for individuals, communities and peoples to choose their own identities. People were basically forced to take on these administrative identities, at least to some degree, in order to interface with the state. Pre-colonial social identities have centuries of other classifications layered over top, modifying (and sometimes erasing altogether) these identities. There is no possibility of restoring some mythical originary past, but there is the possibility of letting people choose their own identities now, and decide in what way they want to deal with the Canadian state. These debates over identity are therefore a crucial component of the decolonization process. More broadly, they remind us that social classification is an art rather than a science. It is not about discovering with ever-greater precision the true and mutually exclusive categories. Identity, rather, is complex, overlapping, changing, contextual. A close look in the archives shows us, as Chris Anderson states, that “... administrative categories such as ‘Half breed’ and ‘Indian’ historically were never as stable as they appear in government policy and literature today.”³⁴ This is true, and we can view it as both a problem and a possibility. It is a problem because it makes historical research confusing; the researcher can rarely be certain who officials are referring to when they write about “half breeds” or “mixed bloods” or “Métis.” But it also opens up emancipatory possibilities and reminds us that despite their increasing power, knowledge, and reach, the state and colonial society were any-

thing but omnipotent and omniscient. Examining its ambiguous and contradictory policies and ideas respecting the Métis and people of mixed ancestry makes it clear that the Canadian state was fallible, often confused, and its grasp on knowledge and power was actually relatively tenuous. Had the colonial definitions been more certain, they would have been more rigid and it would be nearly impossible for people to think outside those definitions today. Although it is an uphill battle, people *are* still contesting the terms of their own classification, fighting for their rights to define themselves and their nation.

NOTES

¹ “Introduction,” in *Métis in Canada: History, Identity, Law & Politics*, ed.

Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), xv.

² Including: Andersen, “From Nation to Population: The Racialisation of ‘Métis’ in the Canadian Census,” *Nations and Nationalism* 14, no. 2 (April 1, 2008): 347–68; and Andersen, “Moya ʻTipimsook (‘The People Who Aren’t Their Own Bosses’): Racialization and the Misrecognition of ‘Metis’ in Upper Great Lakes Ethnohistory,” *Ethnohistory* 58, no. 1 (January 1, 2011): 37–63.

³ Chris Andersen, *“Métis”: Race, Recognition, and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014), 36.

⁴ Marcel Giraud, *Les Métis Canadien: Son Rôle Dans L’histoire Des Provinces de l’Ouest* (Paris: Institut d’ethnologie, 1945); George F. G. Stanley, *The Birth of Western Canada* (Toronto: Books on Demand, 1992).

⁵ Arthur J. Ray, *Indians in the Fur Trade: Their Role as Trappers, Hunters, and Middlemen in the Lands Southwest of Hudson Bay, 1660-1870* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1974); Carol M. Judd and Arthur J. Ray, eds., *Old Trails and New Directions: Papers of the Third North American Fur Trade Conference* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980); Sylvia Van Kirk, *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur-Trade Society, 1670-1870* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983); Jennifer S. H. Brown, *Strangers in Blood: Fur Trade Company Families in Indian Country* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1985).

⁶ Frits Pannekoek, “The Churches and the Social Structure in the Red River Area, 1818-1870,” (PHD Thesis, Queen’s, 1973); Jacqueline Peterson, “The People in Between: Indian-White Marriage and the Genesis of a Métis Society and Culture in the Great Lakes Region, 1680-1830,” (PHD Thesis, University of Illinois, 1981); John E. Foster, “The Country-Born in the Red River Settlement: 1820-1850,” (PHD Thesis, University of Alberta, 1972); Ens argues it was the buffalo hunt more specifically in Gerhard Ens, *Homeland to Hinterland: The*

Changing Worlds of the Red River Metis in the Nineteenth Century (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996); St-Onge saw more general economic identities becoming ethnicized so poverty and seasonal fishing became markers that ‘made’ a person metis while prosperity and education ‘whitened’ a person, in Nicole St-Onge, *Saint-Laurent, Manitoba: Evolving Métis Identities, 1850-1914* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 2004).

⁷ Liam J. Haggarty, “Métis Economics: Sharing and Exchange in Northwest Saskatchewan,” in *Métis in Canada*, ed. Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 208-9.

⁸ Van Kirk, *Many Tender Ties*; Jennifer S. H. Brown, *Strangers in Blood*; Brenda Macdougall, *One of the Family: Metis Culture in Nineteenth-Century Northwestern Saskatchewan* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010).

⁹ Heather Devine, *The People Who Own Themselves: Aboriginal Ethnogenesis in a Canadian Family, 1660-1900* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2004); Martha Foster, *We Know Who We Are: Métis Identity in a Montana Community* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006); Macdougall, *One of the Family*.

¹⁰ Haggarty, “Métis Economics,” 208-9.

¹¹ Giraud, *Les Métis Canadiens*; Peter Bakker, *A Language of Our Own* (New York: Oxford UP, 1997); Trudy Nicks, “Mary Anne’s Dilemma: The Ethnohistory of an Ambivalent Identity,” *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 17, no. 2 (1985): 103–15; S. Quick, “Performing Heritage: Metis Music, Dance, and Identity in a Multicultural State” (PHD Thesis, Indiana University, 2009); Ted Brassler, “In Search of Métis Art,” in *The New Peoples: Being and Becoming Métis in North America*, ed. Jacqueline Peterson and Jennifer H.S. Brown (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1985), 221–30; Julia D. Harrison, *Metis, People Between Two Worlds* (Vancouver: Glenbow-Alberta Institute in association with Douglas & McIntyre, 1985); Sherry Farrell Racette, “Sewing Ourselves Together : Clothing, Decorative Arts and the Expression of Metis and Half Breed Identity” (PHD Thesis, University of Manitoba, 2004), Carmen Robertson and Sherry Farrell Racette, *Clearing a Path: New Ways of Seeing Traditional Indigenous Art* (University of Regina Press, 2009).

¹² Laura-Lee Kearns, “(Re)claiming Métis Women Identities,” in *Métis in Canada: History, Identity, Law & Politics*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 65.

¹³ Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2008), 62-5.

¹⁴ Gloria Jane Bell, “Oscillating Identities: Re-Presentations of Métis in the Great Lakes Area in the Nineteenth Century,” in *Métis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 47.

-
- ¹⁵ Darren O'Toole, "From Entity to Identity to Nation: The Ethnogenesis of the W̱isakodewiniwag (Bois-Brûlé) Reconsidered," in *Métis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 172.
- ¹⁶ Kelly L. Saunders, "No Other Weapon: Métis Political Organization and Governance in Canada," in *Métis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 339–96.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 349–53.
- ¹⁸ Andersen, "Métis", 20.
- ¹⁹ Christopher Adams, "Government Relations and Métis People: Using Interest Group Strategies," in *Métis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 466.
- ²⁰ Andersen, "Métis", 150.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 23–5.
- ²² Karl Scott Hele, "Manipulating Identity: The Sault Borderlands Métis and Colonial Intervention," in *The Long Journey of a Forgotten People: Métis Identities and Family Histories*, ed. David McNab and Ute Lischke (Waterloo Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2007), 165.
- ²³ *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (UK), 1982, c 11.
- ²⁴ Siomonn P. Pulla, "Regional Nationalism or National Mobilization? A Brief Social History of the Development of Métis Political Organization in Canada, 1815–2011," in *Metis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 2013), 397–431.
- ²⁵ Janique Dubois, "From Service Providers to Decision Makers: Building a Métis Government in Saskatchewan," in *Metis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 2013), 433–62.
- ²⁶ Ian Peach, "The Long, Slow Road to Recognizing Métis Rights: Métis Aboriginal Rights Jurisprudence in Canada," in *Métis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 279–306.
- ²⁷ Jeremy Patzer, "Even When We're Winning, Are We Losing? Metis Rights in Canadian Courts," in *Métis in Canada: History, Identity, Law & Politics*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 321.
- ²⁸ Andersen, "Métis", 148–50.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 67–71.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 44.

Arthur J. Ray, *Telling It to the Judge: Taking Native History to Court* (Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011).

Gregg Dahl, "A Half-Breed's Perspective on Being Métis," in *Métis in Canada*, ed. Christopher Adams, Ian Peach, and Gregg Dahl (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 120.

Andersen, "Métis", 110.

Ibid., 24.