University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

James A. Rawley Graduate Conference in the Humanities | History, Department of

4-12-2008

Indians, "Esquimaux," and Race: Identity and Community in the Lands West of Hudson's Bay in the Eighteenth Century

Strother Roberts
Northwestern University, s-roberts2@northwestern.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/historyrawleyconference

Part of the History Commons

Roberts, Strother, "Indians, "Esquimaux," and Race: Identity and Community in the Lands West of Hudson's Bay in the Eighteenth Century" (2008). *James A. Rawley Graduate Conference in the Humanities.* Paper 25.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/historyrawleyconference/25

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in James A. Rawley Graduate Conference in the Humanities by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Indians, "Esquimaux," and Race: Identity and Community in the Lands West of Hudson's Bay in the Eighteenth Century

Strother Roberts

Northwestern University

Abstract

This paper proposes that a cross-tribal sense of belonging, similar to modern conceptions of racism, facilitated the formation of multi-ethnic communities among the Indian populations living to the west of Hudson's Bay in the eighteenth century.

Based upon observations made over the course of a century by employees of the Hudson's Bay Company regarding the attitudes held by their Native American trading partners towards the region's Inuit populations, this paper concludes that Indians living to the west of Hudson's Bay in the eighteenth century constructed an inclusive trans-Indian sense of identity based, at least in part, on the exclusion of the Inuit "other." Indian prejudice against the Inuit stretched across the boundaries of dialect and language-family and, within the scope of this manuscript, included Chipewyan, Cree, and Yellowknife Indians. Individual Indian communities An inclusive, trans-Indian identity was perpetually reinforced through trade, cohabitation and marriage, and joint raiding activities by the "in groups," activities from which the Inuit were excluded. This exclusion was both result and cause of the continual hostility present between Indian and Inuit groups throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

Paper presented at the 3rd Annual James A. Rawley Conference in the Humanities — *Imagining Communities: People, Places, Meanings.* Lincoln, Nebraska, April 12, 2008. Sponsored by the University of Nebraska–Lincoln History Graduate Students' Association.
Copyright © 2008 Strother Roberts.

The history of the Canadian Arctic and Subarctic offers hints of how certain aboriginal American communities constructed identities across the lines drawn by differences in language and culture, identities comparable to modern conceptions of race. A study of the relationships between the Indian and Inuit inhabitants of the lands lying to the west of Hudson's Bay in the eighteenth century suggests that Indian trading, cohabitation, and war-making practices served to create and reinforce culturally constructed inter-community identities. These identities proved fluid enough to incorporate old rivals (the Chipewyan and Cree Indians) as well as new trading partners (Hudson's Bay Company employees), while still excluding cultural others (the Inuit) at least until the end of the century. The example of the Chipewyan, Yellowknife, and Cree Indians in their relationships with the Inuit suggests that American Indians, at least in this one case, shared a cross-tribal, trans-Indian sense of identity at least partially defined by their rejection of the Inuit "other," and which performed many of the functions commonly associated with European/Euro-American systems of racial "othering."[1]

Early on the morning of July 17, 1771, a band of over a hundred men wove their way between the rolling hills running parallel to the banks of the Coppermine River. The raiding party joined together a diverse collection of peoples and languages. The great majority of the party consisted of Chipewyan Indians, accompanied by an indeterminate number of Yellowknife Indians, as well as two Crees. The Chipewyan and Yellowknives spoke distinct dialects of the Athabascan language family. The Crees were Algonquin speakers. A traditional animosity had long existed between the Crees and their Athabascan neighbors, and persisted into the nineteenth century. Likewise, linguistic consanguinity did not entirely discourage confrontation between the Yellowknives and the Chipewyan, who had clashed violently on several occasions in preceding decades. On this morning, though, they were united in their martial intentions. An Englishman, an explorer in the employ of the Hudson's Bay Company named Samuel Hearne, constituted the remainder of the raiding party.

Their target was a camp of about a dozen tents of Copper Inuit, or "Esquimaux" in Hearne's recounting of the event. With the sound

Figure 1. Map of Tribes and Areas Discussed. Derived from *The Handbook of North American Indians: Arctic,* ed. William C. Sturtevant and David Damas, 17 Vols. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institute, 1984), 5:x; and *The Handbook of North American Indians: Subarctic,* ed. William C. Sturtevant and June Helm, (1981), 6: ix.

of their approach covered by the roar of the nearby waterfall, the surprise was complete and in a short time, twenty-two of the camp's inhabitants lay dead. Following their swift victory, the Indians turned to plundering the camp. Having emptied the tents of all the valuables they could find, the Indians once again turned their attention

to their Inuit enemies. In the midst of a ritualized mutilation of the bodies, Hearne's Indian companions called out to him to come over and examine the Inuit corpses, pointing out to him what they considered the most exceptional aspects of Inuit anatomy, trying to convince Hearne of the considerable physical differences which existed between Esquimaux and Indian.[2]

This unwelcome lesson in comparative physiology was lost on the Englishman, however. Far from recognizing the physical differences that his Indian companions insisted upon, Hearne found himself driven to distraction by the whole disquieting experience. In the published account of his exploration of the Coppermine River, Hearne records that:

> [I] firmly believe that had there actually been as much difference between them as there is said to be between the Hottentots and those of Europe, it would not have been in my power to have marked the distinction. I have reason to think, however, that there is no ground for the assertion; and really believe that the declaration of the Indians on this occasion, was utterly void of truth, and proceeded only from the implacable hatred they bore to the whole tribe of people [the Esquimaux] of whom I am speaking.[3]

If Hearne found this intended physiology lesson so disquieting, it is perhaps because it felt so familiar. Hearne had undergone similar scrutiny (though in his case not post-mortem) a month earlier when he and his Chipewyan and Cree traveling companions had first encountered the Yellowknife Indians who were to join them in their attack on the Inuit. Having never before encountered a European, the Yellowknives inspected Hearne from head to foot, commenting on the strange color of his hair and eyes and expressing distaste for the whiteness of his skin, which they compared to meat which had been soaked too long in water. But despite these observable differences, the Yellowknives ultimately pronounced Hearne to be "a perfect human being."[4]

The irony of these two instances is that the European explorer played the role of skeptic while the native inhabitants of the region

propounded an attitude that looks suspiciously like European/Euro-American constructions of race. When faced with an outsider traveling through their territory, the Yellowknife Indians had attempted to understand Hearne through close physical examination. Despite the obvious aberrations of complexion, the Yellowknives apparently found Hearne's physical make-up sufficiently similar to their own to declare him a "perfect human being", and they ultimately welcomed him into their camp. Following the slaughter of the Inuit camp, the same Indians inspected the bodies of their Inuit victims and took note of what they perceived as far more pronounced physical aberrations - differences which Hearne found indiscernible - seeming to offer these as justification for their violent actions.[5]

The current historiography of Native Americans often overlooks the role played by native peoples in the construction of racial identities. Most scholars approach the problem of race by asking how Europeans and Euro-Americans developed a perception of Indians as belonging to a separate race, distinct from themselves.[6] Such studies portray Native Americans as the subjects, rather than the agents of racial constructions. Even those scholars who grant Native Americans a limited degree of agency in the construction of their own racial identities consider such constructions as reactionary, often a response to Euro-American violence, and essentially as the mere adoption of the pre-formed ideological systems of Euro-American racism.[7]

While the fur traders operating around Hudson's Bay in the eighteenth and nineteenth century were slowly recognizing their own whiteness, the application of a chromatic moniker to their native trading partners never became common. Instead, they referred to most of the native inhabitants living near the Bay simply as "Indians", though physical descriptions often noted the "tawny" or "copper" hues of the Indian complexion.[8] The presence of the Inuit in the Canadian Arctic complicated the racial dichotomy of "European and "Indian", of "white" and "red" (or "copper" or "tawny") which was beginning to prevail throughout the rest of the continent. In the northernmost reaches of the Bay region, white Europeans and copper-complected Indians came face to face not just with one another, but also with the "swarthy", "olive" skinned Inuit.[9]

The nomenclature chosen by Hudson's Bay Company employees to reference their Indian and Inuit trading partners makes clear the distinction they perceived between the two groups. The officers of the Hudson's Bay Company both recognized the diversity of distinct native peoples in the Bay and revealed their implicit belief in the essential affinity of these peoples by referring to individual "tribes" of "Indians". The English conceptually united the distinct cultures of the Crees and the Chipewyan through references to "Cree Indians" (or "Southern Indians") and "Chipewyan Indians" (or "Northern Indians"). This referential affinity did not extend to the Inuit, however.

This distinction drawn by the English employees of the Hudson's Bay Company between 'Indian' and 'Inuit' does not seem to have been their own invention; instead the convention seems have been adopted from the Indians with whom the Company traded. Only employees of the Company with little or no direct acquaintance with the region's aboriginal peoples conceptualized the Inuit, or "Esquimaux," as "Indians". Writing from London, the committee members of the Company often lumped the Inuit under the more expansive category of Indians in their correspondence to the trading posts on Hudson's Bay.[10] The captains of the supply ships that arrived from England annually wrote of trading with the "Eskimaux Indians" as they entered the Hudson Strait each year.[11] But officers with more direct personal experience of the North American fur trade, those who lived year-round on the shores of Hudson's Bay in constant contact with the aboriginal communities with whom they did business, drew a strict distinction between Indian and Inuit. Among those Company employees with the greatest experience in Native American culture and Native American attitudes, references to the Inuit as "Indians" are so rare as to be exceptional.

Standard studies of the interrelationships between the different ethnic communities of native North American commonly identify three strategies for interaction: symbiosis, merger, and war.[12] Symbiotic, or complementary, strategies of interaction included both peaceful trade and reciprocal raiding. Merger represented a continuum of activities that ranged from cooperation in hunting and raiding bands, to intermarriage among individuals from different eth-

nic communities, to the full incorporation of one community into another and the abolition of any ethnic distinctions between the groups. Disputes over territory or competition over resources precipitated wars between Native American populations. The act of war consisted of raiding for resources and attempts to destroy or to drive off competing populations.

These three strategies often overlapped and existed roughly conterminously within the same relationship. Reciprocal raiding might represent a strategy to reallocate resources from communities of abundance to communities suffering from a scarcity. Seasonal fluctuations in food supplies or other goods might shift the roles of raider and raided, but locked both inside a complementary relationship. But raiding might also represent a non-complementary act of war when it occurred outside the framework of reciprocity. Raiding for captives led to merger when host societies incorporated those captured through marriage or adoption. This incorporation of captives into host populations in turn led to symbiotic trading relationships when cultural converts provided trade links to their former communities.[13] Communities at war often laid their hostilities aside temporarily to engage in trade, or to visit kin in the opposing community.[14]

All three strategies of interaction – symbiosis, merger, and war – existed among the different Indian communities surrounding Hudson's Bay in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Peaceful trading, intermarriage, the merger of bands for hunting or trading, and the commission of violent acts in the pursuit of raiding and war all equally represented the relationships between Crees and Chipewyan or between Chipewyan and Yellowknives in the period. The same cannot be said for the interaction between these same Indian communities and their Inuit neighbors.

In my own research I have found that a wide gulf existed between the forms of peaceful interaction that occurred between different Indian groups (Chipewyan and Crees, for example), and the potential for peaceful Indian-Inuit exchanges. By the 1760s, Crees and Chipewyan Indians, could live peacefully together beneath the walls of Fort Prince of Wales.[15] Inter-mingling of cultures also took place away from the multi-cultural sites provided by the Hudson's Bay

Company posts. Many of the hunting and trading bands ranging the lands bordering Hudson's Bay in this decade were more or less multi-cultural in character. Crees and Chipewyan commonly traveled peaceably together, occasionally including amongst them Indians from populations as far removed from the Bay as the Archthinue (Blackfoot).[16]

Chipewyan and Cree efforts to guard their monopoly on European trade goods caused much of the open conflict that did exist between Indian groups in the region during this period. Groups of Yellowknife or Dogrib Indians attempting to bypass Chipewyan middlemen and trade with the Hudson's Bay Company directly did so at the risk of Chipewyan violence. By contrast, Yellowknife and Dogrib Indians who visited the western frontier of Chipewyan territory with the purpose of trading the furs they had collected for European trade-goods carried to the interior by Chipewyan middlemen received a warm welcome.[17] The distinction between hostile and friendly relations amongst different Indian communities contained a degree of fluidity that allowed Matonabbee to assemble a multi-cultural war party incorporating a large number of Yellowknife Indians just four years after another Chipewyan leader had pillaged a group of Yellowknives and left them to die.

The same degree of fluidity does not seem to have been present in Indian-Inuit relations. This is not to say that peaceful interactions between Indians and Inuit did not occur.

Writing from the perspective of the early 1790s, Samuel Hearne notes that the efforts of the Hudson's Bay Company and its officers had begun to bear fruit; that "perfect peace and friendship" had finally been established between the Chipewyan and their Inuit neighbors. This was only a partial victory for the peacemakers of the Company, however. Only those Inuit who inhabited the coastal lands on the west of Hudson's Bay and traded with the trading vessels sent north annually from Fort Prince of Wales received the "protection" of the chief factors of that post. Elsewhere, Hearne admitted that the Inuit continued to fall victim to Chipewyan aggression.[18]

At points visited by Company trading vessels such as Whale Cove and Navel's Bay, both far removed from the territory of the

Chipewyan, the Inuit likely did come to trade without fear of Indian attack. At Cape Esquimaux (also Eskimo Point or Knapp's Bay, today's Arviat in Nunavut), however, the threat of violence seems to have been ever-present. The Hudson's Bay Company had established regular trading voyages to the north as a means to prevent Inuit-Indian violence by eliminating the need of Inuit to travel along the frontier of Chipewyan territory to Fort Price of Wales. However, the Chipewyan soon realized that showing up on the coast of the Bay at the right place at the right time of year could save them over a hundred miles off their trading trips. One-hundred-sixty miles (about 260 km) north of Fort Prince of Wales, Cape Esquimaux was sufficiently close to the southeastern bound of the Chipewyan range for at least a few Chipewyan to visit it every year to trade. Each summer brought various bands of mutually hostile Indians and Inuit into close contact on the shores of Cape Esquimaux, just waiting for the trade ship to arrive.

In the summer of 1755, these circumstances brought disaster. A band of Chipewyan returning north from Fort Prince of Wales noticed a ship putting into Cape Esquimaux and approached to trade. Arriving near the coast, they witnessed the officer of the ship trading with a group of Inuit. The Chipewyan then rethought their plans to trade and instead chose to lay in wait and ambush the Inuit at the first opportunity. When the ship's officers had concluded their trading, they began to sail away and the Inuit, who always paddled out to meet the ships in kayaks, returned to shore. Seizing their opportunity, the Chipewyan fell upon three tents of Inuit, killing all inside and plundering them of their recently obtained goods. A smaller group of Inuit, safely camped on an island a little ways from the shore, escaped a similar fate but were forced to watch helplessly as those on the shore were slaughtered.[19]

While the Hudson's Bay Company journals record no further incidences of open violence at Cape Esquimaux, the tensions that underlay that violence remained. Even as late as the 1780s, during the period when Hearne had declared that Indian and Inuit traded side by side in "perfect peace and friendship", this intercultural tension was obvious. In 1785, Thomas Price, captain of the trading sloop

Charlotte, noted that many of the Inuit who regularly traded at Cape Esquimaux had left for Navel's Bay before the ship's arrival, out of fear of the Chipewyan already gathered there.[20]

Far from being a result of "friendship," any peace that prevailed between the Inuit and Chipewyan at Cape Esquimaux was often the product of separation. To avoid trouble, the trading ships never allowed Indians and Inuit on board to trade at the same time.[21] The Inuit located their camps miles away from those of the Chipewyan, often on small islands.[22] Most of the Indian tribes of central Canada, adapted to an inland existence, had no knowledge of open-water craft. Consequently, the Inuit with their kayaks and umiaks could camp on islands, row out to Hudson's Bay Company trading vessels, and never come within reach of the hostile Chipewyan.

This "peaceful" co-existence through careful segregation stands in stark contrast to the multi-ethnic blending taking place in bands of hunters and traders elsewhere. Large bands of Chipewyan were able to live alongside a large Cree population at Fort Prince of Wales. Parties of Chipewyan traders were able to visit the Cree, the Dogrib, and the Yellowknife Indians and to receive parties of the same within their own territory. These groups were even capable of putting together multi-ethnic war parties for attacks on their mutual enemy, the Inuit. That the Chipewyan and Inuit could not abide within a few miles of each other, often separated by a veritable moat, without one party feeling obliged to withdraw from the animosity of the other, suggests that the Chipewyan attitude towards the Inuit differed qualitatively from their attitude towards the other native groups of central Canada.

Even more telling then the failure of Indian and Inuit to co-exist peacefully, was the apparent failure of Indian communities to incorporate Inuit through enslavement and adoption. Hearne records his belief that when the Chipewyan and Inuit met in battle they never took captives but rather "the strongest party always killed the weakest, without sparing either man, woman or child."[23] Having served eleven years as chief factor of Fort Prince of Wales, and having been an unwilling witness to the events at Bloody Falls, Hearne seems as reliable an informant on this particular aspect of Chipewyan-Inuit

interaction as the historian may hope to find. Moreover, Hearne's characterization of Chipewyan-Inuit warfare as wholesale slaughter is corroborated by the observations of Andrew Graham, another trading at Fort Prince of Wales, Sir Alexander Mackenzie's writings of a decade later.[24]

Most striking is the failure of the war-party which Hearne accompanied at Bloody Falls to take any prisoners. In the published account of his journey, Hearne records how a young Inuit woman escaped the initial onset of the Indian warriors and ran to him, pleading for mercy. As the young woman entwined herself around Hearne's legs in supplication, she was overtaken by several Indian pursuers. The Indians thrust their spears into the young woman's body, pinning her to the ground, slowly torturing her to death. When Hearne protested against this cruelty, the Indians replied mockingly, asking Hearne if he "wanted an Esquimaux wife."[25]

While this story of the young Inuit woman is in all likelihood apocryphal (it does not appear in any of Hearne's earlier manuscripts), it does beg the question of why none of the victorious Indian warriors sought to take himself "an Esquimaux wife."[26] Matonabbee, the party's Chipewyan leader, in particular, had lost two of his six wives during the journey from Fort Prince of Wales to the Coppermine River. Given the importance of women in Chipewyan society (for dressing skins, preparing food, and carrying burdens), it is surprising that Matonabbee, as leader of the war-party, would not have taken the opportunity to replenish the ranks of his helpmates. The failure of the Indians accompanying Hearne at the Coppermine River likely to reserve any young women or children as captives marks Indian-Inuit warfare as something as an aberration.

In contrast, intermarriage and adoption seems to have been common among Indian populations. Hearne recorded that Yellowknife women were greatly esteemed among the Chipewyan. Indeed, several of the Chipewyan men with whom Hearne was traveling had taken wives during their visit among the Yellowknives. Hearne also records the occurrence of Chipewyan-Cree intermarriage at Fort Prince of Wales. Matonabbee himself, both of whose parents seem to have been Chipewyan, had been adopted and raised among Crees until he was

about five.[27] The journals of James Knight, the founder of Fort Prince of Wales, attest to the Cree practice of taking captive Chipewyan women and children and incorporating them into Cree society from the very beginning of European knowledge of the region.[28]

The failure of Indian-Inuit contact to fit within the conventional framework of symbiosis, merger, and war that generally characterized interactions between native North American communities raises the question of just what made this relationship unique. In the eighteenth century, populations of Chipewyan, Crees and Yellowknives could co-exist within symbiotic networks of trade, or merge through peaceful cohabitation and intermarriage. That these Indian populations excluded the Inuit from these peaceful forms of interaction, that raiding and massacre predominated Indian-Inuit relations as the only consistent form of interaction, suggests that there was something exceptional in the attitudes of these Indians towards their Inuit neighbors. In fact, Indian attitudes towards the Inuit seem surprisingly similar to modern conceptions of racism.

Discussions of race in North America often begin with Europeans explorers and traders encountering peoples whose behavior and culture differed markedly from their own. Observations of behavioral differences invariably led to interest in the distinctive features separating the behavior of Native Americans from that of their European contemporaries, and to the origins of these behavioral distinctions. To these European observations of behavioral and cultural differences was added an awareness of physical differences. Early European explorers not only perceived Native Americans as behaving differently, but as looking different as well. Theories explaining both behavioral and physical differences became confounded and Europeans began to perceive Native Americans as not just culturally distinct, but as a distinct race.[29]

Such a narrative of exploration, discovery and interpretation applies equally well to North America's original explorers: the aboriginal peoples who populated the continent far in advance of European contact. As the ancestors of the Inuit spread across Canada's northern coastline, they encountered the ancestors of the Chipewyan and the Cree Indians. Faced with a new culture, whose members were

also physically distinct from other populations whom they had previously encountered, the Indians of the Hudson's Bay region developed a conception of the Inuit similar to the racialized views of the "other" that European explorers developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Race is an ideology, a social construction, and a product of historical process. The scholar can only properly analyze race within the context of the specific histories of the specific communities within which it arises.[30] The diversity of human history mirrors the diversity of human societies. Logically, scholars should assume that the development of race-like social constructions within human societies is equally diverse. Human history has actually given rise not to a single, Western ideology of racism, but rather to a plurality of historically specific racisms.[31] In the context of the present study, this includes the apparently racialized attitude that the Indians of the eighteenth- and early-nineteenth Hudson's Bay region held towards their Inuit neighbors.

Observable differences in physical appearance, subsistence strategies, and material culture provided the Chipewyan, Yellowknives, and Crees with the raw material for the construction of what resembles a racialized attitude of the Inuit. The merger of bands and intermarriage across tribal lines provided the mechanism for the diffusion and maintenance of racialized attitudes between Indian populations. The exclusion of the Inuit from these networks of kinship and complementary exploitation both prevented the sort of cultural exchange that would have diminished these observable differences and established the Inuit as a distinct descent group.[32] The unique ancestry of the Inuit, together with their distinct physical and cultural characteristics, allowed their Indian neighbors to conceptualize the populations of Hudson's Bay into two categories: the first characterized by a cross-tribal sense of trans-Indian identity, the second comprised of the Inuit "other".

The actual articulation of othering, which in the case of Indian-Inuit relations usually took the form of avoidance or violence, is determined by a complex interplay of social processes.[33] The exclusion of the Inuit from inter-Indian networks of trade and cohabitation

precluded opportunities for the establishment of peaceful relations and opened the door for a rigid attitude of violence and cultural prejudice. Without the fluidity of symbiosis and merger to mitigate inter-community hostility, cultural antipathy evolved into a racialized attitude of Indian-Inuit differentiation. Racialized attitudes of hostility in turn discouraged trade and other forms of peaceful coexistence. Racialized attitudes thus became both the cause and the effect of the continuing hostility that characterized Indian-Inuit relations throughout the eighteenth century.

The evidence presented here suggests that the uniqueness of Indian attitudes toward the Inuit in the eighteenth century arose from the fact that the relationship involved was not just inter-tribal; that it may justifiably be characterized as inter-racial. Samuel Hearne's narrative of the massacre at Bloody Falls offers the historian an intriguing fragment with which to reconstruct the motives of his Native American companions in their actions towards the Inuit. The Indians traveling with Hearne - drawn from distinct linguistic groups - put aside traditional animosities and united across ethnic lines, to make war against a commonly constructed group of outsiders. The Indian warriors expressed their disapproval of miscegenation by refusing to take an "Esquimaux wife." Indians used references to perceived anatomical differences to highlight the inferiority of a slain foe, linking culture with physiognomy and crossing the line into racialized differentiation.

The recognition of racialized differences in the relationship between the Indians and the Inuit living to the west of eighteenth-century Hudson's Bay has implication for both the study of race in general and the study of Native American history in particular. The Indian-Inuit relationship suggests that prior scholarship on native North America has been remiss, first, in assuming that racialized thought among Native Americans could only have begun with European contact, and secondly that Indian attitudes of group differentiation focused merely on cultural, not physical (and thus racial), distinctions. In the field of race, this recognition challenges the latent, but persistent tendency towards Euro-centrism. The recognition that race is socially constructed rather than biologically determined is a

major step forward, but it is now time to consider the great variety of societies, not just European or Euro-American, in which such a construction may have taken place. The eighteenth-century Indian societies of the Hudson's Bay region offer just one such example.

Notes

1 The definition of race used here is derived from George Fredrickson, who frames race as based on differences "in physical characteristics that are subject to classification, immediate or remote ancestry, and cultural traits associated with belonging to a historically defined community…race and racism derive form the act of interpreting or constructing such… differences to create a sense of group solidarity or peoplehood that becomes the basis for assertions of dominance or privileged status over those considered outside of the group." George Fredrickson, *The Comparative Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism, and Social Movement,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 83.

2 Unfortunately, Hearne deemed these details "too indecent to describe, leaving the historian to speculate as to what these markers of physical differentiation may have been. Samuel Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772*, ed. Richard Glover (Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1958), 100.

3 Hearne, 101.

4 Hearne, 78.

5 Certain caveats should be noted when drawing upon Samuel Hearne's published journal as an historical source. The journal was published five years following Hearne's death and the degree to which the editorial hand determined its contents is debated. I. S. MacLaren notes many of the arguments in favor of the journal being the product of an active ghost writer while Heather Rollason Driscoll makes (in this author's opinion) a compelling case for Hearne as substantially the author of his own work. The issue of authorship aside, the possibility remains that Hearne may have embellished certain aspects of his narrative. The lesson in comparative physiology

upon which this vignette centers is corroborated by an excerpt from a no longer extant early manuscript of Hearne's, probably recorded shortly after his return to Fort Prince of Wales in 1772 and copied down by Andrew Graham in his *Observations*. In this excerpt Hearne records the Indians' "curiosity in examining, and making their remarks on the formation of the women" and indicates that his companions were only willing to depart the site after, among other things, making "all their observations on the bodies as before-mentioned." This passage presents a far more ambiguous picture of the Indians' behavior and allows the interpretation that they were driven in their examinations by no more than a macabre lewdness. It also contains no mention of Hearne's inspection at the hands of the Copper Indians. Ian MacLaren, "Notes on Samuel Hearne's *Journey* from a Bibliographic Perspective," *Papers/Cahiers* of the Bibliographical Society of Canada 31, no.2, (1993), 21-24; MacLaren, "Exploring Canadian Literature: Samuel Hearne and the Inuit Girl," in Peter Easingwood, Konrad Gross, Wolfgang Klooss, ed., *Probing Canadian Culture*. (Augsburg: AV-Verlag, 1991), 91-94; Heather Rollsson Driscoll, "The Genesis of *A Journey to the Northern Ocean*: A Dissertation concerning the Transactions and Occurrences related to Samuel Hearne's Coppermine River Narrative, including information on his Letters, Journals, Draft Manuscripts, and Published Work," Unpublished dissertation (University of Alberta, 2002), 225, 227, 233-5, 337-44; Andrew Graham, *Andrew Graham's Observations on Hudson's Bay,* ed. Glyndwr Williams, (London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1969), 199.

6 Alden T. Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); James Axtell, *Natives and Newcomers: The Cultural Origins of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). Examples also include those essays focusing on Native Americans from the January 1997 edition of the *William and Mary Quarterly*, which took as its theme the construction of race in the early modern period: David Bryan Davis, "Constructing Race: A Reflection," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (1997): 7-18; Karen Ordahl Kupperman, "Presentment of Civility: English Reading of American Self-Presentation in the Early Years," 193-228; and Joyce E. Chaplin. "Natural Philosophy and an Early Racial Idiom in Comparing English and Indian Bodies." 229-252.

7 Daniel Richter, for example, takes the cult of the Delaware prophet Neolin and the outbreak of Pontiac's War, both reactions to Euro-American racism and land-hunger, as the beginning point for Native American constructions of an "Indian" race. Daniel Richter, *Facing East From Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 188-201.

8 Andrew Graham, *Andrew Graham's Observations on Hudson's Bay,* ed. Glyndwr Williams, (London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1969), 143.

9 Graham, 213; and John McLean, *John McLean's Notes of a Twenty-Five Years' Service in the Hudson's Bay Territory,* ed. W.S. Wallace (Toronto: Champlain Society, 1932), 266.

10 Quotation from the Hudson's Bay Company Archive in William Barr, "The Eighteenth Century Trade Between the Ships of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Hudson Strait Inuit," *Arctic* 47, no. 3, (1994), 237.

11 Henry Ellis, *An Account of a Voyage to Hudson's Bay by the* Dobb's Galley *and the* California *in the Years 1746 and 1747 for Discovering a North West Passage* (London: Printed for H. Whitridge, 1748), 131-2; and T. S. Drage as quoted in William Barr, 244.

12 The tripartite model of "symbiosis, merger, and war" is taken from Patricia C. Albers. An alternative model might be that of "intermarriage, trading and war." Patricia C. Albers, "Symbiosis, Merger, and War : Contrasting Forms of Intertribal Relationship Among Historic Plains Indians," in John H. Moore, ed., *The Political Economy of North American Indians* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), 95-132; and Ernest S. Burch Jr. and Thomas C. Corell, "Alliance and Conflict: Inter-regional Relations in North Alaska," in D. L. Guemple, ed., *Alliance in Eskimo Society: Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1971), 19.

13 James Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community In the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 34.

14 Albers, 126-7.

15 Hudson's Bay Company Archives, Provincial Archives of Manitoba, B42/b/11, 3 August 1765.

16 HBCA, B42/b/5, 15 August 1759.

17 Hearne, 116-117.

18 Hearne, 217.

19 HBCA, B/42/b/2, Ferdinand Jacobs to Joseph Ibister and Thomas White, 1 April 1756.

20 HBCA, B42/a/105, 25 July 1785.

21 HBCA, B42/a/93, 18 July 1776.

22 HBCA, B42/a/93, 24-24 July 1785.

23 Hearne, 218n.

24 Alexander Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal, on the River St. Laurence, through the Continent of North America, to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans: In the Years 1789 and 1793* (London: Printed for T. Cadell, Jr. and W. Davies, 1801), cxxiii.

25 Hearne, 101.

26 MacLaren, 32-33

27 Hearne, 5, 79, 223.

28 Smith, 140.

29 This particular presentation of the emergence of European perceptions of racialized categories is drawn from Leo Driedger and Shiva S. Hall's discussion of the construction of race in Canadian history. Leo Driedger and Shiva S. Hall, "The Race Challenge 2000," in Leo Driedger and Shiva S. Hall, eds., *Race and Racism: Canada's Challenge* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), 2-4.

30 Barbara J. Fields, "Ideology and Race in American History." in J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson, eds., *Region, Race and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 144, 150.

31 Robert Miles and Rudy Torres, "Does "Race" Matter? TranAtlantic Perspectives on Racism after "Race Relations."" in M.A. Kalbach and W.E. Kalbach, eds., *Perspectives on Ethnicity in Canada: A Reader* (Toronto: Harcourt, 2000), 23.

32 This process for racializing the other is drawn from George Fredrickson. Fredrickson, "Understanding Racism," 79, 81-83.

33 Miles and Torres, 23.