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ABSTRACT. In the many studies of the Red River Settlement written since 1856, the prime factors affecting the Settlement have been variously conceived as economic, geographic or political. In contrast to the traditional historical studies exploring these external influences, recent writings have dealt with the internal dynamics of the community as the source of development and change.

RESUME
Dans les nombreuses études réalisées depuis 1856 sur la colonie de la Rivière Rouge, les facteurs primordiaux affectant cette colonie ont été perçus comme étant d'ordre économique, géographique ou politique. Par opposition avec les études historiques traditionnelles explorant ces influences externes, de récentes études ont traité de la dynamique interne de la communauté comme étant la source de développement et de changement.

A great deal has been written on the Selkirk years of Red River and even more on its annexation to "the Empire of the St. Lawrence" in 1869. The years between have received less attention. These were not only critical years of intermittent crises, but also years of relative stability, prosperity and consolidation—years which nurtured a community with a unique identity and sense of purpose. Since Alexander Ross published The Red River Settlement in 1856, historians have tried to come to grips with the character of this exotic mixture of Scottish peasants, half-breeds and fur traders. Ironically only Alexander Ross succeeded. Other historians have imposed interpretations contrived from central Canadian, British or American environments; while they have unearthed quantities of detailed information, they have been able to assess it only from the perspective of London, Montreal or St. Paul, not Red River itself. They perceived that the dynamics that shaped Red River were externally rather than internally generated and lost their most important analytical tool in the process. Only in the last decade have historians again begun to write Red River's history from a uniquely western Canadian viewpoint, thereby offering the promise of a new synthesis.

Alexander Ross, the most prolific writer and holder of offices in the pre-1870 West, was Clerk to the Pacific Fur Company, the North West Company and Hudson's Bay Company, Sheriff of Assiniboia, Councillor of Assiniboia and member of its Committee of Public Works and Finance, Commander of the Volunteer Corps, Magistrate of the Middle District, Governor of Gaol, Collector of Customs, ex-officio President of the Court in the Upper District and Elder of the Presbyterian Church at Frog Plain. He authored three books at Colony Gardens, his home in Red River. His first two books were based on careful and detailed journals written during his years in the Pacific
North-West; his third book, *The Red River Settlement*, appeared in 1856 shortly before his death. The best single piece of writing on Red River, the history clearly illustrates Ross’s belief that the motley, quixotic settlement at the forks of the Red and Assiniboine had a predestined purpose. To Ross, Red River was a nucleus of Christian civilization. Through Selkirk the settlement had been ordained to bring this civilization to the heathen. But in this Red River had failed. Its sons did not comprehend their divine purpose and their colony was smothering under the weight of its own ignorance.¹

Despite his pessimism Ross was tireless in his devotion to his community, his church and especially his mixed-blood children. He attempted to ease them through the brutal shock of civilization when he could, but he suspected that neither they nor the other mixed bloods had the skills to survive. In Ross’s opinion, the feuding and incompetence of the missionaries rather than the Hudson’s Bay Company or the environment were to blame for this sorrow. Convinced that the Company’s monopoly was necessary, Ross felt that complete free trade would be ruinous to Rupert’s Land. He argued further that the Metis’ ill-considered cry for free trade could have been contained had it not been for the oppressive racism of Adam Thom, the first Recorder of Rupert’s Land.

Other historians who share Ross’s methodology and his general observation that Red River was moribund also saw Red River from the inside. Joseph James Hargrave (1841–1894), was a Red River fur trader and son of James and Letitia Hargrave; Alexander Begg (1839–1897) was a journalist, merchant, civil servant and immigration agent; and Donald Gunn (1797–1878) was a Smithsonian Institute Corresponding Secretary, fur trader and leading citizen. Their histories, Hargrave’s *Red River*, Begg’s *The North West* and Gunn’s *Manitoba* all fail, however, to acknowledge the mission that Ross assigned to the settlement.² In the later nineteenth century when Hargrave, Begg and Gunn were writing, Red River had already been seduced by the prosperity that union with Canada offered. Immigration, railroads and wheat soon supplanted the missions and the fur trade as the focus of Red River society.

Gunn was particularly happy to see the end of the Red River Settlement and the dominance of the Hudson’s Bay Company. A staunch defender of the Selkirk colonists, he believed that the Company’s every move was a conspiracy to destroy the vitality of the settlement. Hargrave’s views, if indeed he can be said to have any, were those of a Company employee and a member of the Red River elite. He supported the Company, and despised the malignant Canadians and their newspaper, the *Nor’Wester*. Nevertheless, he too was a pragmatist and he looked longingly toward union and prosperity.
The twentieth century marked a re-orientation of Red River historiography and witnessed the first efforts at academic analysis. R. G. MacBeth (1854–1934), was a native of Kildonan, a lawyer and a clergyman; George Bryce (1844–1931), was corresponding secretary to the Manitoba Historical, Literary and Scientific Society, a Presbyterian clergyman and the founder of Manitoba College. To both writers Red River became an arcadian Utopia:

The primitive history of all the colonies that faced the Atlantic—when the new-found continent first felt the abiding foot of the stranger—from Oglethrope to Acadia, reveals, alas! no Utopia, a transplant of elder habitudes, where the rancor of race, caste and rule was found to be too ingrained to yield to even the softening influence of such a sylvan paradise as Virginia. It remained for a later time,—the earlier half of the present century, amid every severity of climate, and under conditions without precedent, and incapable of repetition,—to evolve a community in the heart of the continent, shut away from intercourse with civilized mankind—that slowly crystallized into a form beyond the ideal of the dreamers—a community, in the past, known faintly to the outer world as the Red River Settlement which is but the by-gone name for the one Utopia of Britain.³

Above all the Selkirk colonists were glorified for their struggles to preserve the West for Confederation, for it was “the opening of the West (that made) Canada complete.”⁴ The function of the Selkirk settlers as seen by Ross was augmented by MacBeth. They were now not only God’s instrument of civilization but also his instrument for preserving the West for Canada. In MacBeth’s mind the two were not mutually exclusive.

Father A. G. Morice (1859–1938), British Columbian missionary and founder of Le Patriote de L’Ouest, and A. de Trémaudan, a French Canadian teacher, real estate agent, lawyer and newspaper editor, can also be grouped with Bryce and MacBeth, despite their vicious feud over a number of specific issues in Métis history. Where MacBeth and Bryce emphasized the Selkirk influence, Morice and Trémaudan dwelt on Métis nobility and the Métis emerged as unblemished as the Selkirk settlers.

Morice and Trémaudan argued that Riel thwarted American annexation and brought self-government first to Manitoba and then to the Northwest. MacBeth and Bryce had established the place of Selkirk’s contribution. Morice and Trémaudan hoped that the Métis contribution would gain a similar recognition through the establishment of a
dual Northwest both Catholic French-speaking, mixed-blood, and white English-speaking Protestant.

The reasons for the glorification of the Red River’s past by these historians cannot conclusively be established without a great deal more research, but Carl Berger’s *The Sense of Power* (Toronto, 1970) is helpful. Berger argues that the Canadian nationalism of the 1880s emphasized historical antecedents, stimulated an interest in history, and most important, depended for its credibility upon the assumption that the past contained principles to which the present must adhere if the continuity of national life was to be preserved.  

In nineteenth-century Canadian terms it was the Loyalists who embodied all the past virtues of the new nation. The Selkirk settlers and the Métis were the Loyalists’ western counterparts. The myth that they were the distilled essence of what the West had become was fostered by early Red River Canadian settlers like Frank Larned Hunt, and Kildonan descendants like MacBeth. Morice and Trémaudan also would have been susceptible to the nostalgic myth because of the disasters that had befallen the Métis in the decades after Confederation. A didactic perception of the western past that extolled idyllic agrarian life, Canadian and Imperial connections, and (in Morice’s and Trémaudan’s case) ethnic duality, was imperative if the new west of the twentieth century was to achieve an acceptable identity within the Canadian historical tradition.

When Harold Innis, in Toronto, A. S. Morton, a Saskatchewan history professor and archivist, and E. E. Rich, the editor of the Hudson’s Bay Record Society and Professor of History at Cambridge University, trained their attention on western Canada, the history of Red River became a footnote to their more pressing interest in the fur trade. To Innis, Red River was merely a convenience that absorbed the fur trade’s cast-offs while serving as the transportation and provisioning hub for the Saskatchewan and Athabasca hinterlands. Because of the St. Paul influence he also saw Red River as the weakest link in the east-west economic and geographic chain that bound the Canadian nation, a nation that had emerged “not in spite of geography, but because of it.”  

On the other hand, the westerner, A. S. Morton in his *The History of the Canadian West to 1870–71* (Toronto, 1939) saw the fur trade as a sub-regional, rather than national or even western unifying force. It was not Canada, but each of the four sub-regions of the Northwest: the tundra, the shield, the prairies and the Pacific mountains, that was united by the fur trade. The west was fractured because of its disparate geography and only unified by the administrative structure of the Hudson’s Bay Company. While Morton cannot be labelled
as an adherent of any one school of history, his great concern with geography does place him very loosely with those who would see the environment as history's principal motive force. Yet in spite of these differences Morton's interpretation of Red River between 1830 and 1868 differed little from Innis's analysis. His examinations of political and social detail were only embellishments on Innis's rather disjointed and thoroughly unsatisfactory study of the pre–1870 West. The impression given by Morton's manuscript footnotes to *The History of the Canadian West to 1870–71*, in the University of Saskatchewan Archives, was that Morton was exhausted by the last chapters and that much of his writing on Red River was done with less than his usual care.

Morton divided the history of Red River into three chronological periods: 1817–1840, 1840–1859 and 1860–1869. The first period was one of stability, and the last, one of growing political polarization. This was a departure from the commonly accepted Red River chronology. Previously 1827, the year after the great flood which drove many of the undesirable elements from the settlement and consequently set the ethnic mix for Red River; 1849, the year of the Sayer trial which saw the “breaking” of the Company's abhorrent monopoly, and 1869, the year of the great Riel uprising which finally “freed” Red River from the Company's tyranny, were the common dividing dates.

In the end, Morton's major contribution to Red River historiography was not his moderate and credible environmentalist interpretation, or his slight alteration of the traditional periodization of Red River history, but his minute consideration of the formidable Hudson's Bay Company archives. Unfortunately, he had failed to consult the supplementary material in the missionary archives and many of his statements regarding the Red River clergy, the settlement's most important element of social control, were overgeneralized and misleading. The critical importance of William Cochrane who almost single handedly founded and ruled St. Andrew's, the most important English-speaking mixed-blood settlement, is altogether ignored. Having neglected the Church of England half-breeds of the Upper Red River parishes in favour of the more flamboyant Métis, Morton was prompted to make the false generalization that Red River was a “little Quebec.” Red River was rather a community equally influenced by Indian, Scot, Métis, Half-breed, Canadien and Canadian.

From the work of A. S. Morton a logical historiographical step would have been the production of a series of detailed scholarly studies on various aspects of pre–1870 western Canadian history, with at least one on Red River 1830–1869. Another monographic history of the West to 1870 was hardly needed and E. E. Rich's three-volume *Hudson's Bay Company* (Toronto, 1960) became little more than a para-
phrase of segments of the Company's archives. It is as muddled as the Innis volume and, in many areas, duplicates Morton's spadework of the 1930s.¹⁰

Rich's major theme, the maintenance of the Company's charter through prosperity and adversity, did not merit his thousand pages and failed to allow for a smooth integration of Red River history into that of the fur trade. Only four of thirty-one chapters dealt with the settlement. The major social conflicts, the Presbyterian-Anglican burying yard controversy or the Ballenden scandal, so important to explaining the disintegrative forces at work in Red River, are artificially inserted into an uninspired narrative. Rich fails to see that the conflict over the Presbyterian right to bury in Anglican consecrated ground or the alleged sexual improprieties of Mrs. Ballenden, a mixed blood, fractured the community once and for all amongst its white and mixed blood, its Métis and halfbreed, its Catholic and Protestant and its Anglican and Presbyterian parts. Basically Rich contended that Red River was the source of an agricultural and free trade threat to the Company's rights as granted by the Charter. But these threats were met and in 1849, while the Company may have abandoned its "legal defences," it certainly did not lose economic control. The Company now would not use the courts to enforce its hegemony; rather, it would ruthlessly exercise its considerable economic power to eliminate the free traders—prices were cut in areas of competition and furs trapped to extermination.

This concentration by Innis, Morton and Rich on Red River in the context of the fur trade was not as great a departure from the themes in the works of Hargrave, Begg, Bryce, MacBeth, Morice and Trémaudan as might be thought. They sought to justify union with Confederation by events in the romantic Red River past; where Innis, Morton, and to a lesser extent Rich attempted to justify Confederation by geography. Red River, the focus of the fur-trade hinterland, provisioned the staple trade that welded the Saskatchewan, Columbia, Nelson and Mackenzie river systems to that of the St. Lawrence. Whatever the nuance in argument, or however scholarly the research, Confederation was seen as the millennium for the pre-1870 Canadian West.

With the appearance of John Perry Pritchett,¹¹ Alvin Gluek¹² and J. S. Galbraith,¹³ Red River became the concern of the frontier historian. Pritchett saw Red River at the heart of the North American continent. It lay at the junction of three drainage basins, the St. Lawrence, the Nelson and the Mississippi, controlled respectively by Canada, the Hudson's Bay Company and the United States, but the Nelson basin capitulated to the indigenous Red River Métis in 1849. They retained virtual independence until annexation by the "Empire of the St. Lawrence" in 1869. To Pritchett this fate was not final.
What the next or the most permanent outcome of this triple tug will be, no one knows. Will the West become independent, as Riel seemed to wish, and trade by way of the Nelson drainage basin? Will it form with the Mississippi drainage basin an economic union? —a political union? Or will it resist the pressure from both the Nelson and the Mississippi systems and remain indefinitely, both politically and economically a vassal of the St. Lawrence?¹⁴

The struggle of the river basins masked an equally important internal struggle. Pritchett imposed a frontier-tainted, Whig interpretation on the Red River past. One of the “nurseries of democracy,” Red River fought the traditional battle against “vested autocratic interests,” in this case the Hudson’s Bay Company. Effective “self government” was seen by Pritchett as an achievement of the Sayer “insurrection” of 1849, but no conclusion could have been more absurd!¹⁵ The Company did not capitulate in 1849 and the Council of Assiniboia remained under the Company’s influence after this date. Furthermore, Red River society could not be construed as democratic. The clergy and fur-trade aristocracy, for the most part adherents to the Company’s society, lost their dominance only during the social disruptions of the 1860s.

Gluek, in his *Minnesota and the Manifest Destiny of the Canadian West* (Toronto, 1965), provided a well documented and researched addition to Pritchett’s river-basin thesis. The Red River valley, Gluek asserted, was a geographic extension of Minnesota. The natural tendency to political absorption by Minnesota failed because of Minnesota’s economic collapse in 1857, the Sioux and the Civil Wars of 1861–66, the Hudson’s Bay Company, the activities of Canada, and the preference of the people of the Red River. Gluek was not as hostile to the Company as was Pritchett. Instead he sympathetically documented the Company’s continuing battle for that most important fur bearing northern district.¹⁶ To him the struggle for Red River was a commercial one, not a territorial struggle of conflicting political powers.

Gluek, unlike Pritchett, revealed little of the inner workings of Red River society. He accepted A. S. Morton’s view that 1840 was the year Red River acquired its permanent character, though he studiously avoided footnoting Morton.¹⁷ Perhaps more disconcerting is the impression that Gluek was uninfluenced by M. Giraud’s *Le Métis Canadien* and that his conclusions regarding the English parishes of Red River were based on a few documents appended to W. L. Morton’s edition of Begg’s *Red River Journal*.¹⁸ Most important, he over-emphasized the American impact on Red River while the English, though not the Canadian, impact was ignored.

While Gluek concentrated on the American connection, Galbraith in his *The Hudson’s Bay Company as an Imperial Factor 1821–1869*
(Toronto 1957) was concerned with the Hudson’s Bay Company and the Imperial government policies toward the monopoly, free trade and the settlement frontier. While the volume is invaluable as a comment on British policy, the sections dealing with Red River had been, for the most part, superseded by Gluek’s and Rich’s more extensive though by no means definitive works.

The major contribution of the frontier school of Red River historiography has not been its insight into the Red River past, but rather its questioning of Innis’s argument that Canada was a nation because of geography. Red River’s major overland connections were southward and only political and military factors ensured that Red River would be Canadian.

It was through the imaginative labours of Marcel Giraud, the French ethnologist, that Red River history broke from the historiography of competing river basins, commercial powers and imperial designs. His monumental work, one of the milestones in Canadian history, still provides the most exciting interpretation of the Red River settlement and serves as the impetus for much recent study. His most famous western Canadian exponent has been W. L. Morton. The change Giraud produced in Morton’s work on Red River is startling. Morton’s first essay, “The Red River Parish” written in 1936, reflected the grip of the fur-trade school: “The Settlement was an adjunct, not of civilization but of the fur trade.” It was a suggestive article and posed a still unanswered question about the allegiance of the Red River inhabitant to his parish, ethnic group or the settlement at large. But, based as it was on a fur-trade thesis, the article was antithetical to the Giraud paradigm which Morton first clearly accepted in his “Agriculture in the Red River Colony” (Canadian Historical Review, 1949) and in his appreciative review of Giraud’s Le Métis Canadien (Paris, 1945) in The Beaver (1950).

Giraud traced the history of the Métis in thirteen hundred well researched, impeccably footnoted pages. Three hundred concerned Red River. The Red River past was divided into two periods “les années d’incertitude” (1818–1827) and “les années de stabilisation” (1828–1869). These latter forty years were for the Métis, “les années les plus heureuses.” Yet it was a life of precarious equilibrium, balanced between the hunt, the trip, the river lot, and the fisheries, a life symbolic of Red River itself:

In the Red River colony civilization and barbarism met and mingled. On the one hand was the sedentary agricultural economy of the colony, on the other the nomadic hunting economy of the plains . . . . The result was a society quaint and unique, in which were reconciled the savagery of the Indian and the culture of Europe.
Giraud and Morton argue that civilization failed to bridle the Métis; that their nomadism was self-perpetuating and inescapable. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, given the attitude of the clergy, the needs of the Hudson’s Bay Company, the economic stagnation of Red River and the Company’s continued opposition to an always faltering agriculture? The constant intercourse with the Indians and the never ceasing influx of Métis from the plains further reinforced the tendency to “barbarism.” The clergy and “la bourgeoisie,” the only elements of stability, could hardly be other than ineffective counterpoints. It was a way of life, “as swiftly transient as a prairie cloud,” and it could exist only,

dans un pays dont l’économie prédominante respecte la nature primitive et dont le gouvernement est animé d’une mentalité statique, réfractaire aux innovations profondes.22

The Métis tendency to free trade weakened the very government that protected their existence. In 1869,

civilization (would triumph) over barbarism, the sedentary over the nomadic way of life, and the Métis who were intermediaries between the two—the personification of the equipoise of the Stone Age and the Industrial Revolution which was the fur trade—(would be) shattered.23

Yet, the Giraud/Morton hypothesis only accounts for half of Red River society and assumes that the values in conflict within this half were in conflict within Red River society as a whole. The English-speaking half-breed, the Kildonan settler, and the agents of the Church Missionary Society were nowhere satisfactorily examined. But the religiously and ethnically distinct parishes may not have been as interconnected as Giraud and Morton believed. Was there, in fact, a delicate balance between the two Red Rivers, the “civilized” and the “barbaric,” as Morton and Giraud assumed?

Recently, historians have begun to look at Red River as a complex entity, a community. Unfortunately, while interest in Selkirk and Riel continues unabated, interest in Red River per se is waning. Only the frontier school, within its constant attempt to justify Confederation, continues to dote on Red River. There are always the graduate students, but they have tended to offer marginally researched narrative histories devoid of complex interpretation. The Red River past must be attacked with sophisticated weapons. Demographic studies of each parish and the internal dynamics of the community must be undertaken. Sylvia Van Kirk’s work Many Tender Ties (recent PhD dissertation) is very provocative, determining as it does the role of white women in the disintegration of Red River society.24

Van Kirk proves without a doubt that the white women who came to Red River in the 1830s as the wives of the missionaries and of a select
few chief officers of the Hudson's Bay Company precipitated serious racial conflicts within the settlement. Where before the mixed-blood wives of the officers had ruled supreme, they now were challenged by intruders who had no doubt as to the inferiority of those with Indian blood. Because Van Kirk is more concerned with the fur trade than with Red River she does not investigate the impact these schisms may have had on Red River more generally. In fact, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the racial conflict precipitated by the coming of these white women may have aggravated the landmark crises of Red River: the 1849 free trade troubles and the Riel uprising. The deep schisms within English-speaking Red River that prevented any effective opposition to Riel can in fact be traced to the racism of the 1830s. If racism is indeed the central theme in Red River's history, rather than geography or economics, then perhaps the old historic time markers like the Riel Rebellion may, upon closer investigation, not be as relevant as tradition dictates. Perhaps the racial flashpoints like the Bal-lenden scandal, which divided the community along racial lines, or the Corbett scandal of 1863, which divided the settlement between Métis and Halfbreed and Halfbreed and European, are more important. Only future research will tell.

Jennifer Brown's *Strangers in Blood* (Vancouver 1980) provides similar unique insights which require further clarification with regard to Red River. She suggests that the Northwest Company and the Hudson's Bay Company had two separate and unique social and family structures. This of course could lead to the conclusion that the divisions between the Métis and Halfbreeds within Red River were the result of cultural antecedents unique to Rupert's Land rather than a conflict imported from Ontario.

The most promising enquiries to date have been undertaken by the Métis Federation of Manitoba in their efforts to analyze the community quantitatively. The results are still preliminary and conclusions indefinite, but their findings are tending to reinforce the directions hinted by Van Kirk and Brown that Red River was an increasingly highly stratified and divided community. In fact, Red River provides a unique laboratory from which to explore the dynamics of closed, isolated single-industry communities.

What more recent historians all have in common is their emphasis on the internal dynamics of the community. Their basic question is not “How Was the West Won for Confederation?” but rather, “Why Did the Red River Community Change?” Why could this peculiar community not survive the immigrations from the Canadas? This inward reflection is an indication that western scholars are no longer looking to Eastern Canada or London as the metropolitan centres which directed historical change. Rather they are saying that it is time Western
Canada looked at itself, its people and its geography for historical causation. While many of these new reflections are somewhat rough and uncut, they do promise new directions, and for that they are welcomed.
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9 Ibid. p. 802. By 1860 the population was almost equally divided between French and English. It was the mixed-blood (Metis and Half Breeds) who were predominant.

10 While E. E. Rich, Hudson's Bay Company (Toronto, 1960) contains no footnotes, a footnoted copy has been placed in the National Library of Canada.


14 Pritchett, op. cit., p. 271.
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