

**MILITARISM, SOVEREIGNTY, AND NATIONALISM: SIX NATIONS AND THE
FIRST WORLD WAR**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Committee on Graduate Studies in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in the Faculty of Arts
and Science**

**TRENT UNIVERSITY
Peterborough, Ontario, Canada**

© Evan J. Habkirk, 2010

Canadian Studies and Indigenous Studies Graduate Program

May 2010



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-64081-4
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-64081-4

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

Abstract

The First World War affected many Native nations throughout Canada, none so more than the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory. The Six Nations' participation in the war was interpreted, by many people outside the Grand River community, as the Six Nations accepting their role not as an autonomous nation outside the jurisdiction of the Canadian state, but as Canadian and British subjects. This theory has been propagated by scholars like G. Elmore Reaman, Sally M. Weaver, and John Moses. By examining local sources through Robert Rutherford's Hometown Horizons theory, however, the Six Nations participation in the war can be interpreted as the Six Nations upholding their traditional military alliance with the British Crown within a post-traditional society.

Acknowledgements

Much of the financial backing for this thesis was provided by Trent University, especially through the assistance of the Leslie Frost Entrance Scholarship.

Many libraries and archives also aided me in this research. I would like to make special mention of the staff of the Woodland Cultural Centre Research Library for the use of their rare and extensive collections. As well, I would like to thank the staff of the Brantford Public Library, especially the continual support of Geoffrey Moyer, who not only guided me through their local history holdings and their Brantford Expositor microfilm collection, but was there to answer any question I had about Brant County's World War One experience.

Many people also aided me in my research. In no particular order, I would like to thank Dr. Gary Warrick, Dr. Carole LeClair, Dr. Peter Farrugia, and Dr. David Olivier of Wilfrid Laurier University, Brantford Campus. Your support and belief in me will never be forgotten. The many consultations with Linda Cook, Jeff Burnham, Shelia Staats, Mary Liggins (nee Hill), and Ken Liggins, whose family histories brought the Six Nations First World War veterans experience into a contemporary light. Thank you for your willingness to share.

The editorial and advisory support of Dr. John S. Milloy, Paul Williams and Dr. Bruce Hodgins cannot go unmentioned. Your combined breadth of knowledge, your generosity, and your willingness to help out any way you could will be remembered forever.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family who supported me personally through this process. To my parents, my sisters, my brother, and girlfriend: thank you for putting up with my ups, downs, and continued absenteeism throughout this process. You have seen me through all of it and for this, I am ever thankful.

Dedication

To all the veterans of the First World War, especially to the veterans of the Six Nations whose role during and after the war has long been misinterpreted. This is your story and may you never be forgotten.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Six Nations: An Undying Culture.....	Page 6
Chapter 2: The Creation of a Six Nations Enlistee.....	Page 24
Chapter 3: The Six Nations/City of Brantford Relationship.....	Page 44
Chapter 4: Six Nations in the First World War.....	Page 66
Chapter 5: Interpretations of Six Nations War Evolvment.....	Page 97
Chapter 6: The Six Nations' Veteran.....	Page 121
Conclusion: The Legacy of War.....	Page 157
Bibliography.....	Page 161

Chapter 1: Six Nations: An Undying Culture

On 7 October 1924 at 9 am, Lt. Col. C.E. Morgan, Superintendent of the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, set out from the City of Brantford to the village of Ohsweken with a proclamation approved by the Governor General and written by the Canadian Privy Council. After arriving at the Fair Grounds in Ohsweken, Morgan, escorted by members of the RCMP, was met by the Chiefs of the Six Nations traditional government. To the Chiefs, Morgan read the proclamation which dissolved the Six Nations traditional government and replaced it with a band council elected pursuant to the process set out in Canada's *Indian Act*. The Chiefs, who were meeting at the Fair Grounds due to repairs being made on their Council House, heard the proclamation and made no form of resistance or protest to the announcement.¹ The Canadian government believed that it had successfully removed the Six Nations' traditional government from power. This removal from power forever changed the way the Canadian and British government interacted with the Six Nations and forced an official system of government, a government that had been in place on the North American Continent since time immemorial, to go underground where it currently operates today.²

In a recent article, John Moses has proposed that this event was supported in the main by the veterans of Six Nation's who had recently returned from the First World War. According to Moses, these Six Nations veterans came from families who wanted to see the Six Nations traditional government removed in favour of an elected band council. Feeling that the traditional government did not support them during the war and feeling a disconnection from the Six

¹ Brantford Expositor, 7 October 1924. For a similar description of the event, see Scott R. Thevithick's Conflicting Outlooks: The Background to the 1924 Deposing of the Six Nations Hereditary Council (MA Thesis, University of Alberta, 1998).

² Currently, in the land claims negotiations now proceeding between the Six Nations and the government's of Ontario and Canada, the Six Nations negotiation team is led by the Six Nations traditional government. Although the traditional government is part of the negotiation process, Federally, it remains the unofficial governing body of the Grand River Territory.

Nations community to which they returned further fuelled the opinions of the returned veterans against their traditional government. These veterans, who Moses claims had the ear of the Canadian government, actively petitioned Ottawa which culminated in the events of 7 October 1924.³ This conclusion, based on dated sources,⁴ is too simplistic. Revisions need to be made to this theory as the theory limits the range of opinions of all Six Nations veterans to a single action. The returned veterans from Six Nations were individuals who had many ideas of what their service during the war meant to them and how it related to ideas found within their community. These ideas about their service would have manifested themselves in many ways during the post war years, but not all of these manifestations led to the 1924 attack on the Six Nations traditional council.

To better understand the veterans and the community of the Grand River Territory, a more complex framework is needed to allow for the array of opinions found among the Six Nations veterans. To this end, the theoretical framework proposed by historian Robert Rutherford can be used. Rutherford's hometown horizon theory explains that in order to understand the full effect the First World War had on a community, the researcher must narrow their focus to a local cultural space, like the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, while also examining and understanding the effect that central administrating centers, in this case the Canadian Government and the Department of Indian Affairs, and their policies had on the citizens of the local space.⁵ According to Rutherford's theory, although the policies issued from

³ John Moses, "The Return of the Native: Six Nations Veterans and Political Change at the Grand River Reserve, 1917-1924" in *Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives*, P. Whitney Leckenbauer and Craig Leslie Mantle eds. (Kingston, Ontario: Defense Academy Press, 2007), 117.

⁴ Academically, this theory can be traced to the book *Trial of the Iroquois Indians* by G. Elmore Reaman (pgs 82-83). This theory was furthered used and expanded upon by Anthropologist Sally M. Weaver in her many works. More recent Six Nations community scholarship by Susan M. Hill counter this claim (Susan Marie Hill, "The Clay We Are Made Of: an Examination of Houdenosaunee Land Tenure," (Ph.D. dissertation, Trent University, 2006).

⁵ Robert Allen Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to Canada's Great War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004) xiii-xiv.

the Federal central administering centres in Ottawa were designed to have a homogenous effect on all Canadians, local spaces like towns and cities would implement the policies in accordance and as not to affect the cultural practices of the local community. All local spaces would have developed and understood their role in war time differently. In this way, local spaces were part of Canada's larger war effort, but also acted as autonomous units within the larger configuration of Canada. Following this model, the Six Nations and their relationship to the City of Brantford and Ottawa will be analyzed pre, during and post First World War.

One problem of Rutherford's theory is that it was not designed to be applied to First Nations issues. With this in mind, it will be necessary to rework and expand Rutherford's theory to include First Nations' and Six Nations' specific issues into the Hometown Horizons framework. For many First Nations communities, including the Six Nations, the important issue of nationalism must be included into the Hometown Horizon's framework. The Six Nations believe themselves to be allies of the Crown and an independent nation outside of the Canadian state because of their existing treaty relationship with the British Crown that began with the Treaty at Albany in September, 1664 and had been further strengthened by the creation of the Covenant Chain relationship in 1677, prior to their migration to the Grand River Territory in 1784 and into 1785. Any policies issued by the Canadian government or Duncan Campbell Scott, the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and the architect of the federal assimilation policies from the 1880s to the 1930s, and the Department of Indian Affairs would be interpreted by the Six Nations traditional government with this in mind. Any policy that the Six Nations government viewed as a possible infringement on their rights and status as a separate

nation would not be implemented or would be implemented in such a way to fit into their existing treaty relationship.⁶

Rutherford's theory needs to be expanded to include the nationalistic sentiment that still exists within the Six Nations community today. By utilizing Rutherford's theory about the uniqueness of all communities during the First World War, we can gain a better understanding of the cultural forces and complexities at play in the lives of the Six Nations men who enlisted to fight in the Great War and the community that they returned to. This community's culture would have influenced the ideas of the veterans which, in turn, would have influenced the actions of these men before the 1924 takeover of their traditional government. Six Nations culture and nationalism did not die in the face of the militarism of the First World War. It instead became an evolved and post traditional culture that was still uniquely Six Nations.

In the academic study of pre-World War One Six Nations society, two camps have developed: those who believe that the Six Nations culture that was found within the Grand River Territory had dissolved in favour of the British/Canadian culture that surrounded it and those who believe that the traditional Six Nations culture hybridized with the British and Canadian culture to form a new post traditional culture. The latter group, which made up of Six Nations and non-Native academics alike, claim that there was a unique and continuing Six Nations' culture that still could be found within the Grand River Territory pre-World War One while the former of these two positions claims that the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory had become assimilated into the larger Euro-Canadian society that surrounded it from the mid 1800s onwards. To this group, by the outbreak of the First World War, there was nothing

⁶ Susan Hill states that for the Six Nations, the Six Nations/British treaty relationship was similar to that of a marriage: "the treaty relationship did not end because of violations by either party; instead, the subsequent treaty addressed the wrongdoings and created a means to rectify the wrongs" (Hill, 189).

differentiating the Six Nations community found within the Grand River Territory from the surrounding non-Native communities in Brant and Haldimand Counties.

The group of scholars that champion the Six Nations assimilation into Euro-Canadian culture are led by the archaeologist Ian Kenyon and the anthropologist Sally M. Weaver. Both of their writings point to an extinct Six Nations culture from the 1830s onward. Ian Kenyon bases this position on his archaeological work on the abandoned Mohawk Village, and other Six Nations sites within the Haldimand Tract, arguing that an assimilation pattern evolved within the Six Nations Territory throughout the 1830s and into the 1850s. Through an analysis of ceramic remains, everyday household wares, and domestic and wild animal bone fragments, Kenyon concludes that before the modern reservation period (1847 to present), the Six Nations were beginning to develop a social structure marked by positions and class divisions common in Victorian Canada.⁷ Kenyon does however note that while the “Up River” nations, consisting of the Mohawk, Upper Cayuga, Oneida, and Tuscarora nations, were willing to participate in the non-Six Nations style agriculture and local market economy, the “Down River” nations, consisting of the Lower Cayuga, Seneca, and Onondaga nations, resisted these British/Canadian influences. Through farming and participation in the local market economy, the “Up River” nations became acculturated into the dominant Euro-Canadian culture.⁸

⁷ The idea that Six Nations people, by adopting Euro-Canadian material positions, were becoming assimilated can be found in other sources like the paper delivered to the Brant Historical Society in 1911 by Evelyn H.C. Johnson. In this paper, about her ancestor’s home, the Martin Settlement, Johnson states that the Martin home, “with the great wide fire-place contained evidences of highest civilization. Half a dozen silver tea-spoons and a pair of solid silver sugar trays; each delicately engraved with and picked out with the letters “G.C.M.” entwined...Did he [George Martin] purchase them or were they presented to him? Did Catherine Rollston [wife of George], whose initials is one of the letters engraved on this silver, influence her dark-skinned husband to higher civilization? Who can tell?” Evelyn H.C. Johnson, “The Martin Settlement,” Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society, (no publisher, no date), 61.

⁸ This study is further clouded by the fact that by the 1830s, the Mohawk Village site was known to be inhabited by white traders, escaped black slaves, and people of the Six Nations (J.J. Hakwins, “Early Days in Brantford,” Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society, (no publisher, no date), 45 and Neal Ferris, “In Their Own Time: Archaeological Histories of Native-Lived Contacts and Colonialisms, Southwestern Ontario A.D. 1400-1900” (Ph.D diss., Columbia University, 1999), 240. Although Kenyon had

Two problems are apparent with Kenyon's works. First, the majority of his conclusions are based on the ratios of domesticated versus wild animal bones and ceramic tableware shards. Through the examination of physical remains, Kenyon supposes that since members of the Six Nations were adopting Euro-Canadian farming practices de-emphasising hunting and other traditional Six Nations ways of living, they were compromising their identity. Kenyon supposes that this change within the Six Nations' physical culture correlates with a change of their metaphysical culture, although he does not provide any examples of this. The use of ceramic tableware shards is also problematic, as Kenyon points out in an article on ceramic tableware, ceramic tableware only made up 5% of a household's daily implements in the 1840s.⁹ Kenyon, by basing his findings largely on only 5% of a household's daily implements, leaves a large portion of daily life for members of the Grand River Territory unexplored.

Secondly, in his excavations of the cabins of Thomas Echo Hill, a "Down River" Onondaga Chief, and Levi Turkey, an educated "Up River" Tuscarora, Kenyon draws conclusions that go against his own theory. In examining Thomas Echo Hill's cabin, Kenyon found that although Hill was a traditional Onondaga Chief and although there were traditional shell and bone items were found on site, there were still more domestic compared to wild animal bones found during the excavation. Also, the Hill site had many items that were store bought and were not on the Department of Indian Affairs annual gift lists.¹⁰ This illustrates that Hill, a "Down River" Onondaga Chief, was tied into the Euro-Canadian economy, but still remained a part of Six Nations traditional society. In his excavation of Levi Turkey's cabin, Kenyon found

identified that the cabins he was excavating did belong to members of Six Nations, the artifacts found in middens of these sites could have come from any of the various settlers in the area.

⁹ Ian Kenyon, "A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario, 1780-1840," Arch Notes, Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society 85:3 (1985): 41.

¹⁰ Ian Kenyon and Thomas Kenyon, "Echo the Firekeeper: A Nineteenth Century Iroquois Site," Kewa, Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society 86:2 (1986): 19-20.

that although Turkey was an educated “Up River” Tuscarora, the ceramic tableware shards showed that Turkey did not follow the usual pattern of ceramic use demonstrated by other “Up River” Six Nations people.¹¹ These findings bring into question the entirety of Kenyon’s theories and generalizations about the changes found within the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory solely based on animal bones and ceramic tableware evidence.

One of the most formidable scholars who wrote about Six Nations is anthropologist Sally M. Weaver. In her many works, Weaver documents the changes that Six Nations society went through from the 1830s to 1945. By focusing on the small minority known as the Dehorner,¹² Weaver divides the Six Nations into two camps: those who are followers of Euro-Canadian societal practices and those who continue to follow traditional Six Nations practices. Although Weaver’s works have become one of the most relied upon canons of work dealing with the Six Nations, she over represents a small segment of Six Nations society at the expense of the rest of the Six Nation’s population. The dehorner were a group of Six Nations people who wanted to be governed by an elected band council, as outlined in Canada’s Indian Act as opposed to the Traditional Six Nations council that was in place until 1924. To Weaver, if you supported the Dehorner faction, which was never able to garner close to the majority of the Six Nations population to their cause, you were assimilated into the Euro-Canadian culture. It is the activities of the Dehorner that make up the majority of Weaver’s work. The rest of the Six Nations population was minimized in Weaver’s work, giving the impression that the Dehorner

¹¹ Ian Kenyon, “Levi Turkey and the Tuscarora Settlement on the Grand River,” Kewa, Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society 87:1 (1987): 23-24. According to Kenyon, the “Up River” Six Nations people are more integrated within the surrounding Euro-Canadian economy and therefore had more expensive ceramics with a low cup and saucer ratio while the “Down River” Six Nations people, who are less integrated within the Euro-Canadian Economy, have less expensive ceramics with a higher cup and saucer ratio.

¹² To Weaver, Dehorner are Christianized, “Up River” Six Nations followers who, through the adaptation of Euro-Canadian practices and education, were also wealthy. These followers are usually from the Mohawk, Cayuga, Tuscarora, and the Delaware Nations. Sally M. Weaver, On Iroquois Politics, Unpublished manuscript, found at the Woodland Cultural Centre.

were in the majority and without a record on how the rest of the Six Nations population lived their lives.

According to Weaver, the various petitions for an elected system of government that were forwarded to the Canadian government by the Dehorner faction of the Six Nations between the 1890s and 1919 caused large social and political divisions to form within the population of the Territory. To Weaver, these Dehorner and traditional camps, and their support for different forms of government, caused infighting amongst the people of Six Nations, which, in turn, impeded the Council's ability to govern the Territory.¹³ These statements are problematic as there was a functioning Council whose rulings were followed by the majority of the Territory's Longhouse and Christian populations and this Council was also considered the official governing body of the Territory by the British and Canadian governments until their forcible removal in 1924. In fact, the Council functioned as a place where both Longhouse and Christian followers met, interacted, and discussed issues of the day.¹⁴ This social interaction contradicts Weaver's opinion that there was minimal social interaction between the two groups. This invented division within the Grand River Territory is one of the major flaws in Weaver's works.

According to Weaver, the Dehorner and traditional division within the Six Nations society was so rigid, the groups never had contact with each other.¹⁵ This separation would have been impossible to maintain especially in the various social spaces like the council house, schools, festivals and fairs within the Territory. In fact, John Brant-Sero points out that non-Christian Six Nations' children attended and learned to read English from the Bible in schools,

¹³ Weaver, "Seth Newhouse and the Grand River Confederacy at Mid-Nineteenth Century," 172, "The Iroquois: The Grand River Reserve in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century, 1875-1945," 213-214 and "Six Nations of the Grand River, Ontario," in Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 15 *Northeast*, Bruce G. Trigger ed., (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 530.

¹⁴ Hill, 34.

¹⁵ Sally M. Weaver, "Six Nations of the Grand River, Ontario," , 530 and "The Iroquois: The Grand River Reserve in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century, 1875-1945," 213-214

even though they did not follow the Christian teachings.¹⁶ Another example of such interactions was noted in the Indian Magazine, a Six Nations' farming journal, in 1896. During the various Christmas pageants and socials, Christian Six Nations' children and traditional non-Christian children celebrated Christmas and New Years together with the giving of presents and participating in the *Noyah* (News Years day) tradition of going door to door visiting friends and family.¹⁷ This segregation between these groups could not and did not happen, but instead the traditional and non-traditional Six Nations' cultures were hybridizing and creating a unique and distinct evolved Six Nations culture.

Another problem with Weaver's analysis of the Six Nations is that she claims the Six Nations Council itself was accepting their role as a municipal government as outlined in Canada's Indian Act.¹⁸ This acceptance can be found with the Council's adaptation of Euro-Canadian style bylaws and committees.¹⁹ These opinions are contradicted by lawyer Malcolm Montgomery and Weaver herself when they both point out that during this time period, the Council was actively petitioning the Canadian and other international governmental bodies about the current state of affairs within the Territory.²⁰ These petitions by the Six Nations Council were intended to be acting outside the Canadian government's national sphere and, since they were directed toward Britain and other outside adjudicators, the Council obviously did not see themselves as a simple municipal council.

¹⁶ John O. Brant-Sero, "The Six Nations Indians in the Province of Ontario, Canada," in the Journal and Transactions of the Wentworth Historical Society 2 (1899), 73.

¹⁷ The Indian Magazine, January 1896, found in RG 10 (Indian Affairs), Vol. 2837, File 171,348, Reel C-11284. Although the *Noyah* tradition originated in the Mohawk Valley from the Dutch tradition *Nieuwe Jaar*, it does combine both contemporary Six Nations cultural practices and contemporary Dutch ones. This tradition came with the Six Nations when they migrated into the Grand River Territory.

¹⁸ Sally M. Weaver, Medicine and Politics Among the Grand River Iroquois: A Study of the Non-Conservatives, (Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, 1972), ix, and "Seth Newhouse and the Grand River Confederacy at Mid-Nineteenth Century," 176.

¹⁹ Sally M. Weaver, "The Iroquois: The Grand River Reserve in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century, 1875-1945," 233.

²⁰ Malcolm Montgomery, "The Legal Status of the Six Nations Indian in Canada," Ontario History 55:2 (1963), 96 and Sally M. Weaver, "Six Nations of the Grand River, Ontario," 528.

Challenging Weaver and Kenyon are a new wave of academics that propose that pre First World War Six Nations culture was not polarized into rival Dehorner/aculturated and traditional camps. Archaeologists and Anthropologists, Gary Warrick and Neal Ferris, and two Haudenosaunee Six Nations academics, Susan Marie Hill and Deborah Doxtator, counter Kenyon and Weaver by claiming that there was a hybridized, but still distinct Six Nations culture that is made up of aspects of Euro-Canadian customs, but still rooted in the traditional Six Nations culture. Warrick and Ferris' conclusions on their excavations of Six Nations sites along the Grand River point to a continuing Six Nations culture which was adopting some Euro-Canadian tools and ways of life for the sake of convenience and not because they were turning their backs on their traditional culture. Warrick's examinations of 19th century Six Nations sites within the Haldimand Tract, found Six Nations sites that did not follow the trends outlined by Kenyon. At the Dewer and Davisville sites, Warrick found that although some farmers were practicing large scale Euro-Canadian style farming, 75% of the population within the Territory were practicing small scale traditional mixed with some European style farming on less than 20 acres.²¹ This farming was carried out within a traditional Six Nations framework with either farming being done communally by an entire clan or by fields being cleared by men, but worked on communally by females of the same clan.²² With the introduction of 19th century plough agriculture, since the fields were outside the settlement, they were worked on by the males for economic gain, while the females tended small garden patches filled with traditional foods like corn, beans and squash for the family inside the settlements.²³ These examples of continued Six

²¹ Gary Warrick, "Six Nations Farming," Presented at the 41st Annual Meeting of the Canadian Archaeological Association, Peterborough, Ontario, May 2008. Dr. Warrick based this findings on the statistics found in the 1843 Agricultural Census.

²² Warrick, "Six Nations Farming," 8 and 13 and Hill, 114 and 300. In 1829, when the Crown suggested the Six Nations divide their lands into six tracts for each nation, the Six Nations Council declined as it would disrupt the shared cornfields of the Mohawk, Cayuga, and Oneidas (Hill, 297-298).

²³ Warrick, 13 and Hill, 113, 126, and 320.

Nations frameworks show that although the Six Nations were now farming for economic gain, their personal values and ways of life did not change. Further demonstrating cultural continuity, Warrick also notes the settlements and field placement of the 19th century Six Nations people within the Grand River mirrors that of the settlement patterns of their ancestors, the Princess Point people.²⁴ Warrick also found that both sites had a large ratio of wild game bones compared to domesticated animal bones.²⁵ These findings are significant as Davisville was a Christian missionary settlement established by Mississauga Rev. Peter Jones. The fact that Christianized Six Nations people favoured wild game over domesticated animals directly counters Kenyon's findings of assimilation.

Neal Ferris, in his examination of the Powless cabin within the Mohawk Village site, drew similar conclusions. Ferris found that subsistence and hunting activities were still practiced in the Grand River community as late as 1857.²⁶ To demonstrate this, Ferris excavated faunary piles at the Powless Cabin site. During these excavations Ferris found high concentration of game and fish bones in the later sections of the faunary piles.²⁷ Also, these faunary remains was 20-30% higher in concentration than found in the surrounding non-Native sites.²⁸ This dependence on wild game shows that the inhabitants of the Powless cabin were living in their traditional way with the land. Ferris also found that although the inhabitants of the Powless cabin relied on wild game and plants for their daily sustenance, the site did show signs of oat

²⁴ Warrick, 13.

²⁵ This point becomes more significant when compared to the official reports about Six Nations settlements on the Grand River filed by missionaries and government officials. Warrick points out that, according to these official reports, the Grand River land was unfavorable for hunting and therefore, Six Nations people were no longer participating in the hunt. Warrick concludes this contradiction by saying "obviously, the officials responsible for this report were either poor observers of reality or deliberately misrepresented reality." Gary Warrick, "Historical Archeology of the Six Nations of the Grand River," (Presented at the 36th Annual Conference of the Canadian Archeology Association, at McMaster University (Hamilton, Ontario), 7-10 May, 2003), 13.

²⁶ Ferris, 256-257.

²⁷ Ferris, 267.

²⁸ Ferris, 272.

agriculture. This agriculture, Ferris states, was either for a cash crop or someone was renting the fields.²⁹ Ferris' study of the Powless site also noted changes in clothing and kitchen artefacts. Although the people living on the Powless site were adopting European style clothing, they were also maintaining aspects of their traditional clothing as beaded objects, shell wampum beads, silver ornaments, head dresses and a war club were found within the site's remains. This is because the people living on the Powless site were continuing their historical distinctiveness.³⁰ This retention of cultural distinctiveness can also be demonstrated with Ferris' findings with kitchen artefacts. Within the kitchen area of the Powless Cabin, Ferris found that only 21% of the kitchen artefacts found were of European origin. This usage pattern is 45-60% lower than similar non-Native sites of the period.³¹ This demonstrates that the people living in the Powless site were cooking their traditional food in traditional ways. In his conclusion, Ferris sums up his findings by saying that Six Nations culture did not change completely on the Grand River Territory. The people of Six Nations accepted some colonial practices and rejected others in favour of their own. It is this interplay between traditional culture and innovation that created an evolved, but still distinctly Six Nations, culture found within the pre-War Six Nations society.³² This sentiment is echoed by an old Seneca Chief interviewed by R.B. Orr in 1919 who said "[o]ur religion is not of houses, or shoes, or of bark lodges, or moccasins, or feathers; it is a thing in my heart."³³

²⁹ Ferris, 267. Ferris notes that during the period 1850-1860, agricultural activities on the Powless' land was decreasing. Although it is hard to tell way this was happening, Ferris claims that the Powless' may have been getting older and unable to farm. In a personal communication, Six Nations lawyer Paul Williams also pointed out that Six Nations farmers would have needed draft horses to draw their plows. These horses had to be fed and possibly were fed the oats found within this site's remains (Paul Williams, 17 August 2009).

³⁰ Ferris, 274.

³¹ Ferris, 272.

³² Ferris, 285-286.

³³ R.B. Orr, "The Iroquois of Canada," in the 31st Annual Archeological Report 1919 Being Part of Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario (Toronto: A.T. Wigress, 1919), 49.

Two Haudenosaunee academics, Susan M. Hill and Deborah Doxtator, in their dissertations, point to a Six Nations society that, although affected by colonialism and the assimilation policies of the Canadian government, remained, in the main, followers of their traditional Six Nations values and frameworks. Deborah Doxtator's Ph.D. thesis, *What Happened to the Iroquois Clans?: A Study of Clans in Three Rotinonhsyonni Communities*,³⁴ shows that although the Grand River Territory's culture did change over time and allowed ideas that were not necessarily Haudenosaunee into the Council's daily operations, these changes were based on the traditional values embedded in Six Nations culture. To exemplify this, Doxtator points to the fact that before coming to the Grand River Territory, the Haudenosaunee were made up of many different nations and religious beliefs. The Council had to maintain a balance between these different groups.³⁵ This balance by the Council was continued through Christian/Longhouse and the "Up"/"Down" river debates. Although the "Up River" Six Nations groups seemed to be more progressive, they were kept in check by the opinions of the more traditional "Down River" groups and vice versa.³⁶ This conflict may have made the administration of the Council difficult, but the Council was able to maintain balance between these two different points of view.

By using the traditional Six Nations' framework of inside and outside the village, Doxtator is also able to demonstrate that although the people of Six Nations may have been changing their economic base from hunting and gathering to Euro-Canadian style farming, they still maintained a traditional sense of societal roles. In traditional Six Nations society, it was females who took care of the affairs of the village while the men maintained the affairs outside

³⁴ Deborah Doxtator, "What Happened to the Iroquois Clans?: A Study of Clans in Three Rotinonhsyonni Communities," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Western Ontario, 1996).

³⁵ Doxtator, 4.

³⁶ Doxtator, 328.

the village.³⁷ This idea can best be demonstrated with the male oriented activities like hunting or warfare which traditionally meant that males had to leave the village to fulfill their traditional roles.³⁸ With the adaptation of Euro-Canadian farming, women continued to look after the homestead and family inside the settlement, while men farmed in the fields outside the settlement.³⁹ In this way, the adaptation of Euro-Canadian style farming can be seen as an adoption of a non Six Nations traditional cultural trait, it does not necessarily mean that the Six Nations were turning their backs on their own values and ways of living.⁴⁰

Susan Marie Hill's Ph.D. dissertation, *The Clay We Are Made Of: An Examination of the Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River Territory*, demonstrates that when the Six Nations settled the Grand River Territory after the American Revolution, they still continued and maintained the principles of their traditional value system when it came to land use. As outlined in the "Dish With One Spoon" wampum belt and the Nanfan Treaty of 1701, land for Six Nations people was held in a common trust for all.⁴¹ Land was to be used to provide for your family and future generations. When the Council would hand out land allotments to its people, it was the receiver's responsibility to care for that land. If the receiver fulfilled their responsibilities to the land, it was theirs to keep for their future generations to care for.⁴² In this way, the Council still held governance over land as they held it in common for the Six Nations' community.

³⁷ Doxtator, 5.

³⁸ Doxtator, 91.

³⁹ Doxtator, 137 and Hill, 320.

⁴⁰ This borrowing of European cultural traits was also at the centre of Anthony F.C. Wallace's book Death and Rebirth of the Seneca. Although Wallace does take his analysis too far claiming that this borrowing of Quaker farming practices by the Seneca was the Seneca choosing European culture over their traditional culture, Wallace's study does show a post-fur trade Six Nations community adapting new ways to survive in their new environment (Anthony F.C. Wallace Death and Rebirth of the Seneca (New York: Alfred A. Knoph, 1970).

⁴¹ Hill, 108.

⁴² Hill, 354.

Hill's dissertation also explains some of the political problems that erupted between the Council, the people of Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, and the Department of Indian Affairs pre and post World War One. Hill's dissertation points out that, although there was dissention by a vocal minority within the Grand River Territory, the majority of the community was in support of the Council.⁴³ This support can best be seen throughout the 1920s with members of the Six Nations holding massive picnics in support of the Council. Many of these critical mass events ended with the generation of petitions to various Canadian political leaders from members of the Six Nations.⁴⁴ In Hill's view, since the 1880s, the Department of Indian Affairs supported this vocal minority and encouraged any dissent within the community in order to replace the Council with a government controlled elected council that would act as a municipal council. To prove this point, Hill uses many examples of the Department's interference with the Council's day to day operations including the various interferences by Superintendent Gordon J. Smith, the Council Secretary debate after the death of Josiah Hill in 1915, the Canadian government's staunch denial of any impropriety in land claims cases, and even the Department's implementation of the Soldier Settlement Act after the Council refused its implementation on the grounds that it went against the Grand River Territory's land holding system.⁴⁵ All of these incidents point to an active campaign by the Canadian government and the Department of Indian Affairs to end the Six Nations Council's control over the Grand River Territory.

There are many other places a scholar can turn in order to see evidence of a continuing Six Nations culture during the period leading up to the First World War. Many Anthropologists who studied the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, during the periods leading up to or just

⁴³ Hill, 374, 380, and 387.

⁴⁴ Hill, 385.

⁴⁵ Hill, 364, 359, 374, and 366.

after the First World War, all report different aspects of Six Nations culture that continued despite the introduction of Christianity, agriculture, and Western style education. Six Nations spiritual beliefs still continued and, according to John O. Brant-Sero in a paper delivered to the Wentworth Historical Society in 1896, was growing within the Territory at the same ratio as Christianity.⁴⁶ Anthropologist Elisabeth Tooker states that many Six Nations cultural traits continued after 1820. Tooker, similar to Doxtator, points out that women's role stayed unchanged. Women still kept the household affairs in order, like child rearing and household gardens, which produced the majority of the food the family ate daily and they continued to collect berries, nuts and maple sugar to supplement their family's diet, while men hunted and fished.⁴⁷ Child rearing practices amongst the Six Nations also did not change. In an article entitled *Indian Cradle, 100 Years Old, Yet Still Used*, the Brantford Expositor reported that at a fair in 1917 in Ohsweken, the staff reporter witnessed a Six Nations mother demonstrating how to use a 100 year old cradle board with her baby.⁴⁸ Alexander A. Goldenweiser, an anthropologist who was conducting field research within the Grand River Territory in 1912, wrote that kinship ties and genealogies within the Six Nations communities were widely known and were in continuous usage.⁴⁹ In his report, Goldenweiser also states that traditional Six Nations Societies were also continuing in existence, such as healing and dream interpreting societies.⁵⁰ These healing practices were also recorded by Marcel Rioux in the 1950s. Rioux

⁴⁶ Brant-Sero, 73. Susan Hill further states that in 1830, missionaries stationed in major Six Nations villages reported that at least half of the Six Nations population still practiced traditional Six Nations spiritual beliefs (Hill, 322)>

⁴⁷ Elisabeth Tooker, "Iroquois Since 1820," in Handbook of the North American Indians Vol. 15: Northeast, ed. William C. Sturtevant (Series Editor) and Bruce Trigger (Volume Editor) (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 463.

⁴⁸ Brantford Expositor, 5 Oct. 1917.

⁴⁹ A.A. Goldenweiser, "On Iroquois Work 1912," in The Summery Report of the Geological Survey Branch of the Canadian Department of Mines, 1912 (1914), 468. Goldenweiser states that one particular genealogy of 258 names was tested by him and was proven to be completely accurate.

⁵⁰ Goldenweiser, 472-474.

noted that traditional healing practices were something that Christian and non-Christian Six Nations people continued to use. Rioux further states that non-Six Nations people from the surrounding communities also partook and had faith in Six Nations traditional medicine.⁵¹ The reason why traditional medicine was still in use in the face of Western medicine, according to Rioux, is that the traditional medicine was proven to work.⁵² Rioux further stated that for Christian Six Nations people, they continued to use traditional medicine as they felt it was a distinct part of their Six Nations culture.⁵³

Another aspect of Six Nations' culture that stood the test of time was the Six Nations Council. This governing body was still attended and respected by Christian and non-Christian Six Nations people until its removal in 1924. Anthropologist John A. Noon, in his book, *Law and Government of the Six Nations Iroquois*, demonstrates this respect of the Council by Six Nations peoples by pointing out the many compromises that the Council reached between its Christian and Longhouse members and the unchallenged verdicts in estate cases brought to the Council by people for reconciliation. These cases were never sent for further arbitration to the Department of Indian Affairs after the Council decided its verdict. The Council's decision was considered final and shows that the members of the community within the Grand River Territory respected their traditional Council and its ability to judge cases fairly based by the traditional values of the Six Nations and aided by the Indian Act in cases where no precedent was found within the Six Nations' traditional values.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Marcel Rioux, "Some Medical Beliefs and Practices of the Contemporary Iroquois Longhouse of the Six Nations Reserve," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 41, 5 (1951): 151.

⁵² Rioux, 152.

⁵³ Rioux, 152.

⁵⁴ John A. Noon, *Law and Government of the Grand River Iroquois* 31-32, 48-49 and 73 and Hill, 329. Hill further states that only a minority of cases were presented to the Council as most estate cases were still decided within the family unit based on traditional values (Hill, 331).

Although many of these scholars did not directly write about the First World War and its aftermath on the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, all of the works presented above paint a picture of a community whose members individually held different ideas of what their identity meant in the years predating the First World War. To understand the action of the Six Nations veterans, one must understand the community they came from. The community's identity impacted the identity of the individuals that made up the community. It is this unique identity that would fuel the decisions of each Six Nations Veteran pre, during and post First World War.

Chapter 2: The Creation of a Six Nations Enlistee

Although scholarship about Six Nations culture within the Grand River Territory differs between the assimilationist and non-assimilationist camps, it can be safely stated that there was something inherently different about the culture found within the Six Nations Territory as opposed to that of the Euro-Canadian communities surrounding it. Not so diverse, however, that the existing cultural framework did not allow for fusion with some aspects of the Euro-Canadian culture from the surrounding non-Six Nations' communities to create an evolved, but still uniquely Six Nations, culture. All the scholars discussed in Chapter One agree that cultural diffusion did occur between the surrounding Euro-Canadian and Six Nations cultures, but they disagree, of course, about how much diffusion took place. This chapter does not propose to end that disagreement, but hopes to shed light on the interplay between the two cultures and how this could have influenced men of the Grand River Territory to enlist to fight in the Great War. Whether these men did adapt Euro-Canadian culture and practices, continued to maintain their traditional core values and societal practices, or developed and created an evolved Six Nations culture, these men were still influenced by the culture and society found within the Six Nations' Territory. It was these societal and cultural influences that led these men to enlist and believe that their decision to do so did not conflict with their identity as Six Nations people; it was not an indication of assimilation.

With the Haldimand Proclamation, many people of Six Nations' relocated to the Grand River Territory as allies of the Crown, but to the non-Native community who moved with the Six Nations, the Six Nations shared with them the identities as United Empire Loyalists and allies

and refugees of the Crown.⁵⁵ For some members of the Six Nations, these identities were fused into a single identity. For others, these identities had not been fully integrated or rationalized. Although the Six Nations would give aid to the British during various wars and conflicts, this support, this uneasy military alliance, was always re-evaluated by the Six Nations Council prior to their participation. Such debate, like any debates by nations when agreeing to a military alliance, usually centred around whether the supporting nation, in this case Britain, was sincere in its promises of support to the Six Nations and what was the cost/benefit analysis of this support for the Six Nations.⁵⁶ Although the Six Nations were considered loyalists, like the members of the surrounding non-Six Nations communities, this did not mean automatic universal support; indeed the Six Nations Council was almost always divided in their decisions whether or not to go to war.⁵⁷ This, however, this did not stop individuals or individual nations from volunteering for military service.⁵⁸ There were many conflicts that demonstrate this individual military participation by members of the Six Nations. During the American Revolution, the Six Nations' Council was divided on whether to aid the British, so individual nations within the Six Nations fought for either side.⁵⁹ In the War of 1812, the Six Nations' Council was again divided on the issue of war. At first, only 100 men from Six Nations reported

⁵⁵ This was also the opinion of Superintendent of the Indian Department William Claus (Robert S. Allen His Majesty's Indian Allies: British Indian Policy in the Defence of Canada 1774-1815 (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1992), 94).

⁵⁶ Allen, 45 and 46. Although this cost/benefit analysis of war is mainly based on the tally of human lives, it could also be based on other societal factors. In a lecture delivered for the Woodland Cultural Centre, historian Dan Glenney estimated that over the course of the War of 1812, the Six Nations of Grand River Territory lost over half of their warriors. This loss stagnated agriculture within the Six Nations' Territory which took some 50 years to recover. This example shows that with supporting the British during war time, the number of men that could be lost during wars can affect the entire society found within the Grand River Territory. (Warriors Conference Tapes, Tape, author's possession).

⁵⁷ This division may also have to do with the fact that the primary concern of the Six Nations Council is to keep the Six Nations at peace. This ideal was instilled in the Six Nations through the Great Law of Peace. This ideal would have been challenged with every proposal to mobilize for war.

⁵⁸ Individuals were free to give their services for war even if the Six Nations' Traditional Council was divided on the issue (J. Bearfoot as cited in J.A. Macrae Macrae "Report RE Sanitary and Other Matters Six Nations Reserve, 26 October 1899" (Sessional Paper No. 14, 5th Session of 8th Parliament, Session 1900), 619.

⁵⁹ Allen, 46.

for service at Niagara, but as the war progressed, more Six Nations' men joined the cause and gave invaluable service in various battles.⁶⁰ During the 1837 Rebellion, the Six Nations contributed 100 men, led by William Johnson Kerr, an 1812 veteran, to Sir Allen McNab's forces from Brantford and Hamilton.⁶¹ In his semi-autobiographical book, The Feathered U.E.L.'s, Enos T. Montour gives a great description of not only the division within the Six Nations' Council over whether to aid the British, but a great description of the individual men who did volunteer to aid the British.⁶² These above examples show that although the Six Nations were loyal to the military alliance that existed between them and the British, the Six Nations were also acting independently from the British and giving aid as it suited them.

While the Six Nations aided the British in all of these above mentioned examples by taking part in these conflicts, the people of the Grand River Territory were also expanding on their own ideas on militarism. These ideas are important, as they would fuel the militarism of generations of Six Nations' men.

There are two types of militarism that affected the Six Nations in the years pre-World War One that need to be defined. Internal militarism is the militaristic traditions found within the traditional culture of the Six Nations community. This can include not only stories about traditional leaders and battles of the past that Six Nations participated in, but could also include any number of examples of Six Nations/British battles mentioned above. External militarism is the militaristic traditions that were forced on the people of the Six Nations by members of the Euro-Canadian community surrounding the Grand River Territory. People living in the

⁶⁰ Charles Murray Johnston, The Valley of the Six Nations: A Collection of Documents on the Indians Lands on the Grand River (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1964), lxxi-lxxiii and Allen, 136.

⁶¹ Charles Johnson, lxxvii and J.J. Hawkins, 48.

⁶² Enos T. Montour, The Feathered U.E.L.'s: An Account of the Life and Times of Certain Canadian Natives People (Toronto: The United Church of Canada, 1973), 52-55. Montour only mentions 15 men by name, but claims that there were 50 volunteers in all.

Victorian and Edwardian periods leading up to the First World War were consumed by a militaristic culture and it is this culture that members of the Six Nations interacted with and elements of it therefore diffused into the culture of the Grand River Territory.

Traditional/internal militarism was still alive and well in the minds of the members of the Six Nations prior to the First World War. In an article by F.O. Loft, a member of Six Nations living in Toronto, for the Canadian Military Institute, he explains that stories of Native war chieftains were still circulated in Native communities. These stories highlighted themes found in traditional Native warfare like loyalty, devotion to the cause, and the show of strength as opposed to the plundering or conquering and seizing enemy territory. The protagonists in these stories were made up of resisters and loyalists to the British alike; examples Loft included were Chiefs' Pontiac, Ponetacon (King Philip), Joseph Brant, Red Jacket, and Tecumseh.⁶³ Loft further states that this traditional militarism was connected to nationalism, fear of encroachment of the surrounding Euro-North American settlements, and the confidence and obligations found in historical treaties between the British and Native groups.⁶⁴ In this way traditional Six Nations militarism balanced the Loyalist tradition along side the distinct national and cultural traditions of the Six Nations.

External militarism was engrained in the Euro-Canadian villages, towns and cities surrounding the Grand River Territory. Since many members of the Six Nations sold to, purchased from, and were employed in various industries outside of the Territory, it would be impossible not to think that some of this external militarism diffused into the Grand River Territory. For the Victorian/Edwardian communities surrounding the Grand River Territory, the

⁶³ Fredrick Onondayoh Loft, "Militarism Among the Indians of Yesterday and Today," Selected Papers from the Canadian Military Institute 17 (1909), 38-39. Since Loft himself was a member of the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, it can only be assumed that the examples he gives in the article could be found within the Territory in the mid 1800s and 1900s.

⁶⁴ Loft, 48-49.

popularity of militaristic traditions in North America began with the United States Civil War. Stories of leaders from both the Northern and Southern States filtered into Canada and defined the principles of what being a good man was and attached these definitions to military institutions. The concepts of strength, toughness, humour, and the ability to conduct oneself in battle became part of the popular culture as the definition of what it meant to be manly and this image survived well into the 1890s.⁶⁵ It was not until after the Confederation of Canada and the beginnings of the militia myth, the newspaper coverage and the popularization of the Boer War, and the beginnings of Empire Day that militarism in Victorian and Edwardian Canada fully took shape.

Confederation and the militia myth were both formed in the shadow of the United States Civil War. Confederation and the creation of a militia were both seen as a way to protect Canada from the threat of the United States' new military power. On 12 September 1864, in a speech at the Halifax Hotel in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Sir John A. MacDonald instructed the delegates in attendance to:

Look at the gallant defence that is being made by the Southern Republic – at this moment they are not much more than four millions of men – not much exceeding our own numbers – yet what a brave fight they have made, notwithstanding the stern bravery of the New Englander, or the fierce élan of the Irishman...in the next decennial period of taking the census, perhaps we shall have eight millions of people, able to defend their country against all comers. But we must have one common organization – one political government.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Mark Moss, Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 28. These profiles of manliness and militarism from the United States Civil War could have also been added to the internal militarism of the Six Nations as some men from the Six Nations in the United States fought in the Civil War. Two of the better known Six Nations Civil War leaders were Lt. Col. Ely S. Parker and Lt. Cornelius C. Cusick (Laurence M. Hauptman, Seven Generations of Iroquois Leadership: The Six Nations Since 1800 (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 2008), 102.).

⁶⁶ John A. MacDonald as cited in Brian Busby, Great Canadian Speeches: Words that Shaped a Nation (London: Arcturus Publishing Limited, 2008), 11 and Adam Meyers, Dixie and the Dominion: Canada, the Confederacy and the War for the Union (Toronto: The Dundurn Group, 2003), 98.

Not only did MacDonald see the militaristic power that Confederation would afford, but he also saw the potential for a large citizen militia to be the backbone of this defence. The growing militaristic might of the United States was not lost on other members debating Confederation. Author Adam Mayers stated that during the Confederation debates, no less than 60 members of the United Canada's Legislature made reference to the possible military danger the United States posed to Canada.⁶⁷ However, it was not until the putting down of the Riel Rebellion in the West and the British/Canadian victories during the Boer War that the idea that a citizen run militia was better than a professional force (the militia myth) really took hold in the Canadian consciousness.⁶⁸

Although the Boer War was not the first British Imperial war to be documented by Canadian newspapers,⁶⁹ it was one of the first Imperial wars that the Canadian militia took part in. In Canada, 8,300 Canadians enlisted, 24 of whom were from Brantford, Ontario;⁷⁰ about 7,000 Canadians served: Between 225 and 245 men died in the Boer War, three of whom were

⁶⁷ Mayers, 193.

⁶⁸ Moss, 23 and Mike O'Brian, "Manhood and the Militia Myth: Masculinity, Class, and Militarism in Ontario, 1902-1914" Labour/La Travail 42 (Fall 1998), 117. According to author Roger Sharpe, from 1851-1860, there were at least 13 offers to the Canadian government for the creation of militia units in Brant County. He further states that during this period, smaller communities in Brant County had unofficial militias groups operating beside militia units officially recognized by the Federal government (Roger Sharpe Soldiers and Warriors: The Early Volunteer Militia of Brant County 1856-1866 (Brantford: Canadian Military Heritage Museum, 1998), 10 and 83-90).

⁶⁹ In Brantford, any Imperial war Britain fought in was well reported on. After word finally filtered back to Brantford about Britain's victory in Sebastopol during the Crimean War, the Union Jack was displayed and processions marched through the streets (Douglas F. Reville, The History of the Country of Brant (Brantford: The Hurley Printing Company 1920, 1982), 240). During the Anglo-Zulu War (January-July 1879), the Brantford Expositor reported on no less than 30 stories about various aspects of the war. The Boer War received similar treatment in the Brantford press and various victories were also celebrated in a similar manner (Gary Muir, Brantford: A City's Century, 1895-1945 vol. 1 (Brantford: Tupuna Press, 1999), 37-38).

⁷⁰ Muir, 37.

from Brantford.⁷¹ These deaths were memorialized with monuments in towns of all sizes located in prominent downtown sites.⁷²

The popularization of this war cannot be ignored. Not only was it heavily reported in the newspapers,⁷³ but it was also popularized for children. Books were published for children that addressed the war in facets that would appeal to them. There was, of course, books that used stories of soldiers and their leaders as representatives of ideals the children were to emulate. This was best represented in the social realm by the Boy Scout movement founded by Boer War leader Lord Baden Powell. Other publications channelled Imperial wars as advances in science for the science minded child or as an athletic manual by focusing on the athletic ability of the soldiers themselves.⁷⁴

Another external source of Imperial militarism appeared in 1897 in Hamilton, Ontario. Mrs. Camentine Fessenden of the Hamilton Council of Women and the Wentworth Historical Society founded Empire Day to instil love, loyalty, and the ideals of the British Empire into Ontario's Euro-Canadian children and, of equal importance, to assimilate non-Anglo Saxon children.⁷⁵ A daily program for Empire Day in 1899, according to Ontario Education Minister George Ross included:

Part of the forenoon might be occupied with a familiar talk by the teachers on the British Empire, its extent and resources; the relation of Canada to the Empire; the unity of the Empire and its advantages; the privileges which as British subjects, we enjoy; the extent of Canada and its resources; readings from Canadian and British authors by the teacher; interesting historical incidents in connection with

⁷¹ Desmond Morton, *Canada at War* (1981), 41 as cited in Glen T. Wright, "Serving the Empire: Canadians in South Africa, 1899-1902" *Families* 21,1 (1982), 26 and Moss 39.

⁷² Moss, 39-40. Brantford's monument to its three fallen Boer War soldiers is located in Jubilee Park, named in honour of Queen Victoria's 60th year in reign, in front of the Armouries which marks the beginning the downtown portion of Colburne Street.

⁷³ Unlike the Anglo-Zulu War, any mistakes made by the British during the Boer War were never reported in Canada (Moss, 45).

⁷⁴ Moss, 39, 55, 75, and 84.

⁷⁵ Robert M. Stamp, "Empire Day in the Schools of Ontario: the Training of Young Imperialist" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 8 (Summer 1978), 39.

our own country. The aim of the teacher in all of his references to Canada and the Empire should be, to make Canadian patriotism intelligent, comprehensive and strong. The afternoon, commencing at 2:30 p.m., might be occupied with patriotic recitations, songs and readings by the pupils, and speeches by trustees, clergymen and such other person as may be available. The trustees and public generally should be invited to be present at the time of the exercises. During the day, the British Flag or Canadian Ensign should be hoisted over the school building.⁷⁶

Although it is unknown how many schools participated in the first ever Empire Day,⁷⁷ the cities of Brantford and Hamilton, two of the biggest cities surrounding the Grand River Territory, celebrated in the Empire Day festivities. We can also see, as mentioned in the above paragraph, that Empire Day was to be more than just a school celebration, it was to be a civic wide celebration.⁷⁸ The City of Brantford, during its first Empire Day, followed word for word Minister Ross' daily program. Area schools were decorated with flags, bunting, national emblems, and pictures of prominent men and statesmen. In the morning, for the school children, there were patriotic readings and recitations, songs, and addresses given about the love for their country by the students. These ideas were furthered by instruction by the school teachers about Canada and England.

Outside of the schools, Brantford's downtown was also decorated with all shops and stores closed for a general holiday. Shortly after 12:00 p.m., the Brant Dragoons and cadets paraded the streets of Brantford. There were road races, a carnival, Highland dancers, pipers,

⁷⁶ George Ross as cited in Robert Craig Brown and Ramsay Cook, Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart Press, 1974), 31.

⁷⁷ Stamp, 35.

⁷⁸ Stamp, 35 and 37. Although it is unknown if any of the various Indian day schools and the residential school participated in the Empire Day celebrations, we do know that some families within the Grand River Territory did send their children off the Territory to the surrounding communities for education. Also, entrance exams were held at the various Territorial schools which allowed children to qualify to attend schools outside the Territory. Additionally, since members of the Grand River Territory were economically tied to the communities surrounding the Territory, it is not unfathomable that members of the Territory knew of and participated in the civic celebrations in the surrounding communities during Empire Day. It is also a possibility that members of Six Nations who were living in Brantford (133 were listed as living in Brantford in the 1911 census, one of which may have reported as being of pagan religious beliefs) also participated in Empire Day.

and other shows and demonstrations. At Mohawk Park, the cadets gave such a good demonstration, that Robert Henry, former mayor of Brantford and former member of Parliament for South Brant, commented “that the lads, when the time came to take their places in the battle of life, would do so as honourable men and do what they could to promote the well being of Canada and the glorious empire of which [Canada] formed a part.”⁷⁹ This comment is similar a comment made by the then Premier of Ontario, Sir James Whitney, during the Empire Day celebrations in Toronto in 1907. The Toronto Globe reported that Whitney said, after watching a similar cadet military demonstration, “he saw the future soldiers of the Crown, who would defend all that the British Empire stood for throughout the world.”⁸⁰ This Imperial militaristic attitude found in Empire Day would grow as Britain became involved in the Boer War in 1900.⁸¹

The royal and military traditions of the Six Nations and the surrounding Brant and Haldimand county communities, although different in the scope and focus, were strong leading up the First World War. These traditions were augmented by visits from members of the Royal family or their designate, the Governor General. Between 1860 and 1919, there were 14 of these Royal visits to Brantford and/or the Grand River Territory. For most of these visits, a combination of members of the Six Nations and/or the citizenry of Brantford was always present. Out of these 14 Royal visits, members of Six Nations were present for at least nine of them. For all these visits, the City of Brantford and the Grand River Territory were decorated similarly and the same activities (i.e. speeches, addresses, luncheons, etc...) took place. Two activities during these visits were uniquely Six Nations: the open airing of political grievances and the making of honorary Chiefs. Of the nine Royal visits that Six Nations’ members were present for, at least

⁷⁹ Brantford Expositor (25 May 1899), 1-3.

⁸⁰ Toronto Globe (24 May 1907) as cited in Stamp, 39.

⁸¹ Stamp, 36. This growth can be seen in Brantford’s Empire Day celebrations in 1900 as the 23 May 1900 edition of the Brantford Expositor dedicated its entire newspaper to Canada’s and Britain’s military and Imperial heritage.

three Royal visitors were made honorary Chiefs and there were at least five cases where Six Nations/British political issues were aired.⁸² Out of the nine Royal visits that Six Nations members attended, at least six of them had a Six Nations military presence, being they veterans from various wars, staged war pageants, or the Mohawk Institute cadets.⁸³

The most aired grievance of the Six Nations during these visits was about the Six Nations/British alliance. During the years leading to the First World War, the Six Nations, as they had since the making of their alliance with the British, were always reminding the British that the Six Nations had always kept up their end of the Covenant Chain relationship. Since Canada's Confederation, the Six Nations noticed the conditions and stipulations of that alliance were continually being eroded by the Canadian government. After many appeals by the Six Nations to Canada's Department of Indian Affairs about their special nationhood and ally status that they had succoured through their alliances with Britain were ignored,⁸⁴ the Six Nations had no other recourse but to appeal directly to members of the British Royal family. Another element furthering the Six Nations appeals to the Royal family may have had to do with the many jurisdictional and administrative changes to the Department by the Imperial and Canadian

⁸² For most of these visits, the most aired political grievances aired by the Six Nations revolved around the Six Nations alliance with the Crown. Many of his addresses by the Six Nations remind the Crown representatives of past Six Nations military support for the Crown and the faith the Six Nations have in their treaties with Britain. Many times, the Six Nations delegate would also point out that since the Canadian government was given control of Indian Affairs, the Canadian government had ignored the rights found within the treaties between the Six Nations and the Crown. See below for further examples.

⁸³ All the statistics presented in this paragraph were compiled by the author using various sources including F. Douglas Reville, History of Brant County (Brantford: The Hurley Printing Company, 1982 (1920)), 194-212, E.M. Chadwick The People of the Longhouse (Toronto: The Church of England Publishing Company, 1897), 98-100, J.T. Gilkison, Narrative. Visit of the Governor-General and the Countess of Dufferin to the Six Nations Indians. August 25, 1874 2nd ed. (1875), William Leggo, History of the Administration of the Earl of Dufferin in Canada (Montreal: Lovell Printing and Publishing Company, 1878), The Unveiling of the Bell Memorial at Brantford, Ontario, on October the Twenty-Fourth, 1917 (Bell Homestead National Historic Site Archives), 3-5, and various editions of the Brantford Expositor.

⁸⁴ There are many outside appeals made by various people from Six Nations to other groups about the encroachment on Six Nations rights by F.O. Loft, Evelyn H.C. Johnson, J.O. Brant-Sero, and others. Also appeals were made at Grand Councils, to organizations and to Canadian politicians (see Chapter 3 for these examples). Various other appeals were also found by the author in the pages of the Brantford Expositor.

governments. During 1830-1860, the Imperial government changed the political office that was in control of the Department of Indian Affairs four times.⁸⁵ After the Department was handed over to the Dominion government in the 1860s, the Superintendent General of the Department was also the Commissioner of the Crown Lands Department. The position of the Superintendent General and the position Deputy Superintendent General, a post created in 1862 to help aid the Superintendent General in his duties, would change with every passing Dominion government until Duncan Campbell Scott took the position of Deputy Superintendent in 1913 and continued there until 1932.⁸⁶ During these times of change, only the Governor General's office remained the clear contact person for the Six Nations to the British Crown.

Amongst the Six Nations, two popular Royal family members were Queen Victoria and the Duke of Connaught. The devotion to Queen Victoria had been celebrated by the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory since the 1860s with the annual holiday, Bread and Cheese Day.⁸⁷ Along with the handing out of bread and cheese, which the Queen ordered to be done on her birthday in 1860,⁸⁸ (which stopped in 1901 due to her death) the holiday also included speeches and addresses by Chiefs and visiting local dignitaries from the surrounding communities. These speeches were usually about the Six Nations' role in the American Revolution, the War of 1812, and generally about the Six Nations' historic connection to the British Crown. Although for many people of the Six Nations, these speeches demonstrated the sacrifice their forefathers bore for the British and the obligations this sacrifice demanded from the British, for some, these

⁸⁵ Bruce Emerson Hill, The Grand River Navigation Company (Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 1994), 19.

⁸⁶ E. Brian Titley, A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and The Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986), 4 and 22.

⁸⁷ According to author Enos T. Monture, most classrooms on the Grand River Territory sported a picture of Queen Victoria and a Union Jack in celebration of Six Nations loyalty to the Queen (Enos T. Monture The Feathered U.E.L.'s (Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1974), 26).

⁸⁸ The handout of bread and cheese to the Six Nations also acted as a replacement to the annual giving of presents from the King. This giving of presents was promised to the Six Nations in perpetuity at the Niagara Treaty in July 1764 and when this customary gift giving was abolished by the Crown in order to cut costs of the administration of the Canada and Indian Affairs, the Chiefs of various Native groups protested.

speeches may have also furthered the ideas of militarism within the Grand River community.⁸⁹ In an address to Queen Victoria, on the anniversary of her 60th year of reign, the Chiefs of Six Nations sent her a letter of congratulations, but also a letter concerning their current political situation. The Chiefs, once again pointed to the military assistance that Six Nations had provided for Britain when the British forces in North America were in the minority and assured that the support of the Six Nations' had tipped the scales of power in favour of Britain. But now, however, for the Six Nations, these scales were now tipping against them. Although the Six Nations were now small in number, the Chiefs continued, they still held true to the alliance set forth by their forefathers and they would shed their blood again "in defence of Great Britain and our Country should circumstances require."⁹⁰ This letter, written on 15 June 1897, was laid at the foot of the throne on the 25 August 1897. As a response to the letter, the Queen thanked the "Chiefs, Warriors and People of the Six Nations for their expression of Loyalty and attachment to Her Throne and Person."⁹¹

The Duke of Connaught, third son of Queen Victoria, visited the Six Nations Territory three times and during his second visit in 1913, after an honorary Chieftainship was conferred upon him during his first visit in 1896, he sat in Council with the Chiefs.⁹² In an address to the Duke during his third visit in 1914, Chiefs A.G. Smith and Secretary Josiah Hill told the Duke that the Crown needed to respect the treaty rights of the Six Nations as they had been ignored by the Canadian Federal government ever since the Department of Indian Affairs was brought under

⁸⁹ Weaver, "The Iroquois: The Grand River Reserve in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries, 1875-1945", 220 and Brian Maracle, *Back on the Rez: Finding the Way Home* (Toronto: Penguin Books, 1997), 211-212. According to Maracle, this tradition was revived in 1924 by the newly created Six Nations elected band council. In an ironic twist, in 1982, this elected band council renamed the holiday Independence Day to protest the British government's failure to live up to their end of their alliances with the Six Nations (Maracle, 212).

⁹⁰ Letter from the Six Nations to Queen Victoria (14 July 1897) found in RG10, Vol. 2919, File 187,621.

⁹¹ Letter for the Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs to E.D. Cameron, 15 June 1897, RG10, Vol. 2919, File 187,621.

⁹² Reville, 204 and the *Brantford Expositor* (15 Feb. 1913).

the Canadian government's control.⁹³ Smith and Hill further asked the Duke if he could secure for the Six Nations a copy of the original treaty between the Six Nations and the British Crown as their copy had been lost in a fire. This copy of the treaty would clarify whether the Six Nations were within their rights to be demanding such privileges and considerations from the Canadian government.⁹⁴ According to the Brantford Expositor, the Duke promised to consider the request.⁹⁵ This confusion as to Six Nations rights within the new Canadian government was not new. J. Ojijatekha Brant-Sero, in a paper delivered to the Wentworth Historical Society in 1897, illustrated this confusion when he described a Six Nations' Chief who was confused about the blue book issued to them by the Department of Indian Affairs in 1896. According to Brant-Sero, the Chief claimed the book to be the "devil" as he could not understand it, but he knew the needs of his people.⁹⁶

In this early post-Confederation period, many other addresses had been made to various Governor Generals for help. During the Earl and Countess of Dufferin's tour of Canada in 1874, not only were the usual appeals of loyalty made to the Crown by the Six Nations, but promises were made by the Earl respecting Six Nations traditional treaty rights. After Chief Jacob General's address, which stated that the Six Nations had the utmost confidence in their treaties made with the British, the Earl of Dufferin stated that "never shall the word of Britain once pledged be broken" and that "every Indian subject shall be made to feel that he enjoys the rights of a freeman, and that he can with confidence appeal to the British Crown for protection."⁹⁷

⁹³ Address by A.G. Smith and Josiah Hill to the Duke of Connaught found in RG10 , Vol. 3150, File 356,109 and the Brantford Expositor (9 May 1914).

⁹⁴ Address by A.G. Smith and Josiah Hill to the Duke of Connaught found in RG10 , Vol. 3150, File 356,109.

⁹⁵ The Brantford Expositor (9 May 1914).

⁹⁶ Brant-Sero, 72. The book referenced by Brant-Sero is unknown, but is most likely Parliamentary papers.

⁹⁷ Gilkison, 12 and William Leggo, 261. Furthering his responsibility to Six Nations, the Earl of Dufferin told the members of Six Nations that they "must understand that it is no idle curiosity which brings me hither, but that when the Governor General and the representative of your Great Mother comes among you it is a genuine sign of the

When the Earls of Minto and Grey were appointed Governor General of Canada in 1898 and 1904 respectively, the Six Nations Council sent them addresses reminding them of the Six Nations/British alliance. In both addresses, the Council reminded the Governor Generals that the Six Nations fought to maintain the supremacy of Britain in Canada and because of this sacrifice, which did cost the Six Nations their homeland in New York, the British Crown needed to protect the rights of the Six Nations from encroachments to their sovereignty.⁹⁸ The address to the Earl of Grey also promised that, if the British ever required it, that the Six Nations would be “ready and willing to render faithful allegiance and support to the British Crown.”⁹⁹ In 1909, in a letter to the Six Nations Council thanking them for conferring an Honorary Chieftainship to him in absentia, the Prince of Wales wrote that he was “glad to learn that the Six Nations are as loyal to the British cause...as their forefathers.”¹⁰⁰ The Prince further stated that “should the occasion arise for the British Crown to demand the similar services from the Six Nations in the future, they [the British] would not fail to maintain worthily the glorious traditions bequeathed them by their ancestors.”¹⁰¹

These offers of loyalty and military support for the Crown by the Six Nations were not mere lip service. These were statements reflecting the understanding the obligations found within the Six Nations/British treaty relationship and pride in the Six Nations’ traditional and historical military service. The Six Nations Council actually went beyond words and offered their Chiefs and Warriors for service during the Boer War in 1899. Although this offer was

interest which the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada take in your welfare” (Leggo, 258 and Gilkison, 9).

⁹⁸ Letter from Six Nations Council to the Earl of Minto and the Earl of Grey (21 March 1905) found in RG10, Vol. 2959, File 205,416.

⁹⁹ Letter from Six Nations Council to the Earl of Grey (21 March 1905) found in RG10, Vol. 2959, File 205,416.
¹⁰⁰ Six Nations Council Minutes (4 May 1909) found in RG10, Vol. 3007, File 218,222-133 and RG10, Vol. 3121, File 329,190.

¹⁰¹ Six Nations Council Minutes (4 May 1909) found in RG10, Vol. 3007, File 218,222-133 and RG10, Vol. 3121, File 329,190.

rejected by the Queen in 1900, at least one member of Six Nations did enlist and serve during the war.¹⁰² The support shown for the war by the Six Nations was also widely reported in newspapers outside the Territory. The Brantford Expositor reported that some 300 men were willing to serve and if the Chiefs that they offered to lead them were rejected, the 300 men would like to be led by Captain E.D. Cameron, the Visiting Superintendent of Six Nations.¹⁰³ Memories of past military service by the Six Nations were also celebrated within the Grand River Territory. In 1908, 12 Chiefs of the Six Nations petitioned the Governor General, Viscount Grey, to be able to attend the tercentenary celebrations in Quebec as the descendants of the 12 Chiefs who fought for Britain on the Plains of Abraham. They further requested that they be attached to the already attending Six Nations men in the 37th Haldimand Rifles regiment and further offered that the Chiefs would appear in historical costume for the pageant that was to be staged there.¹⁰⁴ The Six Nations Council, wanting to commemorate their service for Britain on the Plains of Abraham, even offered to contribute fifty dollars to the plan to purchase the Plains of Abraham battlefield.¹⁰⁵ In 1914, this will to commemorate past Six Nations' service in the

¹⁰² Various letters and correspondence found in RG10, Vol. 2991, File 215,977. Ironically, although the Six Nations were willing to send their men to fight for Britain against the Boers, many Prairie Native groups protested Britain's involvement in the suppression of Boer rights. This support for Britain in this matter demonstrates how seriously the Six Nations took their military commitment to the Crown. These documents can also be found in RG10, Vol. 2991, File 215,977.

¹⁰³ Brantford Weekly Expositor (28 Dec. 1899).

¹⁰⁴ Letter from the Six Nations Council to Viscount Grey (15 June 1908) found in RG10, Vol. 3121, File 329,190. It is hard to say what type of Chiefs these Chiefs were. In Six Nations culture, there were three types of Chiefs: Peace or Civil Chiefs, War Chiefs, and Pine Tree Chiefs. Peace or Civil Chiefs rule the day to day matters that come about during peace time. These men chosen by clan mothers as the clan mothers are able to watch the Chiefs grow into adulthood and can judge which person held the traits needed to be good Chief (George Beaver "Early Iroquoian History in Ontario." Ontario History 85, 3 (1993), 224, Tom Porter "Men Who are of the Good Mind." Northeast Indian Quarterly 4, 4 (1987), 11) and Allen, 14. Although there is some confusion about how one becomes a War Chief (see Chapter 4, footnote 229), a War Chief's duties are to see the Six Nations people through time of war (Deborah Doxtator "What Happened to the Iroquois Clans?: A Study of Clans in Three Rotinohsyonni Communities" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Western Ontario, 1996), 91). A Pine Tree Chief is someone who is appointed by the Council due to a special knowledge or skill they possess (Audrey Shenandoah "Everything has to be in Balance." Northeast Indian Quarterly 4, no. 4 (1987), 4, 5-7 and Evelyn H.C. Johnson "Grandfather and Father of E. Pauline Johnson" in Annual Archaeological Report, Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education (1928), 46 and Allen, 14). Both the titles of War Chief and Pine Tree Chiefs cannot be continued through family lines.

¹⁰⁵ Excerpt from the Six Nations Council Minutes found in RG10, Vol. 3121, File 329,190.

name of Britain flared again as the centenary celebrations marking the end of the war of 1812 were underway in Canada. The Six Nations Council was invited and accepted various invitations to speak and give addresses at battlefield sites in which their Six Nations forefathers fought.¹⁰⁶

As mentioned above, there was also a large Six Nations component to the local militia regiment, the 37th Haldimand Rifles. This may have been because, according to John Moses, by the mid 19th century, it was becoming impossible for the Six Nations to offer and mobilize their own military formations and by the 20th century. The only way for members of the Six Nations to demonstrate their traditional military alliance with Britain was to enlist in the Canadian armed forces.¹⁰⁷ At the Toronto inspection of the 37th Haldimand Rifles in 1891, the Rifles were only able to produce seven companies. A Six Nations' Captain with the regiment, J.S. Johnson, began actively recruiting Six Nations men to fill the gaps in the regiment's ranks. Prior to that, recruiting on the reserve was taken up by Capt. Andrew T. Thompson.¹⁰⁸ By 1893, the Haldimand Rifles contained two companies of Six Nations men¹⁰⁹ and by 1904, Six Nations was fielding four Companies and provided the 37th with an entire all Six Nations brass band.¹¹⁰ When the 37th went to their training camp in Niagara in 1908, the regiment was made up of 200 Six Nations men and Chiefs.¹¹¹ Most of the Six Nations' men that appeared at the Niagara Camp in

¹⁰⁶ Six Nations Council Minutes (16 June and 21 July 1914) found in RG10, Vol. 3015, File 218,222-176 and RG10, Vol. 3015, File 218,222-177.

¹⁰⁷ John Moses, "Aboriginal Participation in Canadian Military Service" The Army Doctrine and Training Bulletin 3,3 (Fall 2000), accessed on-line and the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, "Chapter 12: Veterans" Vol. 1 Looking Forward, Looking Back (Ottawa: Canada Communications Group, 1996), 545-546. Lauracene M. Hauptman claims that Lt. Cornelius C. Cusick was probably the last Six Nations' Chief to lead Six Nations troops into battle during the United States Civil War (Hauptman, 102)

¹⁰⁸ Loft, 49. By 1908, Capt. Thompson is referenced as being the commander of the 37th Haldimand Rifles and was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel (RG10, Vol. 3121, File 329,190).

¹⁰⁹ Sessional Paper Number 14, 1893.

¹¹⁰ Sessional Paper Number 27, 1904. After E.D. Cameron was replaced by Gordon J. Smith as Visiting Superintendent of Six Nations, all references to Six Nations participation in the 37th Haldimand Rifles ceases in the Annual Reports and the Sessional papers.

¹¹¹ Loft, 49 and O'Brian, 124.

1908 were also serving in their second or third years with the regiment.¹¹² This participation in the Canadian military was even, at times, supported by the Six Nations' Council. In 1891, the Council decided to grant Lieutenant Joseph Clench a fifty dollar loan to attend a course at the Military School in Toronto so he could become a Captain in the 37th Haldimand Rifles.¹¹³ During the First World War, a high percentage of attestation papers for Six Nations men claim past military service in the 37th Haldimand Rifles.¹¹⁴

Because of the high enlistment rate of Six Nations men in the 37th Haldimand Rifles, in 1896, an exclusive Six Nations regiment was proposed called the Royal Six Nations Regiment. This regiment, although reported about widely within the community, was later rejected by the Six Nations Council.¹¹⁵ During the planning stages, the regiment was to be a meshing of Six Nations traditional culture and Canada's emerging militia system. The uniforms of the regiment were to be a modern derivative of a traditional Six Nations warriors clothing and the regiment was to be made up of six companies representing the Six Nations.¹¹⁶ To honour the past Six Nations battles, Beaver Dams and Queenston Heights were to be printed on the regiment's colours.¹¹⁷ Although it is not clear why the regiment was later rejected by both Canadian military authorities and the Six Nations' Council,¹¹⁸ author J.B. MacKenzie claims that the formation of this regiment was pushed on the Six Nations by people from outside the Six Nations

¹¹² O'Brian, 124. O'Brian also notes that members of the Six Nations, probably not from the Grand River and most likely from Muncy, were prominent members of the 26th Middlesex Light Infantry and made up the unit's entire baseball team (O'Brian, 124).

¹¹³ Letter from E.D. Cameron to the Superintendent General of the Department of Indian Affairs (16 Dec. 1891) found in RG10, Vol. 2606, File 122,342.

¹¹⁴ Various attestation papers in the author's possession. All attestation papers can be accessed on-line through the Library and Archives Canada at <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/databases/cef/001042-100.01-e.php>.

¹¹⁵ Letter from Chief Isaac Hill and a number of warriors to the Governor General (13 Feb. 1896) found in RG10, Vol. 2837, File 171,348.

¹¹⁶ The Oneida Company was to be made up of the Oneida from Muncy (The Indian Magazine, January 1896 found in RG10, Vol. 2837, File 171,348).

¹¹⁷ The Indian Magazine (January 1896) found in RG10, Vol. 2837, File 171,348.

¹¹⁸ The letter from Chief Isaac Hill only offers three vague reasons why the Council rejected the idea for this regiment: the Council did not do what was right, the vote was not unanimous, and the Six Nations did not want to do away with their ancient way of dealing with issues of war (RG10, Vol. 2837, File 171,348).

community, mainly O.W. Howland, a staunch Imperial Federalist, William Hamilton Merritt, promoter of the Welland Canal and Grand River Navigation Company, and E.S. Chadwick, an early historian working at Six Nations.¹¹⁹ The roots of the idea also have been in William Hamilton Merritt's plan to recruit the soldiers from the recent graduates from residential schools, a plan which was frowned upon by the Department of Indian Affairs.¹²⁰ The Six Nations further objected to a proposal to build an armoury for the 37th Haldimand Rifles on the Agricultural Park grounds in Ohsweken to house the four companies of Six Nations men currently enlisted in the regiment.¹²¹ The Six Nations Council rejected this proposal as they were allies to the Crown's forces, and therefore, they should have no part in the establishing of an armoury for the Crown's forces within their Territory.¹²²

This was not the first time that military formations were being introduced to the people of the Grand River Territory. Cadet training, a popular activity for children in Ontario in the latter part of the 19th century, was established for the students of the Six Nations residential school, the Mohawk Institute, in 1872. Along with cadet training, Rev. Robert Aston organized the school in a hierarchal military system to do any task within the school, including washing and receiving food, and the children were assigned numbers for identification purposes. He even went as far, in 1888, to institute good conduct badges for the students which, he claimed, were producing

¹¹⁹ J.B. MacKenzie, The Six-Nations in Canada (Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1896), 102. After the idea of the Royal Six Nations Regiment was rejected by the Department of Indian Affairs, William Hamilton Merritt tried to get the regiment established as an Imperial Corps under the jurisdiction of Britain's war department (Letter from William Hamilton Merritt to the Department of Indian Affairs (11 May 1898) found in RG10, Vol. 2837, File 171,348..

¹²⁰ Letters from William Hamilton Merritt and the Department of Indian Affairs (11 May-3 June 1898) found in RG10, Vol. 2837, File 171,348.

¹²¹ It was proposed that the 37th Haldimand Rifles would pay for the building of the armouries and the Six Nations Council would have to pay for to furnish of the building.

¹²² Letter from Gordon J. Smith to the Department of Indian Affairs (18 March 1913) found in RG10, Vol. 2837, File 171,348.

good results.¹²³ By 1894, drill became an everyday part of life for the young Six Nations' boys who attended the school. The boys were all broken up into four squads for farming purposes. Each company had sergeants and corporals who monitored the other boys in the company.¹²⁴ These boys were trained in all things that a regular cadet corps was trained to do and in 1911, their wooden guns were replaced with Ross rifles for range practice.¹²⁵ The rifle range was located on the Institute's property and was rented out by Rev. Ashton for thirty dollars to the Dufferin Rifles for their rifle practice.¹²⁶ It can only be assumed that this military presence on the Institute's grounds fed into the militaristic culture being fostered among the students of the Mohawk Institute. From all accounts, however, it seems that the Mohawk Institute Cadets preformed well in Provincial competitions. In 1908, the minister and members of the Militia department watched a demonstration by the Cadet Corps, which ended in rave reviews by the observers.¹²⁷ In 1912, the Cadet Corps placed first in the Central Ontario Cadet competition and in 1913, passed their inspection, but felt they could have done better in the rifle range section of the inspection.¹²⁸ These positive results of the Mohawk Institute Cadet Corps continued to be reported in the Brantford Expositor throughout the war years and into the 1920s.¹²⁹

¹²³ Elizabeth Graham, The Mushole: Life at Two Indian Residential Schools (Waterloo, Ontario: Heffle Publishing, 1997), 40 and 86.

¹²⁴ Graham, 90. This comparison between residential schools and army life was made by L. James Dempsey in his book Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War I. In his study, Dempsey, while looking at Cree veteran Albert Mountianhorse, compared Mountianhorse's and other Native families pre-war residential military training and directly connected this experience to their reason for enlisting in the First World War (L. James Dempsey Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War I (Regina: University of Regina Canadian Plains Research Center, 1999), 12 and 19. On one First World War attestation paper from the Six Nations, under past military service, an enlistee answered the Mohawk Institute Cadet Corps.

¹²⁵ Graham, 93-94.

¹²⁶ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to the Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs (18 Nov. 1920) found in RG10, Vol. 3224, File 547,596. Rev. Aston was also the Chaplin for the Dufferin Rifles and would take the thirty dollars given to him from the Department of the Militia for the rent of the range and give it back to the Dufferin Rifles so they could use it for the regiment.

¹²⁷ Elizabeth Graham, 105.

¹²⁸ Graham, 105 and 106.

¹²⁹ Brantford Expositor (2 July 1920).

The military and the militaristic traditions found outside and within the Grand River Territory affected the way that the members of Six Nations viewed themselves and their culture. Although the traditional Six Nations culture allowed for stories and pride of the military endeavours of their forefathers, it was this same pride and respect that was the avenue for a continuing process of assimilation championed by the Canadian government.¹³⁰ Although many of the ideas of Euro-Canadian militarism and patriotism were not part of the Six Nations traditional culture, the members of the Six Nations who were tied to the economy outside of the Territory brought the ideas home with them or else the ideas were forced into the Territory from members of the outside communities. This does not mean, however, that the Six Nations gave up their traditional culture in favour of the dominant Euro-Canadian culture. As we have seen in the examples above, the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory balanced the two cultures and tried to fit these outside ideas, if they fit, into their existing traditional beliefs. This is also not to say that there were not some members of the Grand River Territory who did buy into the ideas proposed by the outside dominate culture. Some probably did, but on the eve on the First World War, the Six Nations community found on the Grand River Territory remained, in the main, followers of their evolved traditional culture.

¹³⁰ Moss, 9 and Scott Sheffield, "Indifference, Difference, and Assimilation: Aboriginal People in Canadian Military Practice, 1900-1945" Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Craig Leslie Mantle ed. (Kingston, Ontario: Canadian Defense Academy Press, 2007), 64.

Chapter 3: The Six Nations/City of Brantford Relationship

Through the evidence provided in chapter Two, it can be seen that the City of Brantford and the Six Nations were linked not only through their geographic location, but their history. With Rutherford's hometown horizons theory, however, Brantford can be seen as an administrative centre as Brantford was also home to the Six Nations Superintendent's office which oversaw the needs of the Six Nations and reported the conditions found within the community to the Department of Indian Affairs in Ottawa. This office was also responsible for the implementation of federal policies on the people of the Grand River Territory. With the Superintendent's office located in the centre of the City, it can be assumed that the local opinions about the Six Nations found within the City affected the policies Ottawa enacted on the Six Nations. Although Brantford can be seen as an official administrative centre, it was also the primary local sphere where the Six Nations and the people of Brantford interacted. Therefore, in order for us to gauge Brantford's public and Ottawa's official opinion about Six Nations during the pre-war years, this chapter will analyze the local newspaper, the Brantford Expositor, official Department of Indian Affairs reports, other local publications, and the day to day social interactions between the people of Six Nations and the surrounding communities.¹³¹

The interactions between the Six Nations and the residents of the Brant County area began not long after the Six Nations migration from their traditional homelands in New York after the American Revolution and the establishment of white settlers on lands leased by Joseph Brant in the late 1780s. In the 1820s it was recorded that escaped Black slaves and white settlers began living in the Mohawk Village. It was not until 1830 that the town plot for what was to

¹³¹ Although smaller towns like Caledonia and Hagersville were also nodes of interaction between the people of Six Nations and non-Six Nations people, due to its size, Brantford would have offered many Six Nations people greater economic opportunities. With the advent of the automobile, many Six Nations men would also travel to and work in the factories of the City of Hamilton.

become the City of Brantford was laid out.¹³² In 1841, the Six Nations lands had been overrun by squatters, and Upper Canada courts had begun to uphold fraudulent leases. The Indian Department refused to take action to remove the squatters.¹³³ In 1841, a “surrender” of the entire Grand River tract except for the present “reserve” was signed by five Mohawk Chiefs in Kingston. The surrender provided that other lands actually occupied by Six Nations people would be excluded from this taking. During the 1840s the Six Nations were evacuated from their scattered settlements in Brant County to their current Reserve. Stories of this evacuation are contradictory. Many non-Six Nations histories of this event describe it as a peaceful migration to Tuscarora Township or some skip over the event as if it never happened.¹³⁴ Six Nations scholars describe this event as one of the one of the most traumatic episodes in the Brantford/Six Nations relationships. Six Nations author Brian Maracle tells of violent mobs from Brantford forming on the North side of the Grand River for the sole purpose of forcing the Six Nations off their land and onto the now existing Reserve. Maracle further describes the authorities in Brantford knowing about the mobs, but doing nothing to stop them.¹³⁵ George Beaver, a Six Nations newspaper columnist, recounted an oral story for his newspaper column about Six Nations

¹³² J.J. Hawkins “Early Days in Brantford” in Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society (Brantford: Brant Historical Society, no date), 47, Charles M. Johnson “An Outline of Early Settlement in the Grand River Valley.” Ontario History 54, 1 (1962), 49 and 65, Roger Sharpe The Village of Brantford in 1830 (Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 2001), 3.

¹³³ Six Nations scholar Susan Hill claims that the 1841 “surrender” was the Crown’s attempt to cover up any abuses the Crown perpetrated against the Six Nations and their lands (Susan Marie Hill “The Clay We Are Made Of: An Examination of the Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River Territory” (Ph.D. diss., Trent University, 2006), 308-311). For an in depth study of these court cases, see Sydney Harring White Man’s Law: Native People in 19th Century Jurisprudence (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998).

¹³⁴ One of the best examples of this can be seen in the text of F. Douglas Reville’s history of Brant County. Although considered by many historians to be the official history of Brant County, it neglects the stories of the forced relocations of the Six Nations, but instead does repeat a story that appeared in an 1883 history of Brant County about an attack by Six Nations on a settler John Solomon Hager. According to Reville, Hager, who was settling on a sacred site of the Six Nations was repeatedly attacked and left for dead by the Six Nation, but would later recover. Reville does record that “this is the only indecent ever recorded in Brant County of any overt act upon the part of the red man (F. Douglas Reville History of the County of Brant vol. 1 (Brantford: The Hurley Printing Company, 1920), 339.

¹³⁵ Brian Maracle Back on the Rez: Finding the way Home (Toronto: Penguin Books, 1997), 52.

people being driven off their land in the South Brantford, Onondaga, Middleport, and Caledonia areas by mobs of white squatters wielding clubs and pitchforks.¹³⁶ In a recent documentary, Tom Hill and Keith Jamieson tell of further violent episodes in 1847. Keith Jamieson tells of a group of Six Nations people forced out of the Cainsville area by mobs while Tom Hill tells of an incident in the Blossom Avenue area in Brant County where members of Six Nations were forced out of the area and on to the Reserve by the local people wielding buggy whips. No matter the location, all these stories include mobs of local citizenry and, in some cases, organized groups of soldiers driving the Native peoples off their land. Some of these mobs would even burn the settlements of the Six Nations to the ground.¹³⁷ This event would forever scar the local Six Nations/Brantford and Brant County relationship.

This would not be the last time that the Six Nations/City of Brantford relationship would be scarred. Another major incident in the relationship was when the City of Brantford foreclosed on the mortgage of the Grand River Navigation Company in 1861. The Company was established in 1832 at the behest of William Hamilton Merritt of Welland Canal fame and David Thompson, a War of 1812 veteran and an entrepreneur from Cayuga, Ontario. When the Company began, Six Nations' money was used to buy one quarter of the company's shares with Merritt, Thompson and other private investors holding equally the remaining quarters.¹³⁸ This buying into the Company was done without the Six Nations consent and, according to some sources, the Six Nations wanted no part of this company.¹³⁹ It was the Six Nations trustees along with the Governor General Sir John Colburne, and not the Six Nations themselves, who were in

¹³⁶ George Beaver Mohawk Reporter: The Six Nations Columns of George Beaver (Ohsweken: Iroquois Publishing and Craft Supply, 1997), 118.

¹³⁷ Ontario Visual Heritage Project and Living History Multimedia Association Brant: Stories for the History of Brant County, Brantford, and Six Nations (Directed by Zack Melnick and Jeremy Lalande, 2004), 126 minutes.

¹³⁸ Bruce Emerson Hill The Grand River Navigation Company (Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 1994), 13.

¹³⁹ Hill, 6. Local historian Jean Waldie claimed that the Grand River Navigation Company had over 100 different shareholders (Jean Waldie Brant County: The Story of its People (Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 1985), 29).

control of the Six Nations' money and avid supporters of the Company. With the trustees approval, the Six Nations, began buying up more and more shares of the Company until they became overwhelmingly the majority shareholders.¹⁴⁰ Also, 360 acres of Six Nations land was taken and used by the Company amid many protests from the Six Nations community.¹⁴¹ When the Grand River Navigation Company cut the City of Brantford's section of the canal, the Company incurred massive amounts of debt. In order to lessen the financial burden, the Company obtained a mortgage from the City in 1851. With the coming popularity of the railway in Brantford in the mid 1850s, the Company soon went bankrupt and the City of Brantford foreclosed on their mortgage in 1861 and seized all the Company's assets and land, including the seized land that belonged to the Six Nations. By the time of this foreclosure, the Six Nations owned at least 6121 shares in the company.¹⁴² The Six Nations were never compensated by the Company or the City for their loss of land or money.¹⁴³

Even though the Six Nations and the City of Brantford's relationship had its strains, due to the City's and the Grand River Territory's geographic proximity to each other, members of the Six Nations did become involved in Brantford's economy. Archaeological studies of old Six Nations villages and cabin sites in Brant and Haldimand counties, completed by Ian Kenyon and Neil Ferris, found many instances of European manufactured items in Six Nations settlements. Many of these items were not on the Department of Indian Affairs' list of annual gifts from the

¹⁴⁰ From 1836-1840, Six Nations went from owning one quarter to of the Company's shares to holding 80% of the Company's shares (Bruce Emerson Hill 21).

¹⁴¹ Bruce Emerson Hill, 11 and 39. For more on the Six Nations protests about the Grand River Navigation Company see Bruce Emerson Hill, 19-26 and Susan M. Hill, 305-308).

¹⁴² Bruce Emerson Hill, 108. It is hard to tell how many shares the Six Nations held in the Company as one of the Six Nations Trustees and also an investor in the Company, S.P. Jarvis, never kept an accurate accounting of Six Nations funds and would even mix Six Nations funds in with his own personal accounts (Susan Marie Hill, 308).

¹⁴³ The last surviving director of the Grand River Navigation Company and Brantford resident, James Wilkes, claimed in 1872 that the Six Nations were given \$5.00 per acre for their land seized by the company. The Department of Indian Affairs claimed that no money was ever paid (Bruce Emerson Hill, 53).

King,¹⁴⁴ which means that the Six Nations were purchasing these items from white settlement stores as far back as the 1820s.¹⁴⁵ Kenyon further found reference to a member of Six Nations buying and trading items in the account books of the Douglass General Store which was located in Brantford. Douglass' store was only open for two years (1832-1833) and during this time, only had one Six Nations customer who bought on credit, Moses Cornplanter. When Douglass closed his store, Cornplanter, unlike some of Douglass' white patrons, had paid off his balance in full. This balance was not paid with money, but with moccasins, which were popular items with Douglass' white customers.¹⁴⁶ This trend of purchasing items on credit continued with many Six Nations families. By the mid 1800s, merchants in Brantford were beginning to feel as though they would never be paid the amounts owed to them by members of the Six Nations.¹⁴⁷ The merchants refused to grant further credit until the Imperial government reviewed the accounts.¹⁴⁸ The Department of Indian Affairs would appoint a commissioner to look into these accounts in 1858. The inquiry ended with all delinquent accounts being paid with Six Nations funds.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁴ The practice of offering "presents" as statements of esteem during councils goes back to the 17th century, but the practice was gradually discontinued, ending in the 1850s with the takeover of the Imperial Indian Department by provincial authorities. In the 1830s, efforts were made to shift the "presents" from tools that would support a hunting and fishing livelihood to one of sedentary agriculture and European clothing, a precursor to later policies of assimilation.

¹⁴⁵ Ian Kenyon and Neal Ferris "Investigations at Mohawk Village, 1983" *Arch Notes* January/February 1984, 83-40 and Neal Ferris, "In Their Own Time: Archaeological Histories of Native-Lived Contacts and Colonialisms, South Western Ontario A.D. 1400-1900" (Ph.D diss., Columbia University, 1999), 397. During their investigations of the Mohawk Village Site, Ferris and Kenyon found bottles and stoneware crockery with manufacturer marks from Brantford (Kenyon and Ferris "Investigations at Mohawk Village, 1983", 40).

¹⁴⁶ Kenyon and Ferris, 40. Kenyon and Ferris also noted that many of the items listed in Douglass' invoice book were recovered in the remains at the Mohawk Village site (Kenyon and Ferris, 40).

¹⁴⁷ In a study of a Six Nations farmer's diary, Fred Voget found that the terms of taking loans were different depending if they were taken from fellow Six Nations people or from the people from outside the community. When a loan was taken from a fellow Six Nations person, there was not a specified time to pay, while if the loan was taken from a non-Six Nations person, there were always terms and a specified time to pay it back attached to it. This double standard may explain why some members of the Six Nations were tardy in paying back their loans taken from people outside their community (Fred Voget, "A Six Nations Diary, 1891-1894" *Ethnohistory* 16, 4 (1969), 356).

¹⁴⁸ Deborah Doxtador *What Happened to the Iroquios Clans?: A Study of Clans in Three Nineteenth Century Rotinohsyani Communities* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Western Ontario, 1996), 136.

¹⁴⁹ To R. Pennefather from J. Thorburn, 30 Sept. 1858 in RG 10, Vol. 242, Reel C12,637, Title: Records of the Civil Secretary's Office 1844-1861 – Correspondence 1844-1861

With the conclusion of this commission, it would seem that the Six Nations and Brantford merchant credit problems were resolved, but this was never entirely forgotten by Brantford's citizenry. In a book published in 1896, it stated that debt was not an important thought to the people of Six Nations. According to this book, the people of Six Nations would run up large debts and never pay them off and, in some cases, evade their creditors altogether.¹⁵⁰ Whether this statement was true or not, members of Six Nations continued to interact in the Brantford and surrounding non-Native communities' economy and would even find employment at various firms and farms outside the Territory.¹⁵¹

Agriculturally, the non-Native and Native communities of Brant and Haldimand County peacefully co-existed with each other. Farmers of different races would often borrow each other's equipment and non-Native farmers would also pasture their livestock on Six Nation's farmers' land. The only disputes that erupted between the farmers, after teaming up to corral both Native and non-Native farmer's livestock, was about whose cattle were whose.¹⁵² Six Nations farmers also sold their agricultural goods at the local markets that surrounded the Territory. In his weekly newspaper column, George Beaver retold stories his father told him about men from Six Nations heading to the Brantford market to sell the furs and game that they hunted and trapped.¹⁵³ Other Six Nations hunters and farmers did the same. Through the study of a Six Nations farmer's diary, scholar Fred Voget found many instances of farm and other

¹⁵⁰ J.B. Mackenzie The Six-Nations in Canada (Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1896), 85. This statement is supported by author Enos T. Monture who claimed that after members of Six Nations were given their annuity payments, merchants from the surrounding non Native communities would wait outside the place where the payments were being distributed for their Six Nations creditors to ensure that they would get paid (Enos T. Monture The Feathered U.E.L.'s (Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1974, 30).

¹⁵¹ In two enfranchisement cases in the 1850s, J.B.W. Kerr and Elias Hill were reported to be working for an insurance company and as a shoemaker in the cities of Hamilton and Brantford respectively. Many other instances can be found where members of Six Nations were either working at businesses, factories and farms outside their Territory.

¹⁵² Fred Voget, 355 and 356 and Elliot Moses "Seventy-five Years of Progress of the Six Nations of the Grand River" Waterloo Historical Society (Vol. 56, 1968), 20 and 21.

¹⁵³ George Beaver Mohawk Reporter: The Six Nations Columns of George Beaver (Ohsweken: Iroquois Publishing and Craft Supply, 1997), 124.

products from Six Nations leaving the Grand River Territory and finding their way to outside markets. Throughout the years of 1891-1894, Peter “Farmer” Hill, his wife, and son made at least 20 trips into Brantford and surrounding area to sell, buy and barter their farm products for money and other goods.¹⁵⁴ Brantford was not only the place where the Hill’s came to sell their goods, but it was one of the few places mentioned where the family held many accounts and leases they needed to pay off.¹⁵⁵ It was also the place where the Hill’s took their grain to be milled and their apples to be pressed into cider. The Hill’s were also bartering and bringing the Euro-Canadian market economy into the Territory. Throughout Hill’s diary, there are 14 references to various work bees within the Six Nations community. These bees were for anything from harvesting, wood cutting, to fence building. According to Voget, these bees seemed to be reciprocal with Hill holding eight bees himself and performing in five bees for others. Hill, on some occasions, would also barter within the community for hired help, while on other occasions, he would pay the hired help money outright.¹⁵⁶ This application of in kind and monetary trading for services within and outside the Six Nations community show that not only were many members of the Six Nations connected to outside markets for their daily sustenance, but at the same time, the Six Nations were a self sustaining community. Part of that resource economy was its relationship to Brantford with Six Nations’ farmer’s relationships with the

¹⁵⁴ Fred Voget. Examples of products Hill sold within the surrounding communities are wood, maple sugar, hay, wheat, beans, turkeys, poultry, and butter.

¹⁵⁵ Fred Voget. In Brantford and the surrounding community, the Hill’s were bartering and participating in other money deals. Hill’s wife bartered for a stove in Brantford, while Hill himself bartered for other things like the processing of his crops, furniture blacksmithing and seed potatoes. Hill also participated in the Euro-Canadian money economy by entering into leases and mortgages in Brantford. On one occasion, Hill mortgaged his horses and chattels in Brantford.

¹⁵⁶ Fred Voget, 354. These bees may be connected to Six Nations traditional culture in the form of mutual aid societies. These societies, often based in the extended families, aid each other in carrying out major tasks within the extended family community (Paul Williams, Personal Communication).

Brantford and other markets would continue into the early 1900s with Six Nations farmers bringing everything from produce, baskets, and firewood to the market to sell.¹⁵⁷

The Brantford market itself became a site of dispute between the City of Brantford and the Six Nations. In 1909, the Brantford City Council wanted to redevelop the site of Brantford's market square. This proposal was met with resistance from the Six Nations who claimed that in the original town plot surrender, the land of the market square was given only if it remained a market.¹⁵⁸ With this protest, the City of Brantford backed down from their proposal for redevelopment.¹⁵⁹ This political issue was one of many Six Nations issues that the population of Brantford would have become familiar with. Not only were some of these issues published in the local newspapers, but if there was a political disagreement within the Territory, some members of the Six Nations would seek arbitration from outside authorities.

Many consultations were held with various people and groups outside of the Six Nations community to aid members of the Six Nations in various appeals. On many occasions, the Indian Act was openly debated with other Native groups in Grand Councils. The concept of a Grand Council made up of all Native groups in Canada¹⁶⁰ was championed by the Six Nations in 1870. The minutes of this first Council, which was organized and held by the Six Nations, were published under the title The General Council of the Six Nations and Delegates from Different

¹⁵⁷ Brian Maracle, 99.

¹⁵⁸ F. Douglas Reville History of the County of Brant (Brantford: The Hurley Printing Company, 1982 [1920]), 132. Reville further stated that the Crown Deed for the surrender for the City of Brantford showed no reference to this stipulation.

¹⁵⁹ Gary W. Muir Brantford: A City's Century Volume One, 1895-1945 (Brantford: Tupuna Press, 1999), 63. The market square debate continued into 1965 when the Brantford City Council again proposed a redevelopment of the property. The Six Nations again protested the redevelopment going as far as to threaten taking the issue to the United Nations. The Brantford City Council refused to give in and sold the property to developers prompting a Six Nations Clan Mother, Alma Greene, to renew a curse on the site that was originally put on the site by medicine woman seventy years previous (Gary W. Muir Brantford: A City's Century Volume Two, 1955-2000 (Brantford: Tupuna Press, 2001), 109, 143-145. The property later became an Eaton's Department Store and is currently owned and operated in partnership with the Toronto Developer G.K. York and the City of Brantford.

¹⁶⁰ Only First Nations groups from Ontario and Quebec attended these Councils.

Bands in Western and Eastern Canada by The Hamilton Spectator newspaper.¹⁶¹ Although the Six Nations would only selectively attend Grand Councils after the first Council,¹⁶² the Councils acted as an open forum to debate the Indian Act publicly with other Native groups. This forum was also heavily published about in local newspapers which would further educate communities outside the Territory about Six Nations issues.¹⁶³ Another such meeting appealing the Indian Act and reaffirming Six Nations' status as allies and not subjects to the Crown was the Ontario Historical Society's meeting held in 1911 at the Ohsweken Council House. Here Chief John W.M. Elliot stated to the members of the Society that the Indian Act was inconsistent, like in the marriage clause where it claimed that members of Six Nations were men under the law, as opposed to other clauses, like the liquor clause, where it claimed that the members of Six Nations were minors. Elliot also stated that the Indian Act grouped the Six Nations in with other Native groups when it was historically known that Six Nations' were allies to Britain and therefore held a special place within British Canada.¹⁶⁴ Although the Historical Society agreed to discuss these points at their next meeting, the appeal fell on deaf ears.¹⁶⁵ This may have been because the once president and current member of the Brant Historical Society was Gordon J. Smith, Visiting

¹⁶¹ The General Council of the Six Nations and Delegates from Different Bands in Western and Eastern Canada (Hamilton: The Hamilton Spectator, 1870).

¹⁶² According to a letter written by the Six Nations Chiefs to D. Laird, the Six Nations delegates left on the first day of the Sarnia Grand Council in 1874 after they helped elect the President. They left eight delegates there to observe and not take part in the deliberations (RG10, Vol. 1949, File 4224, Reel C-11118, Letter from the Six Nations Chiefs to O. Laird). However, after reading the transcripts of this Grand Council, the eight delegates from Six Nations did participate in the meeting (RG10, Vol. 1942, File 4103, Title: Grand Council (28 June to 3 July 1874) on Sarnia Reserve Reel C-11117). According to Paul Williams, a Six Nations legal Historian, the Six Nations delegates left the 1874 Council because Ojibway chiefs insisted running the Council based on the Indian Act, which the 1870 Council had, in the majority, rejected. The Six Nations delegates that did stay insisted that they remained only observers and that the Ojibway Chiefs had falsified the records. In an internal Six Nations investigation, the Six Nations delegates were exonerated (Paul Williams, Personal Communication). They returned to the Grand Council to air their grievances about the Indian Act in 1878 (RG10, Reel C-11130, Sarnia Observer 1853-1878).

¹⁶³ All the Grand Council's deliberations from 1874-1878 were reported on by the Sarnia Observer. The minutes of the 1870 Grand Council was published at the Hamilton Spectator Office in Hamilton, Ontario while during the 1874 council, a synopsis of the deliberations were published in the Brantford Expositor (Brantford Weekly Expositor, 10 July 1874).

¹⁶⁴ Annual Report of the Ontario Historical Society, 1911 (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1911), 46.

¹⁶⁵ Annual Report of the Ontario Historical Society, 1911, 48.

Superintendent for Six Nations. This appeal to the Ontario Historical Society would be repeated in 1921 when Secretary of the Six Nations Council, Asa R. Hill read at the Society's annual conference, a paper entitled "The Historical Position of the Six Nations".¹⁶⁶ This paper, which was approved by the Six Nations Council, was to sway the Society to "endorse and place itself in record as in favour or recognizing the rights of the Six Nations and that such encroachments as are being made, upon their conceded rights, by the Canadian Government are unwarranted and unjust."¹⁶⁷ This too would end in the same result.

Canadian political officials were also no stranger to disputes that arose within the Grand River Territory. In September of 1886, Sir John A. Macdonald paid a visit to the Six Nations. Although Macdonald's trip to Grand River was a last ditch effort to garner Six Nations support in the coming by-election for the district of Haldimand and had nothing to do with specific Six Nations issues,¹⁶⁸ it did bring Six Nations issues to the forefront to the population of the City of Brantford. In 1885, Macdonald's conservative government passed an Act that allowed for the male Native inhabitants of Canada's older Provinces (Ontario and Quebec) to vote in Federal elections. Although this franchise was revoked when the Liberal party came into power in 1896, the 1886 Haldimand election was one of the first test cases for Macdonald's 1885 Act. In a rally

¹⁶⁶ Asa R. Hill "The Historical Position of the Six Nations" Presented at the Annual Convention of the Ontario Historical Society, June 1921. This paper was also reported on by the Brantford Expositor on 8 June 1921.

¹⁶⁷ Six Nations Council Minutes, 7 June 1921 (RG 10, Vol. 1744, File 63-32 Part 13, Reel C-15025, Title: Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1921-1922). Ironically, the Ontario Historical Society, when admitting the Six Nation into the Society in 1898, did recognize Six Nations nationhood status when they admitted six separate delegates from each Nation that made up the Six Nations Confederacy to sit as the representatives for the Six Nations to the Ontario Historical Society. (Annual Report of the Ontario Historical Society, 1898 (Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1898), 29).

¹⁶⁸ Brantford Expositor, 8 September 1886 and Shelia Staats "The Six Nations Council House: Historic Building at Ohsweken." Ontario History 85, 3 (1993), 219. Lawyer Malcolm Montgomery states that in the 1880s, there were already land claims cases the Six Nations Council were petitioning the Canadian Government about that Macdonald could have addressed at this rally, but he chose not to (Malcolm Montgomery "The Six Nations Indians and the MacDonald Franchise" Ontario History 57:1 (1965), 17. One such claim was given to Macdonald in 1882 by the Six Nations Council was the Grand River Headwaters claim. In 1886, Macdonald deemed the claim to be unworthy as he was worried about the precedent this claim would set for other Native groups and if he did deem it worthy, it would hinder the assimilation policy the Canadian government was fostering (Hill, 368-369).

organized primarily by Six Nations Chief A.G. Smith,¹⁶⁹ Macdonald was invited to speak to the Six Nations one day before the election was to take place. Brantford's conservative leaning newspaper, the Courier, praised Macdonald's meeting with the Six Nations. According to the Courier, Macdonald "showed that the members of the Six Nations had already assumed the responsibilities of voting, and they fully appreciated the benefit the privilege would prove to the Indians...It placed them upon a state of equality with their fellows white and black."¹⁷⁰ The article further stated that the Six Nations were already contributing to the state through the taxes on the items they bought outside their Territory.¹⁷¹ MacDonald also spoke to the allegations that his granting of franchise to select Native populations was a scheme to assimilate them. According to Macdonald, the right to vote was to be added on to other treaty rights that any Native group already enjoyed.¹⁷²

Brantford's liberal newspaper, the Expositor, challenged these opinions. According to the Expositor's editorial, the mere timing of Macdonald's visit to Six Nations proves his visit was only to generate votes for Haldimand's by-election: "Sir John has been Premier and Superintendent-General for years and years, yet Monday was the first occasion in his long public career for him to appear upon the Reserve to advise the Six Nations Council as to what was best for their welfare."¹⁷³ The editorial continued that Macdonald had "passed yards of legislation respecting the Indians, but did he ever before deem it advisable...to call the council of tribes together to explain the nature of any such legislation?"¹⁷⁴ William Patterson, South Brant's

¹⁶⁹ Brantford Courier, 8 September 1886.

¹⁷⁰ Brantford Courier, 8 September 1886.

¹⁷¹ Brantford Courier, 8 September 1886.

¹⁷² Brantford Courier, 8 September 1886. Although the Six Nations were able to vote, in an address to Macdonald by Chief William Smith the Six Nation Council was not going to mix themselves up with the franchise (Staats, 219).

¹⁷³ Brantford Expositor, 8 September 1886.

¹⁷⁴ Brantford Expositor, 8 September 1886.

liberal Member of Parliament from 1872-1896,¹⁷⁵ mimicked these sentiments in the House of Commons in 1885 when he said “if his [Macdonald’s] desire is to benefit the Indians, let him give greater facilities for them to attain the full status of rights and liberties, to emancipate them from the guardianship of the Government...to make them free agents, with the right to manage their own affairs.”¹⁷⁶ Whatever the political opinions of the Macdonald’s franchise bill and his subsequent visit to Six Nations, it is important to note the sheer amount of press coverage and the varying opinions about Federal Indian policy towards the Six Nations within the City of Brantford. Although the event was heavily debated, it does show that the people of Brantford understood some of the issues facing the people of Six Nations.

Patterson himself, as mentioned above, was petitioned many times to aid and clarify many political issues for members of the Six Nations. These requests, ranging from simple requests for copies of speeches given to the Governor General and pieces of legislation to detailed complainants about the Indian Act or possible mismanagement of the Six Nations trust fund, were forwarded to Patterson from the Six Nations.¹⁷⁷ According to scholar Malcolm Montgomery, the Six Nations felt that Patterson was always a fair judge of issues, but they also thought that they could govern themselves without any outside government interference.¹⁷⁸ Patterson had mixed feelings about the Six Nations. He found that they were the most loyal, brave, and advanced of all Native peoples, but also found them to be the most warlike and possibly confrontational.¹⁷⁹ Whatever Patterson and the Six Nations thought of each other, their

¹⁷⁵ In an ironic twist, although the Liberals won the 1896 Federal election, Patterson was ousted from office by his Conservative rival due to Conservative Party’s pandering to the Six Nations vote. For an examination of this election, see Malcolm Montgomery’s “The Six Nations Indians and the MacDonald Franchise” Ontario History 57:1 (1965).

¹⁷⁶ Patterson as cited in Montgomery, “The Six Nations Indians and the MacDonald Franchise”, 15.

¹⁷⁷ Many of these original documents can be found at the Trent University Archives in the William Patterson Fonds (1839-1914).

¹⁷⁸ Malcolm Montgomery “The Six Nations and the MacDonald Franchise” Ontario History 57, 1 (1965), 15.

¹⁷⁹ Malcolm Montgomery “The Six Nations and the MacDonald Franchise”, 16.

working relationship remained professional. When Mohawk Pine Tree Chief Frederick Loft wrote Patterson about an accounting of the Six Nations education loans, Patterson tracked down the information from Ottawa for Loft.¹⁸⁰ Patterson was also at the centre of many debates between the Federal government and the Six Nations. On 9 March 1894, Patterson received a letter from the Six Nations Council regarding the Indian Act and how they disapproved of it. They claimed that the Act, especially Section 38, went against their nationhood and allied status to the British Crown. The letter also questioned the Federal government's enforcement of land and timber laws within the Six Nations Territory. The Six Nations did not want to dispose of further lands, they did not want their leasing practices to non-Natives to be interfered with, they wanted the rights to their timber reserves within the Territory, and they wanted the Six Nations Council to be in charge of the forest bailiff appointments. Lastly, the letter condemned the Federal government's meddling in the internal affairs of the Six Nations. Issues like wills and estates, illegitimate children, and placing and striking someone on and off the band list should have been within the Six Nations Council's authority, not the Ontario or Federal government.¹⁸¹ Although we do not know what Patterson did with this letter, the letter, complete with appendices, laid out in full the Six Nations' pleas for sovereignty from the Provincial and Federal governments. Patterson was also appointed the chair of the Select Committee of the Affairs of the Six Nations Indians in Brant and Haldimand in 1874. This committee's mandate was to look into the enfranchisement clause of the 1869 Indian Act and why members of the Six Nations were not applying to be enfranchised. For this Committee, anybody who had connections to the Six Nations could be interviewed. Missionaries, clergy, physicians, merchants from Brantford,

¹⁸⁰ Correspondence between Frederick Loft and William Patterson 21 March-2 May 1894- William Patterson Fonds, Trent University Archives. It is not known if Patterson forwarded the information to Loft, but since Patterson took the trouble to track the information down, one can assume that it was forwarded to Loft.

¹⁸¹ Letter from the Six Nations Council to William Patterson 9 March 1894, William Patterson Fonds, Trent University Archives.

Chiefs, and members of Six Nations were interviewed only to find that although “[t]he Act of 1869 is not acceptable to the Indians”, “[t]here is no earthly reason why the Indians should not in time take their place among the rest of the population of the country, except in the policy of the Indian Department in keeping the Indians in a state of tutelage, instead of encouraging them to manage their own affairs.”¹⁸² This report also gives us a case study in which we can determine what the Six Nations and outsiders thought about the problems facing Six Nations. In this report, eight members from Six Nations, with occupations ranging from farmers, Chiefs, Doctors and clergy, were interviewed. Of the eight, two interviewees were for Six Nations enfranchisement, but agreed that the system needed to be altered in order to entice people from Six Nations to apply for it. Five interviewees from the Six Nations community were against enfranchisement and one interviewee did not comment on enfranchisement.¹⁸³ Of the ten non Six Nations people that were interviewed by the Committee, seven interviewees were for Six Nations enfranchisement and saw no reason why Six Nations should not “take their place among the rest of the population of this country.”¹⁸⁴ No non members of Six Nations were against enfranchisement, but some brought up other issues facing Six Nations. Some were advocating for mandatory attendance for Six Nations children in day schools while others were advocating for an elected band council to govern the Six Nations. These opinions were countered by Chief John Buck and William Montour and supported by Six Nations Visiting Superintendent Jasper Gilkison who all claimed that the majority of people of the Six Nations did not want an elected

¹⁸² RG10, Vol.1935, File 3589, Reel C-11114, Report of the Select Committee of the Affairs of the Six Nations Indians in Brant and Haldimand.

¹⁸³ RG10, Vol.1935, File 3589, Reel C-11114, Report of the Select Committee of the Affairs of the Six Nations Indians in Brant and Haldimand.

¹⁸⁴ Rev. James Roberts in RG10, Vol.1935, File 3589, Reel C-11114, Report of the Select Committee of the Affairs of the Six Nations Indians in Brant and Haldimand. Three other ministers, one of which was also a member of Six Nations, and one medical doctor made similar comments to this effect.

council.¹⁸⁵ Although the Committee's evidence on subsidiary issues conflicted, this Committee's findings show that, although living close in proximity, people from the communities surrounding the Grand River Territory did not understand the needs or wants of the people of Six Nations.

Another report that was submitted to the Federal government about problems on the Grand River Territory was J.A. Macrae's report on Sanitation and Some Other Matters on the Six Nations Reserve. In this report, Macrae was sent to investigate rumours of bad sanitary conditions, which were causing illnesses, within the Six Nations Territory. Macrae's report found that all the rumours of ill health and poor sanitary conditions were false. Contrary to community outsiders' popular belief, Typhoid fever was not rampant within the Territory. Macrae only found two instances of which one was an isolated case and the other was over exaggerated.¹⁸⁶ He found that, in general, the people of Six Nations were personally clean and their homes were properly kept, however some were poorly ventilated. Water was not coming from streams and rivers, but was coming out of properly dug and cribbed wells which in part were paid for by loans from the Six Nations Council.¹⁸⁷ Health wise, Macrae's only negative report was that the death rate within the Territory was three times higher than in the surrounding area. Although Macrae could not account for why this was happening, he noted that the death rate was not increasing. Dr. Secord, the Territory's physician, stated that the high death rate was due to a "syphilitic taint and lax morality."¹⁸⁸ Macrae, although not contesting this opinion of Dr. Secord about Six Nations, did call into question some of the other accusations made by

¹⁸⁵ Chief J. Buck and James Montour and Jasper Gilkison in RG10, Vol.1935, File 3589, Reel C-11114, Report of the Select Committee of the Affairs of the Six Nations Indians in Brant and Haldimand.

¹⁸⁶ J.A. Macrae "Report RE Sanitary and Other Matters Six Nations Reserve, 26 October 1899" (Sessional Paper No. 14, 5th Session of 8th Parliament, Session 1900), 611.

¹⁸⁷ Macrae, 612.

¹⁸⁸ Macrae, 613.

Secord. When investigating a suggested visible infection of worms on Six Nations children, Macrae did not find a single case. Macrae even went as far as to ask missionaries in the Territory about it and found they had not seen any instances of it either. The only one who had claimed worms to be a problem was Dr. Secord.¹⁸⁹ Macrae also noted that the Six Nations doctor's office did not keep records documenting the ailments of the Six Nations.¹⁹⁰ In a letter written to Macrae by Rev. J. Bearfoot, a member of Six Nations and missionary within the Grand River Territory, which was attached to Macrae's final report as Appendix E, also called into question statements made by Dr. Secord. According to Rev. Bearfoot, Dr. Secord and a Mr. Boyle¹⁹¹ wanted the Six Nations to build a hospital in their Territory and a report claiming there was no disease in the Grand River Territory would be detrimental to their plan.¹⁹² Rev. Bearfoot further stated that Dr. Secord thought that many Native people were lazy, when in fact Rev. Bearfoot believed that many Six Nations people were learning and developing the new ways of white culture. Rev. Bearfoot further stated that the people of Six Nations have no thirst for gold or fame and their community's work ethic is the same that can be found in the white communities that surround it: the majority of the community work hard, while a small minority of others do not.¹⁹³ In this way, the health matters that Macrae was assigned to investigate were the fabrication by community outsiders which did not match the reality of the situation found within the Six Nations Territory.

Macrae also reported on other misconceptions placed on the Six Nations. The first misconception was that the Traditional Longhouse religion and culture was dying out. Although

¹⁸⁹ Macrae, 614.

¹⁹⁰ Macrae, 611.

¹⁹¹ This is possibly Mr. David Boyle. David Boyle was working on a project for the Minister of Education collecting information on the religion, customs, and folklore of the Six Nations in the 1890s (Annual Report of the Ontario Historical Society, 1898 (Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1898), 35).

¹⁹² J. Bearfoot as cited in Macrae, 619.

¹⁹³ J. Bearfoot as cited in Macrae, 619.

in the minority (Macrae estimated that 25% of the Six Nations population were Longhouse practitioners), these people were not a problem in the community. He found that they were neat, clean, well spoken people, and their children were well cared for.¹⁹⁴ According to MacRae, Longhouse practitioners religiously were similar to the Christian population as they met on Sunday at the Longhouse where they would listen to a man instruct them in moral teachings. They further believed in a God, a future reward and punishment, but with no reference to Jesus as their saviour, although Macrae claimed that some did entertain this idea.¹⁹⁵ In their everyday life, Macrae found no difference between Longhouse and Christian followers. Both groups had men working in the fields while women worked in the houses. Macrae did warn, however, that a repression of this belief system by legislation would actually cause a revival in the old ways instead of letting it die out naturally.¹⁹⁶

One of the last problems that Macrae investigated was the relationship between the City of Brantford and Six Nations. Macrae pointed out that Brantford had many things in it that brought people from the Grand River Territory into the city, including the Indian Affairs Superintendent's office, the Brantford Farmer's Market, and liquor. Although pointing out that liquor distribution to members of Six Nations was a problem, Macrae did not give any solutions on how to solve this problem. In 1907, Frederick Loft, on behalf of the Six Nations, unsuccessfully tried to move the Superintendent's office from Brantford to Ohsweken in order to cut down on the liquor traffic coming into the Territory especially after people from Six Nations would go to Brantford to pick up their annuity cheques.¹⁹⁷ By 1867, there were 32

¹⁹⁴ Macrae, 616.

¹⁹⁵ Macrae, 617. Macrae findings that traditional Six Nations religious practices were similar to Christianity are very superficial and a closer look at the traditional customs of the Six Nations would have found major differences between the two.

¹⁹⁶ Macrae, 616.

¹⁹⁷ Yale D. Belanger "Seeking a Seat at the Table: A Brief History of Indian Political Organizing in Canada, 1870-1951" (Ph.D. dissertation, Trent University, 2006), 154.

establishments that served alcohol in Brantford.¹⁹⁸ By 1907, Brantford had become nationally known as *Bad Brantford* due to its drunkenness problem. Although denied by Brantford's public officials, the reputation was solidified by the First Baptist church Rev. S.J. Farmer who claimed that he "had never seen drunkenness to such an extent as it is in Brantford which is the most drunken city I have ever found in my travels."¹⁹⁹ According to Sydney Harring, by 1900, the Six Nations were being jailed at a rate that was twice their population with the majority of them serving prison time after failing to pay small fines for drunkenness.²⁰⁰ Harring also found that this problem had steadily increased over time. He found that prior to 1870s, Six Nations people were sent to the Brantford jail proportionately to their population.²⁰¹ By 1873, however, this was not the case. In 1874 out of the 519 people jailed in Brantford's jail, 57 of the prisoners belonged to Six Nations. This increase meant that Six Nations made up 11% of the prison population. This percentage doubled to 23% by 1880 and held at 20% into 1900 with 41 of the 203 prisoners belonging to the Six Nations.²⁰² Author J.B. Mackenzie went as far to say that the former Police Magistrate of Brantford, James Weyns, was made an Honourary Chief by the Six Nations because of the care he took administering to the many Six Nations criminal cases.²⁰³ Whether this statement is true or not, the many alcoholism cases do demonstrate some truthfulness in the comment made by Rev. Bearfoot in his letter to Macrae: "All who know the Indian will, if honest, admit that when not contaminated with the 'cunningness' and 'shrewdness' of the unprincipled whites, he is naturally honest in the discharge of his obligations, and is law abiding."²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁸ Jean Waldie *Brant County: A Story of its People* (Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 1985), 153

¹⁹⁹ Gary Muir *Brantford: a City's Century* (Brantford: Tupuna Press, 1999), 83.

²⁰⁰ Harring, 160.

²⁰¹ Harring, 160. Harring also points out that there are gaps in this study as there are gaps in the official records.

²⁰² Harring, 160.

²⁰³ Mackenzie, 68-69.

²⁰⁴ J. Bearfoot as cited in Macrae, 619.

Although there were some misunderstandings of what the Six Nations meant to the people of the City of Brantford, there were many occasions of peaceful and celebratory occasions between the two groups that praised their shared history. During the Six Nations Christmas celebrations, people and musical bands from Brantford usually came to the Victoria Mills area of the Grand River Territory to celebrate. In 1896, the roads going on to the Territory were so bad that many of the usual people from Brantford did not come to the celebrations, but one Brantford band struggled to Victoria Mills to aid in the celebration while another group from Caledonia made it to the Oneida area and helped out with a local Sunday school.²⁰⁵

Another civic calibration was held in 1886 when a monument to Joseph Brant and the Six Nations was unveiled in the centre of Brantford's downtown in Victoria Park. This unveiling not only acted as a celebration of Six Nations traditional culture, it also highlighted the Six Nations and the City of Brantford's Loyalist roots. The idea for the monument began in 1874 when the Six Nations Council began a correspondence with the Duke of Connaught. After presenting him with a portrait of Joseph Brant and making the Duke an honorary Chief during his visit in 1869, the Chiefs of the Council felt that the Duke was naturally suited to become the patron of such a monument.²⁰⁶ Although the Six Nations offered to give \$5000 in 1877 to help build the monument, interest in erecting the monument died down. The movement to erect the monument regained momentum in 1883 with the granting of money by the Federal, Provincial, Brant County, City of Brantford, and the Mississauga of the New Credit governments.²⁰⁷ Two ceremonies were held to celebrate the monument. The first was on 11 August 1886 with the

²⁰⁵ The Indian Magazine, January 1896 (RG 10 (Indian Affairs), Vol. 2837, File 171,348, Reel C-11284, Title: Six Nations Agency – Correspondence Regarding a Resolution of the Six Nations Council Regarding the Formation of a Regiment on the Reserve to be known as the Royal Six Nations Regiment)

²⁰⁶ Jean Waldie, *Brant County: The Story of its People* vol. 1 (Brantford: The Brantford Historical Society, 1984), 39 and *The History of the County of Brant* (Toronto: Warner, Beers, and Company, 1883), 141.

²⁰⁷ Doug O'Neal, "Brant Monument Artistic Triumph for Sculptor" *Brantford Expositor* (13 Oct. 1984).

laying of the monument's corner stone. This celebration was attended by at least 2000 people and included a parade from the Indian Office in downtown Brantford to Victoria Park. This procession was led by Chief Levi Jonathan, followed by the warriors and Council of Six Nations, and finally the Brant Memorial Association.²⁰⁸ Once at the park, Chief Josiah Hill acted as the chair for the celebration while Chiefs Moses Hill and Moses Martin placed sealed jars in the cornerstone which contained a Canadian Almanac for 1886, a Brantford Colonial pamphlet, the Minutes of Brant County Council from 1885-1886, an Act incorporating the Brant Memorial Association, the letter written to the Duke of Connaght that began the memorial, a Copy of the memoirs of Joseph Brant, various newspapers from Grand River and Brantford, and other artefacts of local importance.²⁰⁹ Chief Henry Clench laid the cornerstone and Chief John Smoke Johnson was there to tell stories of Joseph Brant and war stories from the War of 1812.²¹⁰ While the cornerstone was being laid, sculptor Percy Wood was living amongst the Six Nations trying to capture "the character of the Indian as he was before civilization exercised its effect upon him."²¹¹ In the end, Wood chose six Six Nations Chiefs to sculpt for the monument: Chiefs Johnson, Lewis, Hill, Given, Vanevery, and Newhouse.²¹² For his dedication to the monument, Percy Wood was made a member of the Mohawk Nation on the 25 August 1886.²¹³

The final unveiling of the memorial was held on 13 October 1886. Invited to Brantford for the occasion were Chiefs from the North West who had remained loyal to the British during the North West Rebellion. The Chiefs were given a tour of Canada to show what the Federal

²⁰⁸ Waldie, 39.

²⁰⁹ Reville, 56 and Waldie 39-40.

²¹⁰ Waldie, 39 and Brantford Expositor "A Long Lasting Monument".

²¹¹ Reville, 55.

²¹² George Beaver, 154.

²¹³ Brantford Expositor, 13 October 1886, reprinted 16 September 2000.

government could offer them, and the Six Nations were being used as the model Reserve.²¹⁴

With 20,000 people in attendance, the North West and Six Nations Chiefs left the Indian Office at 12:00 noon leading the procession with a 26 piece band made up entirely of Six Nations men with Lt. Governor Robinson and various City and County delegates in tow.²¹⁵ Once at the platform, a traditional condolence was preformed and Chief John Buck made a speech that was interpreted by Chief A.G. Smith which stated the “this monument will be a still further incentive to the Six Nations to be forever loyal to the British Crown.”²¹⁶ After the festivities in Victoria Park were concluded, the procession made its way to Agriculture Park where a lacrosse game was played between two Six Nations teams and a war dance was preformed in full war paint.²¹⁷ The festivities continued into the evening with speeches and an entire theatrical program provided by the Six Nations at Kerby and Stratford Opera houses.²¹⁸

The people from Six Nations and the people of Brant County have shared in a common past. This past has been marked by turbulent times, but also marked with times of vast cross community cooperation. Although these communities misunderstood what the other community meant, they still co-existed in a common space and were forced to interact with each other. The effects of these interactions are what fuelled these two communities to unite during the First World War, but this uniting would also lead to further misinterpretations. Although the war would unite the spirit of these communities into a common cause, this cause would later serve as

²¹⁴ Hugh A. Dempsey *Red Crow: Warrior Chief* (Saskatoon: Fifth House Ltd, 1995). This tour was a success in this regard because of the Six Nations. According to Dempsey, the tour of the Mohawk Institute and the Grand River Territory convinced the North West Chiefs of the benefits of siding with the Canadian government. Chief Red Crow would go back to his community preaching that a European style education was the answer to all problems and Chief North Axe went so far as to send his son to the Mohawk Institute for his education (198-202).

²¹⁵ Hugh A. Dempsey, 196 and Reville, 57.

²¹⁶ Doug O’Neil “Brant Monument Artistic Triumph for Sculptor” *Brantford Expositor* 13 October 1984.

²¹⁷ Reville, 60.

²¹⁸ Hugh A. Dempsey, 197-198 and Reville, 60.

leverage for the Federal government's overthrow of the Six Nations traditional government which would forever strain the Six Nations relationship with the outside community.

Chapter 4: Six Nations in the First World War

As seen in chapter one, there was a distinct post-traditional culture that evolved within the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory. It was in the context of this post-traditional culture that traditional militaristic aspects of Six Nations culture which, as seen in chapter two, was continued and added on to either by the outside community or the Six Nations themselves. This culture would have influenced the young men of Six Nations when Canada was called to arms in 1914. This chapter, however, will examine the role played by the Six Nations community during the war and the implications this home front participation would have on the community and the veterans as they returned. Throughout the war, conflicting opinions about what the Six Nations support of the war should be would cause internal and external turmoil for the Grand River community. After the war, such turmoil and added issues of post war reintegration would continue and form the context of the political crisis leading to 1924.

When war broke out in 1914, the people of Six Nations had to figure out how they were going to balance their cultural values in the face of total war while the men of Six Nations had to decide whether or not they were going to enlist and fight for their nation's old ally Britain. As the people of Six Nations figured out their role in wartime, the Six Nations Council tried to negotiate their community through the war without sacrificing their independence. As more and more men enlisted and as the casualty lists came home, this balance for the Council was becoming harder and harder to maintain in the face of the conditions of home front Canada. This balance was further aggravated by the policies, like conscription, implemented by the Federal government. As the war came to a close, the people of Six Nations and the Council were thankful, but the scars of war left in to the community were very much still visible.

With the declaration of war by Britain in the summer of 1914, all of Britain's dominions and colonial holdings also found themselves at war. This announcement of war was met with enthusiasm in Canada, Brant County and the Grand River Territory. Within the City of Brantford, the declaration of war was received on 4 August 1914 shortly after 8:00 p.m. With this announcement,

[t]housands of citizens gathered in the heart of the city, and led by the 25th Brant Dragoons Band...joined in the singing of the National Anthem, O Canada, The Maple Leaf Forever, Rule Britannia, and other patriotic songs. Cheers again and again were given for the King...A wild outburst of cheers coupled with the throwing of hats into the air, and other marks of intense relief and gratification that at last the moment had arrived for England to throw her forces in to the balance, greeted the announcement.²¹⁹

By 6 August, before Ottawa gave the order to local recruiting stations to mobilize troops, 140 Brantford men volunteered for active service at the Brantford Armouries within a two hour period.²²⁰

Members of the Grand River Territory responded in a similar manner. Alfred Styres, a Six Nations farmer, was working in his fields when he heard that people in the neighbouring town of Hagersville were recruiting. Styres immediately made arrangements with a neighbour to look after his crops, went to Hagersville, and enlisted in the 4th Battalion.²²¹ Styres was not the only Six Nations person to enlist in the 4th Battalion. Many members of Six Nations enlisted on receiving word that the war had broke out. One of these enlistees was also Brant County's first war casualty. Cameron D. Brant,²²² a serving member of the 37th Haldimand Rifles, enlisted

²¹⁹ The Brantford Expositor 5 August 1914 as quoted in Gary Muir Brantford: A City's Century 1895-2000 (Brantford: Tupuna Press, 1999), 118.

²²⁰ Muir, 118 and F. Douglas Reville History of the County of Brant (Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 1920), 442-443.

²²¹ Duncan Campbell Scott "The Canadian Indians and the Great War" in Canada and the Great War, vol. III: Guarding the Channel Ports (Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1919), 297-298.

²²² Although Cameron D. Brant is officially listed with the Department of Indian Affairs as a member of the Mississauga of New Credit, he and many others from New Credit who enlisted in the war were also considered to be members of the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory. This double consideration is due to intermarriage between the two groups and the nature of how the New Credit territory came to be. When the New Credit territory was

with his cousins Frank Montour and Elgin Brant in the 4th Battalion and was killed in action at the 2nd Battle of Ypres on the 23rd or 24th of April 1915. Soon after the outbreak of the war, it is estimated that 60 men from the Six Nations and New Credit area enlisted for overseas service²²³ with ten of these enlisting before the end of August 1914.²²⁴

Although individuals from Six Nations responded enthusiastically to the outbreak of war, the Six Nations Council faced a problem. The Council had not been asked if they too would go to war, as they had been in 1812 or any other time their services were needed. Until they were asked, the official response from the Six Nations Council was that they were neutral. This neutrality, as demonstrated with the Six Nations participation in the American Revolution and the War of 1812, also allowed for members of the Six Nations to go and fight, but as individuals and without the official support of the Six Nations Council. In November 1914, Lt. Col. Hamilton Merritt, an honorary chief of the Six Nations and fierce supporter of the all Six Nations regiment in 1896, wrote the Council with a proposal to raise and equip two Six Nations companies for service overseas.²²⁵ After this proposal was laid before the Council, the Chiefs

carved out for the Mississauga from the Grand River Territory, many of the Six Nations families who were residing in the newly created Reserve stayed. This is why Cameron Brant was considered a member of the Mississauga and Six Nations (George Beaver Mohawk Reporter: The Six Nations Columns of George Beaver (Ohsweken: Iroquois Publishing and Craft Supply, 1997), 38).

²²³ Draft Copy of the Warriors Exhibit Resource Guide, Woodland Cultural Centre, Warrior Files. Since race was not specified on enlistment forms and since the Department of Indian Affairs did not note the numbers of enlisting Native peoples early in the war, the exact number of these early enlistees will never be known (Fred Gaffen's Forgotten Soldiers as cited in James W. St.G. Walker "Race and Recruitment in World War I: Enlistment of Visible Minorities in the Canadian Expeditionary Force" The Canadian Historical Review Vol. LXX, No. 1, 1989, 4 and Duncan Campbell Scott "The Indians and the Great War", 288.

²²⁴ Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre Warriors: A Resource Guide (Brantford: Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre, 1986), 17. P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Katharine McGowen estimate this number to be eight (P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Katharine McGowen "Competing Loyalties in a Complex Community: Enlisting the Six Nations in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1914-1917" in Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Craig Leslie Mantle (Kingston, Ontario: The Defense Academy Press, 2007), 95). Of the eight men that enlisted, seven of them were known to be Six Nations men. Enos T. Monture puts this number at five with three men being Delaware, one man being Cayuga, and one man being from New Credit (Enos T. Monture The Feathered U.E.L.'s (Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1974), 97).

²²⁵ There are some discrepancies on what was actually proposed in Merritt's first proposal. Some sources claim that he offered to equip two companies of Six Nations men while other claim that he offered to equip an entire battalion of Six Nations men like in his proposal for the Royal Six Nations Regiment in 1896. The author has chosen to

postponed their decision as the proposal for Six Nations participation in a non-Six Nations war was not delivered to them in accordance to the customs of their forefathers.²²⁶ This custom required a direct appeal to the Six Nations Council by their ally who was at war, Great Britain.²²⁷ Once the appeal by Britain was made, the local Chiefs of Six Nations, who took care of civil matters, and the clan mothers, would declare war on another nation and the appoint war Chiefs to guide the Six Nations through the war.²²⁸ In this way, the local or “Peace Chiefs” could not go to war. If they did, they would have to hand over their leadership and title back to their clan mothers for the duration of the war.²²⁹ This, plus the Council’s obligation to keep their people’s minds at peace,²³⁰ may explain why Chief J.S. Johnson’s application to be given the title of War

believe that the offer was for only two companies as that was the offer that was proposed on 3 November and 17 December 1914 to the Six Nations Council (RG 10, Vol. 3015, File 218,222-178, Reel C-11311, Six Nations Agency – Minutes of Council Meeting held between 3 and 17 November Respecting Sundry Matters and RG 10, Vol. 3016, File 218,222-182, Reel C-11311, Six Nations Agency – Minutes of Council Meeting held between 1 and 17 December Respecting Sundry Matters).

²²⁶ Six Nations Council Minutes 3 November 1914 found on RG 10, Vol. 1739, File 63-32 Part 4, Reel C-15023, Minutes of Council – Six Nations (1894-1915)

²²⁷ Marritt himself knew of this custom. In a letter to Lt. Col. S.A. Stanton, Marritt said he understood why the King could not ask all Native groups in Canada individually for their participation in the First World War (Letter from William Hamilton Marritt to Lt. Col. S.A. Stanton in Barbra M. Wilson Ontario and the First World War (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1977), 172). It is also interesting to note that the Six Nations were not the only Native group in Canada to refuse to support the First World War until they were asked to participate by the British Crown (Janice Summerby Native Soldiers, Foreign Battlefields (Ottawa: Veterans Affairs Canada, 2005), 6 and Fred Gaffen Forgotten Soldiers Penticton, British Columbia: Theytus Books, 1985), 20).

²²⁸ Lloyd King “114th Regiment in the Great War” (Unpublished speech in the Woodland Cultural Centre’s Warrior Files), 1, Barbra M. Wilson, cxi, Hill, 145, and A.A. Goldenweiser “On Iroquois Work 1912” in the Summery Report of the Geological Survey Branch of the Canadian Department of Mines, 1912 (1914), 468. The United States Oneida and Onondaga were the only Nations within the Six Nations to formally declare war on Germany (Thomas A. Britten American Indians in World War I: At Home and at War (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 62).

²²⁹ Tom Porter “Traditions and Customs of the Six Nations” in Pathways to Self Determination, Leroy Littlebear, Menno Bolt, J. Anthony Lang eds. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 21. There seems to be some discrepancies about who was able to be a War Chief. Fredrick Loft and E.M. Chadwick, who cites his information from Lewis Henry Morgan, claim that a War Chief assumed their position by popular support (Fredrick Onondayoh Loft “Militarism Among the Indians of Yesterday and To-day” in Selected Papers from the Canadian Military Institute (Wellend Ontario: The Wellend Tribune, 1909), 39 and Edward M. Chadwick The People of the Longhouse (Toronto: Church of England, 1897), 43). Historian Robert Allen claims that War Chiefs were selected clan mothers similar to Peace Cheifs (Robert S. Allen His Majesty’s Indian Allies: British Indian Policy in the Defence of Canada 1774-1815 (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1992), 14). Chadwick goes as far to say that the position of War Chief was no longer in use by the Six Nations and the closest thing the Six Nations had to a War Chief currently were Six Nations officers who were serving in the Canadian army (Chadwick, 43).

²³⁰ This obligation can be found in the Six Nations Great Law of Peace. See footnote 57 for more on this obligation.

Chief before he went overseas to England was rejected by the Council.²³¹ On 24 March 1915, Merritt's proposal was again relayed to the Council by Lt. Fredrick Loft, a member of Six Nations who was a militia officer in Toronto. Although Loft advocated for the formation of the Six Nations companies, the Chiefs declined the offer as they "did not deem it proper that they should ask the [Canadian] government to allow them to form companies when they already have the 37th [Haldimand Rifles] Battalion on the Reserve and are standing ready to respond when called to do so by the Department of War."²³²

Although the Six Nations did not officially declare war, they still supported their soldiers who did go overseas. In November 1914, the Six Nations Council granted the Six Nations Patriotic League \$50.00 to purchase yarn to knit socks for Six Nations soldiers.²³³ By 26 November, the League had produced and shipped three dozen pairs of socks overseas through the Canadian Patriotic Fund.²³⁴ In 1915, on the orders of Duncan Campbell Scott, knitting for soldiers overseas was stopped due to fears that small pox, a known disease within the Territory, would be spread to the soldiers whom the socks were delivered. At the time of this ban, there were 54 plus socks already knitted which were distributed throughout the Territory so as not to go to waste.²³⁵ Some Six Nations women's groups also made quilts to be sent overseas for the

²³¹ Six Nations Council Minutes for 3 May 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 1740, File 63-32 Part 6, Reel C-15023, Minutes of Council – Six Nations (1916)). Not only could this rejection be because of the Six Nations Council's obligation to keep their minds at peace, but it could also be because of the authority that a War Chief would have if the Council granted the application. See footnote 229 for more information about the authority of the War Chief.

²³² Six Nations Council Minutes for 24 March 1915 (RG 10, Vol. 1739, File 63-32 Part 4, Reel C-15023, Minutes of Council – Six Nations (1894-1915)).

²³³ Six Nations Council Minutes for 17 November 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 3015, File 218,222-178, Reel C-11311, Six Nations Agency – Minutes of Council Meeting held Between 3 and 17 November Respecting Sundry Matters). This decision was at first rejected by the Council on 3 November 1914 as it was proposed to the Council by non-Six Nations people. Once it was proposed to the Council by Six Nations women from the Patriotic League, the money was granted.

²³⁴ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to M.A. Brown (RG 10, Vol. 6763, File 452-5 Part 1, Reel C-8509, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Funds Awarded to the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League for Knitting done for Indians Overseas).

²³⁵ Letter from M.A. Brown to Duncan Campbell Scott (RG 10, Vol. 6763, File 452-5 Part 1, Reel C-8509 War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Funds Awarded to the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League for Knitting

Belgian Relief Fund.²³⁶ Other comforts for soldiers that were sent overseas by the various patriotic groups within the Territory included wristlets, mittens, cups, helmets, khakis, silk handkerchiefs, chocolate, individual fruitcakes, Christmas pudding, tobacco, writing paper, and clothing for orphaned children.²³⁷ The only time the Six Nations Council refused to give a grant to the Six Nations Patriotic League was in December of 1916 as there was no record of Six Nations men ever receiving socks from the Council's first grant.²³⁸ It is not known whether an accounting of the socks was ever provided, but the Council continued to grant the League money throughout 1917 and 1918. Through the available records, the Six Nations Council gave the Six Nations Patriotic League anywhere from \$350-\$415 in grants, which was added to the money raised by the Six Nations Patriotic League through private donations and fundraisers, for the knitting of socks and other comforts for the soldiers from Six Nations.²³⁹ At the same time, the Six Nations Council also refused requests for grants of money to other pro-war charitable organizations from the surrounding communities. In May 1916, a delegation from the Brant County Patriotic League made a presentation to the Council asking for monetary assistance. The Council refused the request on the grounds that it had already given similar grants to the Six

done for Indians Overseas). A month after the ban was put in place, Evelyn Davis wrote the Department of Indian Affairs claiming that the Six Nations women of St. Peter's Church had 100 pairs of socks ready to be shipped. She furthered claimed that this ban was discriminatory against the Six Nations as there were small pox infected areas of Brantford and other communities and they were still allowed to knit and ship socks (Letter from Evelyn Davis to M.A. Brown (RG 10, Vol. 6763, File 452-5 Part 1, Reel C-8509 War 1914-1918 – Correspondence regarding Funds Awarded to the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League for Knitting done for Indians Overseas)).

²³⁶ Letter from Evelyn Davis to M.A. Brown (RG 10, Vol. 6763, File 452-5 Part 1, Reel C-8509 War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Funds Awarded to the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League for Knitting done for Indians Overseas).

²³⁷ Brant Aryan Society Report of the Aryan Society and of the Six Nation Indians Womens Patriotic League, County of Brant (Brant Aryan Society, 1916), 17.

²³⁸ Excerpt from the Six Nations Council Minutes from 7 December 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 6763, File 452-5 Part 1, Reel C-8509 War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Funds Awarded to the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League for Knitting done for Indians Overseas).

²³⁹ Excerpts from varying Six Nations Council Minutes (RG 10, Vol. 6763, File 452-5 Part 1, Reel C-8509 War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Funds Awarded to the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League for Knitting done for Indians Overseas).

Nations Patriotic League.²⁴⁰ A similar request to the Council was also made by the Haldimand Patriotic Association in October of 1916 which met the same fate as the Brant County Patriotic Society's request.²⁴¹

The Six Nations also contributed to various war funds. In 1914, the Six Nations Chiefs extended the offer of \$1500 and their warriors if needed to the Imperial authorities as a token of the alliance that existed between the Six Nations and the British Crown.²⁴² The Department of Indian Affairs responded to this request claiming that they could not send the money to the Imperial authorities, but it could be given to the Canadian Patriotic Fund.²⁴³ This offer, according to the Six Nations Visiting Superintendent Gordon J. Smith was unacceptable to the Six Nations as they did not believe themselves to be part of Canada and therefore wanted the money to be given directly to Britain.²⁴⁴ Because of this stipulation, the Six Nations offer was not accepted. In 1917, the Six Nation sent lawyer A.G. Chisholm to purchase \$150,000 in war bonds. Although it is unknown what happened with this request, as this amount was not accounted for in the after-war accounting of war contributions by the Department of Indian Affairs. Duncan Campbell Scott was also surprised that the Six Nations sent a lawyer to be the middleman between the Department and the Six Nations.²⁴⁵ Further, in November 1917, the Six Nations Council authorized the Department of Indian Affairs to invest any and all of Six Nations

²⁴⁰ Excerpt from the Six Nations Council Minutes from 2 May 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-2 Part 2, Reel C-8508 Contributions from Indians to War Funds).

²⁴¹ Excerpt from the Six Nations Council Minutes from 10 October and 9 November 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-2 Part 3, Reel C-8508 Contributions from Indians to War Funds).

²⁴² Excerpt from the Six Nations Council Minutes from 15 September 1914 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-2 Part 1, Reel C-8508 Contributions from Indians to War Funds).

²⁴³ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Gordon J. Smith 21 September 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-2 Part 1, Reel C-8508 Contributions from Indians to War Funds).

²⁴⁴ Letters from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 26 September, 14 October, and 26 October 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-2 Part 1, Reel C-8508 Contributions from Indians to War Funds).

²⁴⁵ Letters from Duncan Campbell Scott to the Six Nations 28 March 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 3195, File 492-946, Reel C-11338 Six Nation Agency – Investment by the Band in War Loan Bonds).

money into Canada's Victory War Loan for a period of five years.²⁴⁶ All of these requests must not have led to any action by the Department as only one \$50 donation appears from the Six Nations in all of the Department of Indian Affairs accounting during and after the war and it was from the Six Nations Patriotic League, not the Council. Most other money amounts offered by the Six Nations are listed in the category titled "Amounts which the Indians desired to contribute from their funds, but which for various reasons were not accepted".²⁴⁷ According to the Six Nations accounting of their war donations, they gave about \$1700, which did not include the money offered by the Six Nations Council in the November 1917 Victory War Loan.²⁴⁸

The Six Nations Council also supported the war effort in other ways. In 1915, they supported a proposal to establish home gardens for children to grow food. According to Superintendent Gordon J. Smith, "the council was most sympathetic with the object [the gardens] and I believe that home gardens will be taken up enthusiastically by the parents and children."²⁴⁹ This was not the only time the Six Nations would aid in food production for the war effort. The Six Nations Council, in March 1917, debated the possibility of beginning a Greater Production League which would bring more agricultural land into production to provide food for the war effort. The only concern of the Council was who would be in control of the League: the Federal government and the Department of Indian Affairs or the Six Nations Council. According to the Council, warriors and women were willing to aid the government in increasing food production within the Territory,

²⁴⁶ Six Nations Council Minutes from 27 November 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 1741, File 63-32 Part 8, Reel C-15024 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1917-1918).

²⁴⁷ Ontario: Contributions to Local Patriotic, Red Cross, and other War Funds (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-2 Part 3, Reel C-8508 Contributions from Indians to War Funds).

²⁴⁸ Six Nations Council Minutes from 2 May 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 1741, File 63-32 Part 7, Reel C-15024 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1916-1917). This is the figure that the Six Nations Council came up with in May 1917. More money could have been given or offered by the Council from this point to the end of the war.

²⁴⁹ Gordon J. Smith's summary of Six Nations Council minutes 27 May 1915 (RG 10, Vol. 1739, File 63-32 Part 4, Reel C-15023 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1916-1917).

but Chiefs, ...do not want any white man to come to us and we understand that this was all made up before it was brought before the Council and we wish to say that you Chiefs it is your place to administer all the Affairs of our Reserve but the Department of Indian Affairs is gradually and surely alienating the minds of some of the members of the Six Nations by its assuming as pretending to assume absolute and entire control of all the affairs of the Six Nations which it has no equitable right to do and yet it has not hesitated to exercise the same in many instances to the great disadvantage of the Six Nations Councils and its individuals (sic).²⁵⁰

By 20 April 1917, the Council and the Department of Indian Affairs came to an agreement on the matter and the Brantford Expositor reported that the Six Nations were going to organize their own Greater Production League. The League, although proposed to the Council by Superintendent Smith, was to be headed by Chiefs Harry Martin and A.G. Smith, and had a committee that reported to the above mentioned Chiefs made up of members of the Six Nations Agricultural Society and missionaries in the Territory. All of this was to be overseen by Charles McGibbon, Indian Inspector for Ontario, and R.H. Abraham, agricultural representative for the Department of Indian Affairs.²⁵¹

The Six Nations Council also supported the actions of their soldiers and their British allies during the war. On receiving word of the death of Lt. Cameron D. Brant, Chief A.G. Smith delivered condolence for him which emphasised Lt. Brant's sacrifice and the alliance relationship between the Six Nations and the British Crown.²⁵² This practice was also observed by the Council when it received word of Lord Kitchener's death in 1916. Chief A.G. Smith was again asked by the Council to deliver the condolence, a draft of which was sent to the

²⁵⁰ Six Nations Council Minutes from 19 March 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1742, File 63-32 Part 9, Reel C-15024 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1918).

²⁵¹ Brantford Expositor, 20 April 1917.

²⁵² Six Nations Council Minutes from 4 May 1915 (RG 10, Vol. 1739, File 63-32 Part 4, Reel C-15023 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1894-1915).

Department of Indian Affairs and King George V.²⁵³ Excerpts from this condolence were also published in the Brantford Expositor 10 June 1916.²⁵⁴

There were only two times during the war that the actions of the Six Nations Council may have made it look like the Council was not supporting its soldiers. In February 1916, the Council heard and rejected a proposal from Six Nations soldiers stationed in Ohsweken to provide for them uniforms in which to play football, baseball, and lacrosse in.²⁵⁵ The other action that may have seemed like the Council was against their soldiers and their families was when the Council ruled that it would refuse to pay for the funeral orders of killed in action Six Nations soldiers in December 1916. The Council understood that the Canadian government had provisions already in place to pay for the funeral orders of their soldiers and since all Six Nations soldiers fighting in the war enlisted in the Canadian military, the funeral costs would already have been provided for.²⁵⁶ Although this action seems to have been accepted by the Six Nations community, it was viewed somewhat disfavouredly by Superintendent Smith. When Harriett John, mother of killed in action Six Nations soldier William Lickers, applied to the Council for a grant to bury her son, the Council rejected her claim. Although Smith's correspondence with the Department does not ask the Department to overrule the Council's rejection of Harriett John's request, the tone in his report hints at some dissatisfaction with the Council's ruling.²⁵⁷

Recruiting within the Grand River Territory could, at times, be difficult. There had always been reluctance from the Six Nations whenever Canadian and British military institutions

²⁵³ Charles McGibbons summary of the Six Nations Council minutes 27 June 1916 and Six Nations Council Minutes from 6 June 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 1740, File 63-32 Part 6, Reel C-15023 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1916).

²⁵⁴ Brantford Expositor 10 June 1916.

²⁵⁵ Six Nations Council Minutes from 1 February 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 1740, File 63-32 Part 6, Reel C-15023 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1916).

²⁵⁶ Six Nations Council Minutes from 5 December 1916 (RG 10, Vol. 1741, File 63-32 Part 7, Reel C-15024 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1916-1917).

²⁵⁷ Gordon J. Smith's summary of the Six Nations Council Minutes 19 June 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 1741, File 63-32 Part 7, Reel C-15024 Minutes of Six Nations Council – Six Nations 1916-1917).

attempted to establish themselves within the Territory as seen in Capt. J.S. Johnson's establishing of a company of the Haldimand Rifles within the Territory and the rejection of the Royal Six Nations Regiment in 1896. Recruiting for the First World War would follow this trend. Although enlistment in the war was never officially banned by the Six Nations Council, individual Chiefs of the Council openly and actively discouraged Six Nations enlistment in the First World War during the pre-conscription years.

In the beginning of the war, the Canadian government did not want Native soldiers to enlist as officially, they feared that Germans would not extend to them the rules of 'civilized warfare,'²⁵⁸ but as mentioned above, 60 men from the Six Nations and New Credit area were able to enlist soon after war was declared. These enlistments were allowed due to the chaotic method of enlistment that was authorized by Canada's Minister of Militia, Sam Hughes. Hughes called for local recruitment offices to be in charge of their own enlistments. In some cases, during the initial confusion before the official announcement that recruiting stations were open and accepting recruits, local recruiters began recruiting without official permission from Federal authorities.²⁵⁹ Although the official response of Canada's military was that there was no colour barrier when it came to enlisting, the Canadian Militia Council, in a position that was never made public to any of the lower ranked military authorities doing the recruiting, forbade the enlistment of Native peoples.²⁶⁰ This unknown policy explains how so many Six Nations and New Credit men were able to enlist while others, like the group of Cape Crooker Native men who applied to four separate recruitment stations, were rejected.²⁶¹ This also shows that the military authorities

²⁵⁸ Summerby, 6 and ²⁵⁸ James W. St. G. Walker "Race and Recruitment in World War I: Enlistment of Visible Minorities in the Canadian Expeditionary Force" *Canadian Historical Review* Vol. LXX, No. 1 (1989), 4.

²⁵⁹ A. Fortescue Duguid "The Outbreak of War 28th June – 22 August 1914" in the *Official History of the Canadian Forces in the Great War 1914-1919* Vol. 1: From the Outbreak of War to the Formation of the Canadian Corps August 1914 – September 1915 (Ottawa: Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1938), 23.

²⁶⁰ James W. St. G. Walker, 7 and 4.

²⁶¹ James W. St. G. Walker, 5.

surrounding the Grand River Territory were not unaccustomed to seeing Six Nations and New Credit men in uniform. In a recent study of Six Nations enlistments, historian Andrew Iarocci found that 152 of 293 Six Nations First World War enlistees listed that they had past militia experience, most with the 26th Middlesex Light Infantry or the 37th Haldimand Rifles.²⁶² Since the original recruitment order from Sam Hughes called for “officers in the Reserve and others with military experience”,²⁶³ many Six Nations men were more than qualified to serve in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. In his 1914 annual report, Superintendent Gordon J. Smith also found that out of 1100 able bodied Six Nations men, 390 were employed in other activities other than farming.²⁶⁴ The majority of these men would have been employed outside of the Territory in the surrounding communities of Brant and Haldimand Counties. The integration of Six Nations men into the outside communities and the existing military establishment was already completed by the dawning of the First World War.

As mentioned in chapter two, Ontario’s pre-war militarism was used as a way to acculturate minorities into the Euro/Canadian mindset. For many Native peoples, this was also the case, but this also could have had larger social implications. Canada’s military held the opinion that Native soldiers should not be segregated into their own regiments. By integrating them with non-Native soldiers, the Native soldiers would be assimilated into the military ideal of service for the defence of the Canadian and British lifestyle.²⁶⁵ Although militarism was supposed to be used for the end goal of assimilation, military service itself was supposed to be a

²⁶² Andrew Iarocci as cited in P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Katharine McGowen, 94. Iarocci further states that according to his research on attestation papers of Six Nations members, 60% of Six Nations Grand River enlistees said they had past militia experience (Andrew Iarocci Shoestring Soldiers: the 1st Canadian Division at War, 1914-1915 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 294n).

²⁶³ A. Fortescue Duguid, 23.

²⁶⁴ Gordon J. Smith as cited in P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Katharine McGowen, 94.

²⁶⁵ R. Scott Sheffield “Indifference, Difference, and Assimilation: Aboriginal People in Canadian Military Practice, 1900-1945” in Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Craig Leslie Mantle (Kingston, Ontario: The Defense Academy Press, 2007), 64.

privilege reserved for white Europeans.²⁶⁶ This exclusion of minority groups from military participation also meant, for Native people like the Six Nations, that their inclusion meant social mobility within the non-Native community. With militia units also being stationed in local areas, the unit itself became integrated into the shared local “kinship” rituals that not only brought civic pride to the unit itself, but also provided civic pride for the members of the local area. For the soldiers, non-Native and Native alike, this meant that through the militia, they could network with upper classes and gain a higher social standing, employment, and entrance into political organizations like the Conservative party.²⁶⁷ In this way, many of the Six Nations men that enlisted to fight in the First World War may have had other motivations for enlisting other than their community’s traditional position and alliance to the British Crown.

Through the various histories about the First World War, one can find many reasons why non-Native people enlisted. At face value, many of these reasons match with reasons why men from various Native populations enlisted, but with some analysis, it can be seen that these reasons, although similar, were quite different. One of the more popular explanations for individual war participation was loyalty to the Crown. As mentioned in previous chapters, this reason seems to be true for both Native and non-Native enlistees, but when analyzed, we can see that this reason has many implications for the non-Native community that were not necessarily

²⁶⁶ R. Scott Sheffield, 61.

²⁶⁷ Mike O’Brien “Manhood and the Militia Myth: Masculinity Class and Militarism in Ontario, 1902-1914” Labour/La Travail Vol. 42 (Fall 1998), 125, 127, 128 and Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein Marching to Armageddon: Canadians and the Great War 1914-1918 (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys Limited, 1989), 9. An example of this political affiliation within Six Nation society can be seen in the family of Six Nations Chief A.G. Smith. Chief Smith was a staunch supporter Canada’s Conservative Party within Grand River Community. His two sons, A.G.E. Smith and C.D. Smith were both serving officers in the 37th Haldimand Rifles and both served in the First World War. Whether Chief Smith’s support of the party came before or after his sons enlisted with the 37th is unknown. Another example of Conservative Party support, Six Nations nationality, and military enlistment can be found in the original head of the Tuscorora Company, 37th Haldimand Rifles, Lt. Col. William Johnson Kerr. Kerr, who rallied Six Nations men in 1837, was a staunch supporter of the Conservative Party (John Moses, Donald Graves, and Warren Sinclair A Sketch Account of Aboriginal Peoples in the Canadian Military (Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 2004), 40). Dr. Peter Oronhyatekha Martin also viewed his militia experience as a way to further his personal professional, and business interest (John Moses, Donald Graves, and Warren Sinclair, 45).

true for Native enlistees. For the non-Native enlistee, this loyalty to the Crown was based on duty and patriotism²⁶⁸ while for the Native enlistee, this loyalty was based on treaty agreements and historical ties to the Crown.²⁶⁹ Although some arguments can be made that some members of various Native nations also enlisted to serve the empire as they had been told to do as children in normal and Residential Schools²⁷⁰ and through other patriotic celebrations as mentioned in previous chapters, this argument negates the fact that these ideas were brought into Native communities from people outside the Native communities.

Another reason to enlist that needs to be clarified is the want for adventure.²⁷¹ Although non-Native and Native men alike did enlist looking for adventure, this adventure for the Native enlistee was a means of escape from the Canadian government's paternalistic, oppressive, and stagnant Reservation system.²⁷² This seeking of adventure can also be seen as a reclaiming and reasserting of the Native men's masculinity. With the imposition of the reservation system and the change to large scale European style farming in the place of traditional hunting and migration patterns, the men in Native communities, especially those who had internal militaristic traditions, felt emasculated and through the enlisting in the war, these men were trying to reclaim the dignity and respect they thought they had lost. By enlisting these men were not only trying to reconnect to their cultural traditions, but give back honour to themselves and their

²⁶⁸ A. Fortescue Duguid, 8 and Dennis Winter Deaths Men: Soldiers of the Great War (London: Penguin Books, 1978), 32.

²⁶⁹ Janice Summerby, 8, L. James Dempsey "The Indians and World War One" Alberta History 31, 3 (1983), 34 and Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War I (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1999), Vii and 46.

²⁷⁰ This teaching of patriotism to children in schools serves as another reason why Native and non-Native men enlisted in the First World War (Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 52 and Terry Copp "The Military Effort, 1914-1916" in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honor of Robert Craig Brown David Mackenzie ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 38). According to J. Castell Hopkins, schools during the war continued in this vain. Schools became a place where war work was promoted to children, the war was made a part of History classes, and the Ontario government even produced its own text books to teach students about the war (J. Castell Hopkins The Province of Ontario in the War: A Record of Government and People (Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1919), 30).

²⁷¹ A. Fortescue Duguid, 8, Winter, 32, Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up: The Canadian Soldier and the First World War (Toronto: Random House, 1993), 51, 52, Janice Summerby, 8, Dempsey Warriors of the King, 46.

²⁷² Dempsey Warriors of the King, 10.

communities.²⁷³ The pressure placed on the enlistees to enlist could have also persuaded men to enlist from both the Native and non-Native communities. The majority of this pressure came from the pulpit and recruitment rallies.²⁷⁴ Once again, for First Nations communities, both of these forms of pressure were from community outsiders trying to impose the Canadian and Imperial government's wishes onto their community. These people were therefore seen as agents of the Canadian government who were acting to further oppress their community.²⁷⁵ Pressure to enlist could also come from those inside the community. Not only did recruitment rallies use returned soldiers from local communities to speak and convince their fellow townspeople to enlist, but some enlistees would also try to convince their friends and family to enlist.²⁷⁶ This was the same for Native communities across Canada.²⁷⁷

The last reason for enlistment for both Native and non-Native soldiers alike were the possible economic benefits.²⁷⁸ The first economic benefit a soldier would receive was his pay. For the Canadian Expeditionary Force, a lieutenant would receive \$3.60 a day, a Non-Commissioned Officer \$2.30 a day and a private \$1.10 a day.²⁷⁹ Although this rate of pay was higher than any other allied soldier during the First World War, for the average person living in

²⁷³ Neal McLeod Cree Narrative Memory: From Treaties to Contemporary Times (Saskatoon: Purich Publishing, 2007), 81 and 91 and L. James Dempsey Warriors of the King, vii, L. James Dempsey "The Indians and World War One", 3, and Fred Gaffen, 15.

²⁷⁴ Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 52 and 24 and Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein Marching to Armageddon: Canadian and the Great War 1914-1919 (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys Limited, 1989), 22.

²⁷⁵ Janice Summerby, 22 and L. James Dempsey Warriors of the King, 20.

²⁷⁶ Dennis Winter, 32, and Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 51 and 56. Family members and friends enlisting together were commonplace in Six Nations enlistments. Also, A.G. Smith's sons Capt. A.G.E. Smith and Capt. C.D. Smith were used in this way when they were brought home to speak in recruitment rallies within the Territory.

²⁷⁷ Janice Summerby, 8.

²⁷⁸ Dennis Winter, 32, Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein, 10, Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 50, Robert Rutherford, 46-47, Janice Summerby, 22, and "Canadian Indians and World War One" Saskatchewan Indian Federated Collage Journal 1, 1 (1984), 68.

²⁷⁹ Terry Copp, 58.

1914, the private's daily wage was less than a junior clerk's or an unskilled labourer's wage, but was higher than the daily wage paid to a farm labourer.²⁸⁰

On top of the daily wage, the soldier would receive a uniform, shelter, three meals a day, and free medical and dental care.²⁸¹ Enlisting in the army also meant benefits for your family through charitable organizations like the Canadian Patriotic Fund and separation allowances. Separation allowances were assigned pay from the soldier that was given to his family through the Canadian army while the C.P.F. money was given to a soldier's family or dependents from charitable groups who raised money locally.²⁸² If a private decided to sign up for a separation allowance, the family could assume to receive a monthly allowance of \$20.00.²⁸³ This amount would only be applied to the soldier's family if certain conditions were met. First, proof of marriage had to be provided. If the soldier and his wife were married through common law or a non-state recognized marriage ceremony, the application was rejected. If a man had separated from his wife, the wife could receive a separation allowance in lieu of her support payments. Children were also eligible to receive a separation allowance if they were too young to work. Boys, to receive this money, had to be under the age 14 and girls had to be under the age 16. This age limit was later raised to boys under the age 15 and girls under the age of 17. Widowed parents could also receive a separation allowance only if they could prove that there was no other income coming into the household and this proof had to be supported by a letter from the clergy

²⁸⁰ Many men from Six Nations worked as farm labourers in the pre-war period.

²⁸¹ Terry Copp, 58, Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein, 50, Tim Cook At the Sharpe End: Canadians Fighting in the Great War, 1914-1916 (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007), 28, Tim Cook Shock Troops: Canadians Fighting in the Great War, 1917-1918 (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008), 569 and Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 184.

²⁸² The Hamilton and Brantford C.P.F. began as independent charitable groups but eventually affiliated themselves with the national organization (Desmond Morton Fight or Pay, 80.).

²⁸³ Gaffen, 32 and Desmond Morton "Supporting Soldier's Families: Separation Allowance, Assigned Pay, and the Unexpected" in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honor of Robert Craig Brown David Mackenzie ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 199.

or a member of the C.P.F.²⁸⁴ This money for a widowed parent could be cut if the son ever married during the war.²⁸⁵ In Quebec and Ontario, there were 8,000 families receiving money from the C.P.F. at an average of \$16.85 a month²⁸⁶ with the average Hamilton, Ontario family receiving \$20.09 a month.²⁸⁷ Many different factors had to be assessed in order to see if a soldier's family was eligible to receive any money from either fund. One of the factors was the terms the enlistment. Many of the soldiers early in the war enlisted by claiming that they were single because single men were preferred by the Canadian army and wives had the right to refuse to let their husbands enlist. If this lie was told, wives and children of the soldiers could have been left destitute.²⁸⁸ Also, if a soldier enlisted or was transferred to a railway battalion, their families were no longer eligible for C.P.F. support as they usually worked far from the lines and made extra working pay, which would be added to their separation allowance.²⁸⁹ This would have affected many Native families as Native recruits were funnelled into railway or labour battalions either as they enlisted or after their original battalions were broken up once they went overseas.²⁹⁰ Native soldiers' families also did not receive their separation allowance pay directly from their family member's pay. Usually, the money from the soldier's pay was paid directly to the Indian Agent or Superintendent, who would then see to it that the money was spent wisely by the soldier's dependents.²⁹¹

²⁸⁴ Desmond Morton "Supporting Soldier's Families: Separation Allowance, Assigned Pay, and the Unexpected", 203.

²⁸⁵ Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 236.

²⁸⁶ Robert Rutherford, 97.

²⁸⁷ Desmond Morton Fight or Pay: Soldiers' Families in the Great War (Victoria: University of British Columbia Press, 2004), 92.

²⁸⁸ Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 236.

²⁸⁹ Desmond Morton "Supporting Soldier's Families: Separation Allowance, Assigned Pay, and the Unexpected", 213.

²⁹⁰ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Eugene Fiset, 15 January 1917 (RG10, Vol. 6766, File 452-13, Reel C-8511, Reports and Correspondence Regarding the Recruits and Enlisted Indians 1914-1918).

²⁹¹ Fred Gaffen, 32.

This, plus the backlog of separation and C.P.F. fund cases lead to lengthy delays in the distribution of money to soldier's dependents Native and non-Native alike. For the C.P.F., 30,000 families across Canada applied to it in the beginning of 1916. This figured doubled by the summer of 1916.²⁹² Separation allowances did not fair any better. In 1917, out of the 200,000 separation allowance files processed nationwide, 40,000 of them were in a state of limbo due to fraud investigations and other matters.²⁹³ For the Six Nations, these funds would cause many problems. In May 1917, the Haldimand Patriotic Society went to the Six Nations Council and proposed withdrawing half of its C.P.F. funding from the families of Six Nations soldiers. The Council asked Inspector McGibbon "to write the headquarters of the said society and inform them that when the Recruiters came upon the Reserve for men they held out to them the amount and moneys their families would receive, and they enlisted under these terms and of course they (the Haldimand C.P.F. and/or the Canadian government) would be expected to keep their word"²⁹⁴ It was well known in the Six Nations community that the economic benefits to enlistment were played up by recruiters within the Territory with some recruiters offering a \$5.00 signing bonus and a free trip to Europe if the war ended before the newly enlisted troops made it overseas.²⁹⁵ Problems with administering these funds also plagued individual soldier's families. In April 1918, Superintendent Smith was asked to find out what happened to the separation allowance or any other money that was given to Levi Hope's family as his wife was

²⁹² Desmond Morton "Supporting Soldier's Families: Separation Allowance, Assigned Pay, and the Unexpected", 208.

²⁹³ Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 236.

²⁹⁴ Six Nations Council Minutes, 2 May 1917 (RG10, Vol. 1741, File 63-32 Part 7, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1916-1917).

²⁹⁵ James W. St. G. Walker, 13.

now in the Hamilton Asylum. Smith could find no reference to any money being paid to Hope's family from the various agencies.²⁹⁶

The actual recruitment of Six Nations men did not begin in earnest until 1915. With the realization that the war was not going to be as short as predicted and with Prime Minister Robert Borden's promise to the Imperial authorities that Canada would raise and commit 500,000 troops for the war effort, the first racial barrier to fall in minority recruitment was the allowance of Native Canadian enlistment.²⁹⁷ For the Six Nations, this demand for troops meant the creation of 114th Battalion, the Brock's Rangers; nicknamed after the historical connection between Sir Isaac Brock, the Battle of Queenston Heights, the Six Nations, and the Six Nations service in the War of 1812. Recruitment and command for the 114th was first given to Col. E.S. Baxter from Cayuga, Ontario. Before the war, Baxter commanded the 37th Haldimand Rifles and was well acquainted with both Six Nations men in the militia system and the untapped potential of manpower within the Grand River Territory. One of the first problems for Baxter was the confusion that the order for the creation for the 114th caused. The original idea of the Departments of Indian Affairs and Militia specified the 114th would be an all Native fighting unit. For recruiters and Commanding Officers of existing units, many questions arose like whether this proposal was a call for the open enlistment of Native peoples or just a call for the enlistment of Brantford and area's Native population, were more all Native units to be formed, were all Native enlistees to be funnelled into this unit, and were all existing Native people already in the Canadian forces supposed to be transferred into this battalion?²⁹⁸ Baxter's biggest complaints were regarding the last two questions mentioned in the above mentioned list. Not

²⁹⁶ Gordon J. Smith's summary of the Six Nations Council Minutes, 9 April 1918 (RG10, Vol. 1742, File 63-32 Part 9, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1918).

²⁹⁷ James W. St. G. Walker, 8.

²⁹⁸ James W. St. G. Walker, 9.

only did some Commanding Officers not want to transfer their Native recruits, some Native peoples themselves did not want to be in a unit with their traditional enemies, the Six Nations.²⁹⁹ Baxter also found that other battalions that were to be raised in Hamilton, Brantford and Dundas were already recruiting on the Grand River Territory and enlisting Baxter's potential recruits.³⁰⁰ Baxter, and his successor Col. Andrew T. Thompson,³⁰¹ were able to clear up many of these problems and were also able to have their own recruiter. This recruiter was honorary Lieutenant Charles Cooke, a Six Nations man who also worked as a clerk for the Department of Indian Affairs.

Cooke himself also faced many problems when recruiting within the Grand River Territory. Many minor problems like snow storms in February 1916 and unpaved and muddy roads during the spring thaw meant that not only were people unable to attend any of the planned recruitment rallies, but Cooke himself could not travel to actively recruit. Another problem for Cooke was the pre-war paranoia of many of the people of Six Nations. One of Cooke's primary ways to recruit men for the 114th was to go door to door and see if anybody in a household would enlist. Fearing that they would be pressed into service, if anyone in a neighbourhood saw Cooke, who would dress in his Lieutenant's uniform that was purchased for him by Col. Thompson to impress potential recruits,³⁰² they would notify others and the men of eligible military age would head for the forests.³⁰³ Cooke and Baxter also complained of individual Chiefs of the Six Nations protesting his recruitment of Six Nations men. In December 1915, Baxter complained to

²⁹⁹ James W. St. G. Walker, 9, Barbra M. Wilson, cxii and Letter from J.D. McLean to H. Thoburn 14 June 1916 (RG10, Vol. 6766, File 452-13, Reel C-8511, Reports and correspondence regarding the recruits and enlisted Indians 1914-1918).

³⁰⁰ Barbra M. Wilson, cxi and Lackenbauer and McGowen 102.

³⁰¹ Andrew Thompson took over command of the 114th 31 October 1916 and held command until the battalion was disbanded for reinforcements after it landed in England. Thompson was also the grandson of David Thompson of the Grand River Navigation Company. The author tried to gain access to the Thompson family papers at Ruthven National Historic Site but was denied permission to do so by the site's Chief Administrative Officer.

³⁰² Lackenbauer and McGowen, 109.

³⁰³ Lackenbauer and McGowen, 104.

his superiors that Chiefs Nelles Montour and Harry Martin were pro-German and were actively preventing enlistments by speaking out against enlisting at a recruitment meeting. By January 1916, after an internal investigation, it was found that the Chiefs were not pro-German, but their position on the war was being misunderstood by Baxter.³⁰⁴ Cooke himself would later complain that Chiefs William Smith, Chauncey Garlow, and Harry Martin were against his recruitment drive.³⁰⁵ These Chiefs were most likely reminding their men of the traditional Six Nations protocol for going to war, as opposed to actively discouraging the men from enlisting.

In all, Baxter, Cooke, and Thompson were able to recruit approximately 300 Canadian Native men to the 114th which included a 30 piece all Six Nations brass band.³⁰⁶ Many of the 300 men were from various Six Nations groups from the Grand River, St. Regis, Caughnawaga (Kahnawake), and Muncey. Other Native groups that made up the 114th were from New Credit, Manitoulin Island, Gibson, and as far away as Manitoba.³⁰⁷ Like many militia battalions raised during the First World War, the soldiers were housed locally in the surrounding areas. Since D Company of the 114th was made up exclusively of Six Nations men, they were billeted locally in various private homes near the 114th Head Quarters which was located on the Ohsweken Fairgrounds. This local approach to recruiting brought the battalion closer to the public with its manoeuvres and training being reported in the local newspapers.³⁰⁸ The Six Nations Patriotic League also made and presented the 114th Battalion with a regimental flag which contained

³⁰⁴ Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre Warriors: A Resource Guide (Brantford: Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre, 1986), 19.

³⁰⁵ Lackenbauer and McGowen, 105. Cooke was also known for allowing only pro-enlistment Chiefs, like A.G. Smith, J.S. Johnson, J.C. Martin and Joseph Montour, while denying other Chiefs who had other views on the war, to speak at his recruitment rallies.

³⁰⁶ 26 of these bandsmen would be killed in action during the war (Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre Warriors: A Resource Guide, 19.

³⁰⁷ Lloyd King, 2 and Summerby, 7.

³⁰⁸ Lloyd King, 3, Lackenbauer and McGowen, 105, and Rutherforddale, 74.

traditional Six Nations symbols side by side with symbols that represented the British Crown.³⁰⁹ In July 1916, the battalion was ordered to Camp Borden for further training. By autumn 1916, rumours spread that the 114th was going to go overseas. When these rumours were rumoured to be false and the unit was to stay in Canada for the winter, many Six Nations men deserted the battalion and headed home. When the rumour about the 114th heading overseas proved to be true, many of the men that deserted made their way back to the battalion at Camp Borden.³¹⁰ Many Six Nations families made their way to Camp Borden as well to say their good-byes. Because of these trips, soldiers like Wesley Burnham, was able to say goodbye his wife, daughter, and son before he made his trip overseas.³¹¹ He would not see his family again until he returned after the war. Those who could not see their loved ones off at Camp Borden made their way to Toronto to wave at the troop trains as they passed.³¹² Once the 114th reached England, it was disbanded with most of its men being absorbed by the 36th Battalion³¹³ with others being posted to various forestry, construction, or railway battalions.

The next big recruitment drive for the Six Nations was brought about by the most contested part of the First World War for Canada: Conscription. When Prime Minister Borden introduced the Military Service Act in May 1917, Native groups across Canada protested. This protest caused confusion for Canada's military and judicial authorities. E.L. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice wrote Duncan Campbell Scott asking if Native populations in Canada were indeed exempt from national registration in September of 1917. Scott replied that the Military Service Act should be applied to Native people and could find no treaties that countered

³⁰⁹ Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre, 20 and the Brantford Expositor 13 September, 3 October, and 4 October 1916.

³¹⁰ Duncan Campbell Scott, 298.

³¹¹ Nina Burnham in a speech given at the Warriors conference 13 November 1986. Tapes in the author's possession.

³¹² Lloyd King, 3.

³¹³ Appendix 1 Canada in the Great World War Vol. 7: Special Services, Heroic Deeds, Etc. (Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1921), 332.

this opinion.³¹⁴ According to the Native population of Canada, this was not true. There were many arguments that Native peoples thought excepted them from the Military Service Act ranging from negotiated treaty rights to Native peoples being wards of the state and therefore not citizens under Canadian law. The Six Nations, however, had one other argument that they used to combat conscription: their allied status to the British Crown. Under this argument, members of the Six Nations could not be conscripted into the Canadian armed forces as they were not citizens of Canada, but citizens of an independent nation that was already allied to Great Britain. Within the Grand River Territory, the Chiefs refused any registration to take place and advised their people to take no notice of the Act and, most importantly, not to register.³¹⁵ Chief J.S. Johnson, who was appointed by the Department of Militia to set up a tribunal to hear the cases of exception under the Military Service Act, wrote Duncan Campbell Scott claiming that the Chiefs would not allow him to use the Six Nations Council House as a venue for the tribunal.³¹⁶ Scott, surprised that the loyal Six Nations would deny the tribunal use of the Council House, wrote Superintendent Smith to instruct the Chiefs that Johnson was allowed to use the Council House for his tribunal.³¹⁷ The Council House itself had been used with permission from the Six Nations Council for military purposes before including a recruitment rally held by Fredrick Loft in February 1917,³¹⁸ but as far as the Council was concerned, the Council House was not going to be used for the forced conscription of their people into Canada's armed forces. After the Chiefs still refused Johnson access to the Council House and after Scott found that the Military Service

³¹⁴ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to E.L. Newcombe 1 October 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20, Reel C-8512, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians).

³¹⁵ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 31 October 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20, Reel C-8512, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians).

³¹⁶ Letter from J.S. Johnson to Duncan Campbell Scott 16 October 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20, Reel C-8512, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians).

³¹⁷ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to J.S. Johnson 19 October 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20, Reel C-8512, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians).

³¹⁸ Six Nations Council Minutes 7 February 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 1741, File 63-32, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1916-1917).

Council did not have the right to commandeer a building for tribunal purposes, Scott advised Smith and Johnson to rent the Council House for the tribunals.³¹⁹

Throughout 1917, the Six Nations used every means at their disposal to protest the Military Service Act. In November 1917, the Council wrote appeals to the Governor General and to King George V, and even sent delegations to Ottawa to stop Six Nations registration.³²⁰ In October 1917, during the unveiling of the Alexander Graham Bell Memorial in the City of Brantford, Secretary of the Six Nations Council Asa R. Hill appealed to the Governor General, the Duke of Devonshire, to see to it that the Six Nations were exempted from the Military Service Act. Hill argued that the Six Nations had already committed 300 men in the war and their overall population was small. For this reason, Hill requested that if Six Nations men were to be drafted, the people of Six Nations would like these men not to go overseas, but instead stay in Canada for home defence.³²¹ The Governor General responded to Hill's speech, but did not say anything about the conscription of Six Nation men.³²² At the close of 1917, the appeals from the Six Nations did nothing to change anyone's mind about the Six Nations legal position within the Military Service Act. In a letter, Duncan Campbell Scott assured Lt. Fredrick Loft, now stationed in France with 71 company of the Canadian Forestry Corps, that the Native peoples in Canada were still subject to conscription, so Loft would have nothing to worry about as far as the

³¹⁹ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Gordon J. Smith 2 November 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20, Reel C-8512, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians).

³²⁰ Various Letters, telegrams and petitions (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20, Reel C-8512 War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians).

³²¹ Transcripts of Speeches at the Unveiling of the Bell Memorial at Brantford, Ontario, on October the Twenty-Forth, 1917.

³²² Transcripts of Speeches at the Unveiling of the Bell Memorial at Brantford, Ontario, on October the Twenty-Forth, 1917. According to F. Douglas Reville, the Duke of Devonshire's response to Hill's address was "fitting" (Reville, 317).

recruitment of Native peoples were concerned.³²³ In the end, all the appeals from Six Nations amounted to a delay in date of their eventual registration.³²⁴

With the dawning of 1918, confusion about the Military Service Act, as it pertained to the Six Nations, was rampant. In January of 1918, the Governor General issued an exemption for Canada's Native peoples from military service based not on their treaties and agreements with the British Crown, but instead based on the fact that the Native population could not vote and were wards of the state.³²⁵ This exemption caused confusion which left Superintendent Gordon J. Smith unsure if members of Six Nations were completely exempt from the Act and, if they were, what was he to do about the members of Six Nations who had already been conscripted?³²⁶ This exemption left the Six Nations with the feeling that they were exempt from registering under the Military Service Act.³²⁷ In the face of this confusion was a message given by Superintendent Smith which ordered all missionaries within the Grand River Territory to tell their parishioners that they had until January 31st to register for an exemption.³²⁸ Anglican Missionary Edwin Lee wrote the Governor General in the hopes of clarifying the matter for his parishioners and to ask the Governor General to extend the deadline for registration as the weather had been so bad on the Sunday he was to announce the deadline, many in his parish did not attend the Sunday service. He also noted that, to his knowledge, the announcement about the deadline was only given to Christian missionaries in the Territory, so the traditional followers of

³²³ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to t. F.O. Loft 12 November 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 6766, File 452-13, Reel C-8511, War 1914-1918 – Reports and Correspondence Regarding the Recruits and Enlisted Indians 1914-1918).

³²⁴ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 21 November 1917 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20, Reel C-8512, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscripting of Indians).

³²⁵ Draft of Legislation from the Governor General 17 January 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20 Part 2, Reel C-8513, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscripting of Indians).

³²⁶ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 22 January 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20 Part 2, Reel C-8513, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscripting of Indians).

³²⁷ Except from the Six Nations Council Minutes 29 January 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20 Part 2, Reel C-8513, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscripting of Indians).

³²⁸ Letter from Edwin Lee to the Governor General 1 February 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20 Part 2, Reel C-8513, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscripting of Indians).

Six Nations may not even be informed that there was a deadline for exemptions.³²⁹ By 5 February 1918, Duncan Campbell Scott announced that the Governor General's exception only relieved the members of Six Nations from military service, but did not in fact release them from registering.³³⁰

By March 1918, the conflict caused by the Military Service Act had reached a fevered pitch. Six Nations men who refused to register were being notified that they must comply with their date of registration and some men were even being arrested. The Six Nations Council sought legal representation from J.W. Bowlby who notified the Council that under their treaty rights with the British Crown, they did not have to register.³³¹ This advice flew in the face of the opinions of Duncan Campbell Scott and the Federal government who claimed that the Six Nations did not have any special status within Canada and that they were subjects, not allies, to the British Crown. Superintendent Smith thought that more education about the Act may be needed as some within the Territory were confused about what the registration meant. Some thought the registration still meant military service, while other thought that once you registered you were immediately enfranchised into the Canadian state.³³² As the registration day approached in June 1918, tensions were high. The Six Nations Council told their people not to register, there were rumours that there would be armed people outside the register buildings who would not permit anyone to enter them, and ex-Chief A.G. Smith was not only assaulted while

³²⁹ Letter from Edwin Lee to the Governor General 1 February 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20 Part 2, Reel C-8513, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians). The announcement about the exemption deadline was read in the Six Nations Council on 29 January 1918.

³³⁰ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Edwin Lee 5 February 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6768, File 452-20 Part 2, Reel C-8513, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the Conscription of Indians).

³³¹ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 5 June 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³³² Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 5 June 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

he was on his way to register, but was threatened with further bodily harm if he did register.³³³

Registration day closed on the Grand River Territory without incident and with not many Six Nations men registering, but it was rumoured that many had made their way to Brantford to register and many were still registering at the Six Nations Post Office.³³⁴

This did not mean that the registering conflicts were over between the Six Nation and the Federal authorities. By the end of June 1918, Six Nations member Wesley Martin was arrested in Brantford for failure to register.³³⁵ Immediately, the Six Nations Council volunteered to pay for Martin's defence.³³⁶ In the face of this turmoil, the Six Nations Council took it upon themselves to issue their own registration cards which stated that the cardholder was a member of the Six Nations and drew annuity money. The front of the card had an excerpt from the Treaty of Paris on it that said that Native peoples were not to be molested. This card was also signed by the Deputy Speaker of the Council, Levi General.³³⁷ According to Duncan Campbell Scott, the Six Nations had no authority to issue registration cards and the cards themselves were deemed worthless in the eyes of the Federal government.³³⁸ By July 12, Wesley Martin was found guilty of not registering and ordered to pay a fine, which the Six Nations Council agreed to pay.³³⁹ Duncan Campbell Scott received word of court's decision from Superintendent Smith on 19 September 1918. The same day it was reported that Seth Newhouse, another member of Six

³³³ Letters from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 14 and 19 June 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians). A.G. Smith resigned from Council on 2 May 1917.

³³⁴ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 24 June 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³³⁵ Letters from Gordon J. Smith to the Department of Indian Affairs 29 June 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians) and the Brantford Expositor, 28 June 1918.

³³⁶ Brantford Expositor, 6 July 1918.

³³⁷ Letters from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 6 and 8 July 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³³⁸ Letters from Duncan Campbell Scott to Gordon J. Smith 5 and 8 July 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³³⁹ Brantford Expositor, 12 July 1918.

Nations, had a warrant issued for his arrest after he failed to appear in front of a conscription tribunal.³⁴⁰

The conflict caused by the Military Service Act did much to strain the relationship between the Department of Indian Affairs and the Six Nations. Superintendent Smith went as far to say that “If the Indian soldiers were only home from the front with their influence against the present system, I believe it would be an opportune time to have the system changed to an elective council. The law abiding Indians have no confidence whatever in the council or its decisions and are disgusted with the present display of lack of patriotism and duties.”³⁴¹ As far as the Provincial and Federal governments were concerned, the Six Nations were just one of many groups seeking exemption from the Military Service Act. Not only were various Native groups and other ethnic minorities seeking exemption, French Quebec, farmers, labourers, men with families, and fit men alike from Ontario were also trying to find some way to be exempt from the Act.³⁴²

As for the Six Nations relationship with the City of Brantford, the war seemed to strengthen their relationship. During the registration problems faced by Six Nations, the City of Brantford continued to allow unregistered members of Six Nations to shop, eat, and travel within the City. The only reported incident during the registration was between two unregistered Six Nations men and McHutcheon’s Bakery. According to Superintendent Smith, the unregistered Six Nations men threatened McHutcheon that if he did not deliver bread to unregistered men’s

³⁴⁰ Letters and News Clipping from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 19 September 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³⁴¹ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott 5 July 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³⁴² Jack L. Granastein “Conscription and the Great War” in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honour of Robert Craig Brown David Mackenzie ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 66 and 69. In his study of conscription during the First World War, Granastein found that nation wide, nine out of ten men that were called up for conscription applied for an exemption. This number does not include the men that ran away or hid when they were called by the tribunals (Granastein, 68).

families, they would assault him.³⁴³ Mayor M.M. MacBride even sent a telegram to the Governor General asking for him to make a visit to the Six Nations and explain registration to them as he felt that there were still some misunderstandings about what registration actually meant to the people of Six Nations.³⁴⁴ Race relations wise, the relationship between the Six Nations and the Brant County's Aryan population was stronger then ever. Twice during the war, the Aryan Society of the County of Brant and the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League published propaganda pamphlets and sold them for fifty cents a book for fundraising purposes.³⁴⁵ In both publications, the Six Nations were connected to the Aryan race and King Arthur and their service in the war was directly connected to service to their Aryan forefathers.³⁴⁶ This racial peace between the two groups could have stemmed from the racial tensions found in Brantford toward its Eastern European population.

Throughout Ontario, there was a general fear about the role recently immigrated Eastern Europeans would play in the war.³⁴⁷ For Brantford, this was no exception. During 1907, Brantford received a large influx of Eastern Europeans including Armenians, Polish, Austrians, Hungarians, Bulgarians and Greeks. By 1911, Brantford claimed to have the largest immigrant population per capita then any other Canadian city.³⁴⁸ By the eve of World War One, Brantford had a total recent immigrant population of 30,000 within the city.³⁴⁹ Racial tensions toward

³⁴³ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to the Department of Indian Affairs 3 July 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³⁴⁴ Telegram from M. MacBride to the Governor General 17 July 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 6770, File 452-26 Part 1, Reel C-8514, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding the National Registration of Indians).

³⁴⁵ Receipt for \$10.00 for the Printing of 20 booklets 15 December 19?? (RG 10, Vol. 6763, File 452-5 Part 1, Reel C-8509, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Funds Awarded to the Six Nations Women Patriotic League for Knitting Done fro Indians Overseas).

³⁴⁶ Brant Aryan Society Report of the Aryan Society and of the Six Nation Indians Womens Patriotic League, County of Brant (Brant Aryan Society, 1916), 1-10 and Brant Aryan Society Women's Institute The Voice of the Knight and his Lady, St. George and Maneita. The Knight of the Holy Grail. The Red Prince of the Sunlight and the Soil and Waneita, the Queen of the North (Brant Aryan Society, 1918).

³⁴⁷ Barbra M. Wilson, lxxi-lxxii.

³⁴⁸ Gary Muir, 92.

³⁴⁹ Gary Muri, 96.

these new arrivals had flared before the war began, but the war itself added fuel to an already burning fire. With the outbreak of the war, the local Hungarian population was accused of harbouring weapons and anybody with a German sounding last name was viewed with suspicion.³⁵⁰ In November 1914, 97 Turkish people were rounded up and detained in the Brantford Armouries when the Turkish government announced that it was joining the war on the German side. It was rumoured that these now imprisoned Turks had planned to blow up the Brantford Post Office. In the end, any prisoner with Canadian citizenship was released, while the others were sent to a Federal holding centre in Kingston, Ontario for enemy aliens.³⁵¹ Although many Ontario towns saw fit to use these Federal holding centres as convenient places to dispose of out of work foreign nationals,³⁵² Brantford was suffering from the opposite problem. Since Brantford was one of the largest industrial centres in Canada at that time, its industries needed manpower during the war. Since many of these new arrivals were not British subjects, they were not able to be conscripted under the Military Service Act. This left these men free to pursue the economic benefits Brantford had to offer at the expense of those men who were British citizens and therefore available for registration.³⁵³

As racial tensions grew in Brantford against Eastern Europeans, the racial divide that separated the citizens of Brantford and the Six Nations grew smaller. This can best be seen in the pages of the local newspaper, the Brantford Expositor. Within the newspaper's pages, the Six Nations participation was well documented. Beginning in 1915 with the formation of the Six Nations Women's Patriotic League and the death of Cameron D. Brant, and ending in 1919 with Six Nations men returning home and the awards they earned while overseas, the pages of the

³⁵⁰ Gary Muir, 125 and Barbra M. Wilson, lxxi-lxxiii.

³⁵¹ Gary Muir, 126.

³⁵² Barbra M. Wilson, lxxi.

³⁵³ Gary Muir, 126 and 124.

Expositor combined the Six Nations and the people of Brantford's war effort into a single struggle. With enlistment lists, casualty lists, and list about men returning home after the war, both the people of Brantford and the Six Nations, who had sons overseas, bonded and supported each other.³⁵⁴ This opened a common and public dialogue between the two groups that had not existed before. For some, the newspaper's stories also showed it readers the shared loyalist history that Brantford and the Six Nations shared. When conscription came along in 1917, the Six Nations objections were published in the newspaper, but did not generate as much controversy as Quebec and the English speaking farmers protests against the Military Service Act.

When the war finally ended in November 1918, the Six Nations Council asked Chief David John "to return thanks to the Great Spirit for the final victory He has seen fit to give the allied Nations and for His blessings and Guidance during this great conflict ... Chief David John accepted the invitation of the Council and did at some length invoke the Blessings of the Great Spirit according to the customs of the Six Nations and congratulated His Majesty the King and also the Canadian Government" for their roles in the allied victory in the First World War.³⁵⁵ The Council also sent a telegram to King George V "to renew their pledges of loyalty to the British Crown and join with Your Majesty in thanks to the Great Spirit for the blessings of peace."³⁵⁶ It would seem that after the war, things for the Six Nations were going to slip into their pre-war patterns of loyalty to the Crown. Nobody expected the turmoil the next decade would have in store for the Six Nations, the Federal government, and the Department of Indian Affairs. All the population of Brantford could do was to watch the events as they unfolded.

³⁵⁴ Enos T. Montour, 97-98.

³⁵⁵ Six Nations Council Minutes 12 November 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 1742, File 63-32 Part 10, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1918-1919).

³⁵⁶ Six Nations Council Minutes 19 November 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 1742, File 63-32 Part 10, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1918-1919).

Chapter 5: Interpretations of Six Nations War Evolvement

After the highly publicized Six Nations support of the British/Canadian war effort during the First World War, community outsiders developed opinions about what this support meant. The question then became did this support mean that the Six Nations had become fully integrated into the greater Canadian society or was this support based on something else entirely? In the main, most people outside the Grand River community viewed the Six Nations support for the war as the Six Nations being a part of Canada as they supported the Canadian cause. Following the Hometown Horizons research model, the post-war opinions of two groups outside the Grand River community, the people of the City of Brantford and the officials in the Department of Indians Affairs and their overseers in Ottawa, have to be analyzed. As seen in chapter 4, the war brought the Six Nations and the people of the City of Brantford closer together. As both groups shared in the struggles of the war years, the post-war years looked to be a new beginning in the Brantford/Six Nations relationship. For the central administrating centres for the Department of Indian Affairs in the City of Brantford and Ottawa, the interpretation of the Six Nations' support for the war were similar: the Six Nations, as British subjects, were ready for Canadian citizenship as they had proven themselves capable of such responsibilities through their participation in the war effort. This opinion clashed with the ideas of the Six Nations Council who saw the war as further proof that the Six Nations were, now more then ever, capable of their own autonomy without the Canadian government's interference. These conflicting opinions would be played out in the public sphere through newspaper coverage and public debates in Ottawa. It is these sources that will be analyzed in this chapter.

By the Great War's conclusion in 1918, the Six Nations Council had successfully navigated the tide of war on their own terms. They held to the opinion of being allies to Britain

and, through the successful rejection of the Canadian government's Conscription registration, furthered this ideal in the minds of their own people and the outside community. This already existing national sentiment would grow in the wake of the idealistic and nationalistic euphoria found in Canada during the post war years. During the 1920s and into the 1930s, the memory of the First World War was used by the Canadian authorities to unite Canada as a nation. The problem with this unity myth was that it was based on British middleclass ideas of social unity and status quo. Peace time Canada was to be a model of pre-war Canada with every political, ethnic and religious group being content in their place within Canada's existing social hierarchy.³⁵⁷ For the Department of Indian Affairs, this was no exception. First Nations populations were to go back peacefully to their place within Canadian society as it existed during the pre-war years.

For the Department of Indian Affairs, the nationhood argument of the Six Nations had been debated in the pre-war years and was deemed to be a falsehood. This idea was continued into the post-war years. Six Nations Superintendent Gordon J. Smith outlined this position in a paper delivered to the Brant Historical Society in 1910. He claimed that the Haldimand Proclamation, which was issued after the American Revolution to compensate the Six Nations for their lost lands in New York State, only gave the Six Nations the right of possession to the land and it did not give the land to them fee simple.³⁵⁸ This meant that the Six Nations had the right to occupy the land, but did not own it. He further stated that the line in the Proclamation that states that the land was "to be held and enjoyed by them [the Six Nations] in the most free and ample manner and according to the several customs and usages" had been quoted so often by

³⁵⁷ Jonathan Vance *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997), 11 and 261.

³⁵⁸ Gordon J. Smith "Land Tenure in Brant County" in *Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society* (Brantford: Brant Historical Society), 34.

the Six Nations “that it has become practically shibboleth” to them as a people.³⁵⁹ Smith claimed that this idea of nationhood had to be false as there are many instances early in the Six Nations/British relationship where the Six Nations said they wished to live under the protection of the King.³⁶⁰ It was also known that just prior to the First World War, Smith did not hold a high opinion of the Six Nations Council. In a paper that was delivered to the Ontario Historical Society, Smith referred to the Six Nations Council as an “assembly of inflexible legislators”.³⁶¹ Although it is hard to pin down the Smith’s opinions of the Six Nations during the post war years, F. Douglas Reville’s book the History of the County of Brant may provide us a hint into the mind of Smith. Reville used Smith as a primary source for his book when it came to the history of the Six Nations. In his second chapter on Indian History, Reville states that not only was the Six Nations Council fire extinguished in 1777 in New York never to be rekindled again, he further states that the Haldimand Proclamation only gave the Six Nations the right to occupy the land and it did not give them the land fee simple.³⁶² Both of these claims seem to echo Smith’s opinions about the Six Nations during the years leading up to the First World War.

Smith’s superior at the Department of Indian Affairs, Duncan Campbell Scott, also held the same opinions about the Six Nations and their traditional government. According to Scott, the Six Nations Council had

³⁵⁹ Gordon J. Smith “Land Tenure in Brant County”, 35-36.

³⁶⁰ Gordon J. Smith “Land Tenure in Brant County”, 41. Smith’s paper made a direct reference to a council held in Onondaga Village on 1 March 1809 where the English transcripts of the meeting record this statement as being made. Anthropologist John Noon counters this opinion and claims that this meeting was not the Six Nations giving up their sovereignty to the Crown, but was a process of autolimitation where the Six Nations, still holding full sovereignty, voluntarily limited its power to another sovereign power. Noon also explains that this autolimitation also accounts for instances when the Six Nations Council consulted the Indian Act in various wills and estate cases (John A. Noon. Law and Government of the Grand River Iroquois (New York: The Viking Fund, 1949) 73).

³⁶¹ Gordon J. Smith “Captain Joseph Brant’s Status as a Chief, and Some of His Descendents” in Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society 12 (1914), 95.

³⁶² F. Douglas Reville History of the County of Brant (Brantford: The Hurley Printing Company, 1920 (1982)), 28 and 35.

been in operation among the Iroquois from legendary time. The council thus elected considers itself as having the status of a sovereign body, basing its theory on the contention that the Iroquois are an independent national entity in alliance with, but not subject to the British Crown, a pretension that the Canadian government is naturally not disposed to recognise.³⁶³

The reality of the situation, according to Scott, was that all First Nations governments across Canada were the same as any city or town's municipal government and not international entities.³⁶⁴ Throughout the war, although he never provided a reason why, Scott thought that the Six Nations Council was not acting in the best interests of their community. He viewed First Nations participation as more than just individual acts of patriotism, but Native veterans would not go back to their old ways and instead would act as leaders in their communities to make the old ways of their communities obsolete.³⁶⁵ In this way, Scott viewed the Native communities in Quebec and Ontario as self-supporting and living a modern life in the same way as any other Canadian.³⁶⁶ To Scott, the Six Nations no longer needed the paternalistic protection of the Department of Indian Affairs. In Scott's mind, the Six Nations should give up being wards of the state and embrace full Canadian citizenship. Although it is not known whether or not Smith received his opinions about the Six Nations from Scott or if Scott based his opinions about the Six Nations on Smith's recommendations, we do know that the cards were stacked against the Six Nations Council and their bid to be recognized as a separate nation during the post war years.

From 1917-1921, Duncan Campbell Scott's superior was Arthur Meighen, Canada's Minister of the Interior, and therefore, the head of the Department of Indian Affairs. During Meighen's administration of the Department, Meighen followed lock step with the advise of

³⁶³ Duncan Campbell Scott "The Canadian Indians and the Great War" in Canada in the Great War Vol. III, Guarding the Cannel Ports (Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1919), 302.

³⁶⁴ Duncan Campbell Scott "The Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada" in The Canadian Institute of International Affairs (1931), 10.

³⁶⁵ Duncan Campbell Scott "The Canadian Indians and the Great War", 302 and 327.

³⁶⁶ Duncan Campbell Scott "The Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada", 10.

Scott. In 1921, Scott was appointed a new minister when Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King appointed Charles Stewart as the Minister of the Interior. For Stewart, this post would be challenging and he would need the opinions of his subordinates to guide him, but, unlike Meighen, Stewart did not let his subordinates opinions dictate his policy. In September 1921, the British government had officially handed over any petitions and matters the Six Nations sent to them to the Canadian government. In a letter from Winston Churchill, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to Canada's Governor General Lord Byng of Vimy, Churchill wrote that "His Majesty has been pleased to command that, as the matters submitted in the petition lie within the exclusive competence of the Canadian Government, it should be referred to them."³⁶⁷ For Stewart, this meant that he was now in control of the Six Nations situation. Stewart committed to meet the Six Nations at various meetings to hear their side of the sovereignty argument. This was a bold step by Stewart as traditionally, the Department of Indian Affairs held the belief that the Six Nations were not a sovereign power, but were subjects to the Crown. This position was solidified by Scott's predecessor, J.D. McLean in 1908 when he claimed that the Six Nations accepted Canadian criminal law in April 1839³⁶⁸ and that the Six Nations themselves, in a petition sent to the Canadian government in 1890, stated that they were subjects to the Crown.³⁶⁹ Although Stewart would never say that he fully agreed with McLean's 1908 statements, Stewart always held that the Six Nations were not a sovereign nation, but were a people under the dominion of Canada.³⁷⁰

³⁶⁷ Brantford Expositor, 15 October 1921.

³⁶⁸ See John A. Noon in footnote 4.

³⁶⁹ Letter from J.D. McLean to J.S. Robertson, 2 October 1908 (RG 10, Vol. 3122, File 330,339, Reel C-11328, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence Regarding the Order in Council of 13th November 1890 Dealing with the Claim of the Six Nations to be Considered as "Allies" and not "Subjects" of the Crown).

³⁷⁰ In many of his speeches to the Six Nations, Stewart would allude to the fact the Six Nations were under the dominion of the Canadian state. An example of this can be found in a speech delivered to the Six Nation on 4 December 1922. In this speech, Stewart told the Six Nations that they should *remain* Canadian citizens (Brantford Expositor, 4 December 1922, emphasis added).

The first meeting between Stewart and the Six Nations was in May 1922 at the Ohsweken Council House. In his opening speech, Stewart told the Chiefs of the Council that he had read about the history of the Six Nations prior to his visit. He warned the Council that he was there to answer any and all questions they had about their status, but when it came to the question of their status, he was afraid that this line of questioning would cost the Six Nations a great deal. He further stated that “This is a question you must discuss when you discuss the question of status. We can come to an amicable arrangement. Perhaps the question of status would not be so important to you if I said I was here on behalf of the Government to tell you we intended doing nothing without your council’s cooperation.”³⁷¹ During his next meeting with the Six Nations, which was held in the main gymnasium at the Y.M.C.A. in Brantford, Stewart made his final appeal to the Six Nations. In his opening address, Stewart said that

My sole desire is to take back to the Government your desires and recommend them to the Government. You seem to have gone along all right up till now and as a new government we hope to overcome any new difficulties, but we think it would be to your advantage to remain as Canadian citizens. Some reports have reached me that have been disturbing. We want you to have the same freedom as your white brothers, but we must insist that we have law and order. We want even-handed justice and will demand this for everyone who is a subject of the British Crown.³⁷²

Although these meetings were reported to be a failure by the Brantford Expositor, the Six Nations Council thought the meetings were “a source of great good, and a better understanding between the Council and the Superintendent General would result therefrom.”³⁷³ It was as a result of these meetings a Royal Commission was appointed to look into the Six Nations case. This Commission, which was first suggested by the Six Nations in May 1922³⁷⁴ was to be made

³⁷¹ Brantford Expositor, 14 May 1922.

³⁷² Brantford Expositor, 4 December 1922.

³⁷³ Six Nations Council Minutes, 23 May 1922 (RG 10, Vol. 1745, File 63-32 Par 15, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1922).

³⁷⁴ This Council minute asked “the Dominion Government to...investigate the Indian Department with respect to the Six Nations financial affairs and that the Indians may be represented in the investigation (Excerpt from the Six Nations Council Minutes, 9 May 1922 (RG 10, Vol. 3229, File 571,571, Reel C-11344, Six Nations Agency –

up of three members: two men were to be appointed by the Canadian government and the Six Nations respectively with the other man being decided by the two group's representatives. The only condition that the Canadian government put on the Commission was that all three members of the Commission were to be British subjects. This clause derailed the talks about the Commission. Viewing this clause to be a ploy to have their legal council, New York (Rochester) lawyer George Decker, disqualified from the Commission, the Six Nations interest in the Commission dwindled. Superintendent Smith wrote Duncan Campbell Scott stating that the Six Nations rejected the idea of a Commission as they felt that their status had already been decided by the Imperial authorities. For this reason, according to Smith, the Six Nations felt that any commission looking into the affairs of the Six Nations should not be a Canadian one, but one made up of an international judicial committee.³⁷⁵ It was at this point that the Speaker of the Six Nations Council, Levi General, and Decker started looking into appealing the Six Nations case to the League of Nations, which further aggravated the Department of Indian Affairs and their view of the Six Nations.³⁷⁶

Staying true to his word that the Canadian government “must insist that we have law and order” within the Territory, Stewart authorized a detachment of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to establish a post in Ohsweken, the main village within the Grand River Territory, in December of 1922. This quick decision to dispatch the R.C.M.P. to the Grand River Territory was most likely due to the fears in post-war Canada of civil unrest. In the wake of the Winnipeg General strike in 1919, the “Red-scare” and fears of Bolshevism was firmly planted in the minds

Correspondence and Newspaper Clippings Regarding a Dispute Between the Federal Government and the Six Nations Council of Their Right to Hereditary Rule)). What specifically brought about this request is unknown.

³⁷⁵ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to the Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, 7 July 1922 (RG 10, Vol. 3229, File 571,571, Reel C-11344, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence and Newspaper Clippings Regarding a Dispute Between the Federal Government and the Six Nations Council of Their Right to Hereditary Rule).

³⁷⁶ For a good description of Six Nations and Department of Indian Affairs interactions regarding this appeal, see E. Brian Titley A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1986).

of Canada's political elite.³⁷⁷ Throughout the 1920s and 30s, although violence within civil demonstrations was increasing, military intervention in these instances was decreasing. The new tool implemented against the domestic dissidents was the R.C.M.P.³⁷⁸

Upon their arrival, the R.C.M.P. reported to the Expositor that they were not receiving any help from the people of Six Nations and they were trying to administer Canadian law in the face of much resistance.³⁷⁹ The R.C.M.P. also found that there was such a backlog of warrants that needed to be served, one Six Nations man who still needed to be served his warrant was murdered some six months back.³⁸⁰ The eight man R.C.M.P. detachment not only served warrants, but patrolled the Territory for illegal alcohol stills and evicted "squatters" from land set aside for soldier settlement, even though the land's occupants had been given permission to occupy the land by the Six Nations Council. This move by Stewart was heavily contested by the Six Nations Council as they considered the R.C.M.P. to be a foreign military force that had invaded their Territory on the orders of the government of Canada. On 8 December, Levi General sent a letter to Stewart demanding to know on whose authority the R.C.M.P. were ordered to intimidate and harass the Six Nations? According to General, the R.C.M.P. was forcing their way into people's homes on the grounds of investigating illegal liquor and on one occasion, "in broad daylight (noon) fired eight times to a fleeing old man of 60 years in age."³⁸¹

³⁷⁷ Bryan D. Palmer *Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991* 2nd ed. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1992), 200. When reminiscing about the post-war riots in Canada 20 years after the Winnipeg General strike, ex-Prime Minister Robert Borden stated that for the Canadian state "it became necessary in some communities to repress revolutionary methods with a stern hand and from this I did not shrink (Palmer, 200)." This mentality rooted in the minds of Canadian officials most likely effected Stewart's decision to post the RCMP within the Grand River Territory.

³⁷⁸ Palmer, 261. Palmer states that after 1917, the RCMP was turned inward against civilians. The RCMP began infiltrating political organizations and became involved in domestic covert operations (Palmer, 197).

³⁷⁹ The Brantford Expositor, 8 and 11 December 1922.

³⁸⁰ The Brantford Expositor, 8 December 1922. The murdered man in question was probably David Lickers who was murdered in September 1918.

³⁸¹ Letter from Levi General to Charles Stewart, 8 December 1922 (RG 10, Vol. 3329, File 571,571, Reel C-11344, Correspondence and Newspaper Clippings Regarding a Dispute Between the Federal Government and the Six Nations Council of their Right to Hereditary Rule).

General further stated that this move by Stewart was viewed by the Six Nations as a breach of faith to the agreements they reached during Stewart's visits to Brantford. On January 6 1923, the Six Nations Council cabled the Secretary of State for the colonies and the Prime Minister of Canada to protest the R.C.M.P. entering their Territory without their knowledge or consent.³⁸²

By 1923, Stewart was still trying to iron out the ill feelings between the Six Nations and the Canadian Government. His move bringing the R.C.M.P. into the Grand River Territory had backfired, the Six Nations were angrily demanding accountings of their money held by the Canadian government, and the Six Nations were now not agreeing to the Royal Commission proposed by Stewart in 1922. Stewart, still undeterred, was still looking for a suitable person to sit as the Canadian government's representative for the Royal Commission. The first person to be considered for this position was Judge C.A. Maston. Duncan Campbell Scott wrote to Maston about the job, but Maston rejected the offer due to an increasing judicial work load.³⁸³ When Scott heard of the protests from the Six Nations community about the Commission, Scott advised Stewart to take the offer of the Commission off the table as he felt the Six Nations had waited too long and, with all the good press about Stewart's dealings with the Six Nations, public opinion was strongly in favour of the Department.³⁸⁴ Stewart refused Scott's request and on 1 March, two letters, one from Duncan Campbell Scott to Charles Stewart and the other from Stewart to the Governor General, were sent recommending that Lt. Col. Andrew Thompson, ex-commander of the 114th Battalion, be appointed the Canadian government's representative on the Royal

³⁸² Six Nations Council minutes, 16 January 1923 By 1923, (RG 10, Vol. 1745, File 63-32 Par 15, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1922).

³⁸³ Letter from C.A. Maston to Duncan Campbell Scott, 17 January 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 2285, File 57, 169-1B, Reel C-11195, Headquarters – Correspondence, Reports, Memoranda, Publications, and Newspaper Clippings Regarding the Political Status of the Six Nations).

³⁸⁴ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Charles Stewart, 27 February 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 3229, File 517-517, Reel C-11344, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence and Newspaper Clippings Regarding a Dispute Between the Federal Government and the Six Nations Council of their Right to Hereditary Rule).

Commission to investigate the problems of the Six Nations.³⁸⁵ By 24 March Lt. Col Thompson had been appointed the Canadian government's representative to sit on the Royal Commission,³⁸⁶ and by 3 April, the Six Nations Council finally accepted the offer of a Royal Commission.³⁸⁷

Although the Six Nations did accept the offer for the Royal Commission, they still had some apprehensions that the Commission was not going to remain impartial.³⁸⁸ When the Six Nations Council was asked to nominate their member for the Commission, the Council refused as they were unsure if their sovereignty case was going to be taken up by the League of Nations.³⁸⁹ This response from the Council received further confirmation when Levi General, now in Rochester with Decker, wrote the Council advising that the Council "Have nothing to do with Colonel Andrew T. Thompson or anyone else that the Canadian Government appoints as a member of a commission...If you do, you loose all chance for regaining your status as an independent nation."³⁹⁰ The Council continued this opinion into September of 1923 with further demands to have their trust fund accounted for and placed in the Council's exclusive control.

When Thompson began his investigation in September of 1923, the Council still refused to take

³⁸⁵ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Charles Stewart and Charles Stewart to the Governor General, 1 March 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 3229, File 517-517, Reel C-11344, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence and Newspaper Clippings Regarding a Dispute Between the Federal Government and the Six Nations Council of their Right to Hereditary Rule). It is uncertain whether or not Scott or Stewart recommended Thompson first for the Commission as the dates on the letters are the same and, in the RG 10 file, Stewart's letter appears before Scott's. This could just be a coincidence, as it would be more fitting for Scott to advise his employer of Thompson, and then have Stewart advise the Governor General of this appointment.

³⁸⁶ Brantford Expositor, 24 March 1923.

³⁸⁷ Six Nations Council Minutes, 3 April 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 1745, File 63-32 Part 16, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1922-1923). Why the Six Nations now chose to accept the Commission is unknown.

³⁸⁸ These fears were not unfounded. As early as 1920, Duncan Campbell Scott and Superintendent Smith were planning what an elective Six Nations Council would look like and how the election districts would be marked out (Sally M. Weaver *Iroquois Politics 1847-1940*, Manuscript, 470). The rumors within the Six Nations community about the Department planning for an elective council were not made public to community outsiders until 22 November 1923 with an editorial by the new Superintendent for Six Nations C.E. Morgan (Brantford Expositor, 22 November 1923). Further proof that the Department of Indian Affairs was planning to enact an elected council was when the elected council was finally enacted in 1924, it was the 1920 election district map made by Scott and Smith that was used (Weaver *Iroquois Politics 1847-1940*, 470).

³⁸⁹ The Brantford Expositor, 6 April 1923.

³⁹⁰ Levi General as quoted in the Brantford Expositor, 28 April 1923.

part. Thompson, however, continued his investigations without the Council's input. He concluded his investigation on 1 October 1923 and submitted it to the Federal government on 22 November 1923, but it was not released, despite protests by the Six Nations and members of parliament for Brant and Haldimand Counties,³⁹¹ until August 1924. The report, as predicted by the Six Nations Council, advocated, amongst other things, the removal of the Six Nations traditional Council.³⁹²

By 25 April, Scott's premonition about Stewart and his handling of the Six Nations had come true. When presenting his annual budget for the Department of Indian Affairs, Stewart was praised by the government for his handling of the Department.³⁹³ Stewart himself was having doubts about his handling of the Six Nations. After the Thompson Report, Stewart saw the Six Nation Council as obsolete and unsuited for modern life,³⁹⁴ and when asked about whether or not traditional government systems should be used for western Native groups, Stewart responded that, "we have a great deal of difficulty on the Six Nations reserve about that very thing. They have a hereditary system there and a very strong exception is taken to it by a great many of the Indians on the reserve, and as a result, there is a conflict going on all the time...I would oppose the hereditary system against the elective, which I think is much more

³⁹¹ House of Commons debates, 31 March 1924 and 1 May 1924. After Mr. Sinn, the representative for Haldimand County, made his appeal for a copy of Thompson's report on 1 May 1924, Stewart responded that "The report is in our hands...I shall be very glad to put the report at the disposal of my honourable friends, but for reasons that I do not care to disclose we do not desire to make public at the moment." Why Stewart did not want to make the report public is not known.

³⁹² Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, 7 July 1922 (RG 10, Vol. 3229, File 571-571, Reel C-11344, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence and Newspaper Clippings Regarding a Dispute Between the Federal Government and the Six Nations Council of their right to Hereditary Rule). Although this statement is accredited to Superintendent Smith, further proof of this point can be found with the anti-climatic reaction of the Chiefs when the removal of their Council was read by Superintendent Morgan on 7 October 1924. This reaction shows that the Chiefs suspected this outcome from Thompson's report.

³⁹³ The Brantford Expositor, 25 April 1923.

³⁹⁴ John Leonard Taylor Canadian Indian Policy During the Inter-War Years 1918-1939 (Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1984), 160.

modern and much more in the interest of the Indian.”³⁹⁵ Ironically after three years of instituting the elective council, Stewart still continued in this line.

In certain instances we have power to override agitators in any band. We have difficulty at the moment on Six Nations reserve, and I say frankly that I think the trouble has come about largely because I have tried to be lenient with those Indians. I find in some cases that this is not the best policy to pursue, for there is not a single band in which there is not a fair percentage of agitators, who thrive on agitation in preference to working for their living. These agitators can always stir up a great deal of difficulty for the department.³⁹⁶

In these later recollections of his experience trying to arbitrate the divide between the Six Nations, the Federal government, and the Department of Indian Affairs, Stewart had to admit defeat and follow the advise of his underlings, Duncan Campbell Scott and Superintendent Smith, who was replaced by Lt. Col. Cecil E. Morgan on 27 September 1923 after Smith’s death in Brantford on 25 May 1923.

Local opinions about the Six Nations dispute with the Federal government varied town to town and city to city.³⁹⁷ In Hamilton, Ontario, the response was clear. On 9 May 1922, a reprint of a Hamilton Harold editorial appeared in the Brantford Expositor. The article claimed that the Six Nations claim of allied status to the Crown was “a matter of academic historical interest...but now they are putting it into effect by violating Canadian law and offering such resistance to the law officers. Such a state of things cannot be tolerated.”³⁹⁸ The editorial further stated that “They [the Six Nations] must be made to understand that the position they take is an impossible one, and that if they refuse to abandon it they are likely to lose such special privileges as they now enjoy.”³⁹⁹ For the people of the City of Hamilton, their position in the Six

³⁹⁵ House of Commons Debates, 24 April 1923.

³⁹⁶ House of Commons Debates, 15 February 1927.

³⁹⁷ This can be seen in the various newspaper clippings found in the Department of Indian Affairs files that related to this time period. The author found 30 plus identifiable articles from different newspapers across Canada in these files all of which had different opinions on how the Federal government should handle the Six Nations. These newspapers range in locality from Montreal, Quebec, to various towns and cities in Ontario, to Lethbridge, Alberta.

³⁹⁸ The Hamilton Herald as cited in the Brantford Expositor, 9 May 1922.

³⁹⁹ The Hamilton Herald as cited in the Brantford Expositor, 9 May 1922.

Nations/Federal government debate was clear: Six Nations were not sovereign unto themselves and if they kept pursuing this argument, they were going to lose more than they were going to gain.

In the City of Brantford, the mood about Six Nations sovereignty during the post-war years was hard to pin point. From the end of the war to the Canadian government's takeover of the Six Nations Council in 1924, the Brantford Expositor published over 200 stories about the Six Nations and their sovereignty. The majority of these stories were about the Federal government's dealings with the Six Nations. Very few of these stories were actually editorials or opinion pieces about the Six Nations, the war, and how the Six Nations war experience affected Brantford's view of the Six Nations in the post-war years. The first editorial about the Six Nations war experience that appeared in the Brantford Expositor was in January of 1919. In this editorial, it was noted that Brant County's first casualty in the war was Six Nations man, Lt. Cameron D. Brant and, in proportion to their population, the Six Nations gave more men to the war effort than Canada. The editorial also explained that the Six Nations were against enlistment and conscription because their custom of declaring war needed an appeal from the King. Predicted in the editorial were conflicts that were going to arise in the future. About enfranchisement, the editorial stated that "At present, every Indian can secure such citizenship by leaving the reserves and qualifying for such citizenship but few of them chose to make such a violent break from their own race."⁴⁰⁰ About the possibility of an elected council, the editorial stated that this question had come up in the past, but little was made of it. To conclude, the editorial stated that "Come what may of the agitation [move for an elected council], the Six Nations' Indians have played a noble part in the war, and their services are worthy of full

⁴⁰⁰ Brantford Expositor, 22 January 1919.

recognition. The blood of the Iroquois warriors of 1776 and 1812 ran true in the veins of their descendents in 1914-18.”⁴⁰¹

Also running through the pages of the *Expositor* was the debate over the support the Six Nations Council gave to its soldiers during the war. The first letter to the editor in this vein was published in May 1919 by Six Nations veteran, William F. Powless. In this letter, Powless claimed that the upcoming celebration planned by the Council for Six Nations’ returned soldiers was a farce as the Council itself did not support the soldiers during the war and “did everything in their power to discourage enlistment, they flatly refused to grant to the Patriotic Fund; they opposed Conscription, [and] they opposed registration...”⁴⁰² This letter opened a flood gate of letters about what the Six Nations support, or lack there of, meant in the post-war years. By 30 May 1919, returned Six Nations soldier Corporal John Butler tried to quell all debate about Six Nations support of the war. Claiming to have interviewed many returned Six Nations soldiers, Butler found that many understood why the Chiefs took the stand they did during the war and that this stand harboured no ill feeling between the veterans and the Council as the soldiers at the time knew that “when the proper time came they [the Chiefs] would...be glad to see every fit warrior to go and help their Ally, the King.”⁴⁰³ Butler also understood that no matter the stand the Council took during the war, there was always going to be people who would disagree with their stand. If they supported enlistment or conscription, there was always going to be someone claiming the Council took away their son or their farm help which, in turn lead to either the son’s death or the family’s loss of livelihood. Butler also reminded the reader that the Six Nations Council also aided the war effort and donated money to many patriotic purposes early in the

⁴⁰¹ *Brantford Expositor*, 22 January 1919. A similar story was printed in the *Brantford Expositor* 15 March 1920.

⁴⁰² William Powless as cited in the *Brantford Expositor*, 16 May 1919.

⁴⁰³ John Butler as cited in the *Brantford Expositor*, 30 May 1919.

war.⁴⁰⁴ Powless and others for or against Six Nations support of the war would write letters to the Expositor countering each other throughout 1919, which highlighted for the Brantford public that there may have been some discontent within the Territory during the war that they had not known before. By June 1919, the Six Nations Council weighed into the debate and told the Expositor where they thought this discontent was coming from. During a Council meeting on 3-4 June, the Council confronted Superintendent Gordon J. Smith about a circular he sent to Six Nations veterans that contained misstatements against the Council and their support during the war. The Council claimed that Smith himself was responsible for causing discontent within Six Nations and Smith himself withdrew all his false statements made within his circular.⁴⁰⁵ This was not the end of Smith's reprimanding by the Council. In 1922, the Council passed a resolution "to dispense with the services of Major Gordon J. Smith as the Six Nations Superintendent as he is the source of trouble and causes discontent among the people of the Reserve."⁴⁰⁶ To this allegation, Smith merely replied to his superiors that "the Council failed to prove any of these charges and in fact did not attempt to do so."⁴⁰⁷ This rationalization by Smith, however, did nothing to stop the Council's dissatisfaction with Smith's performance as their Superintendent.

When the Canadian government passed an Act allowing for the compulsory enfranchisement of Native populations in March of 1921, editorials about the Six Nations flared again in the pages of the Expositor. On 10 March 1920, with the possible rumours of the

⁴⁰⁴ John Butler as cited in the Brantford Expositor, 30 May 1919.

⁴⁰⁵ Brantford Expositor, 9 June 1919 and Six Nations Council Minutes, 3 June 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 11, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919). This was not the first complaint against Smith from the Six Nations Council. In 1907, the Council reported that Smith had been circulating rumours and agitating political critics within the Territory which ended with formation of a petition against the Council being sent to the Canadian government (Hill, 383).

⁴⁰⁶ Six Nations Council Minutes, 23 May 1922 (RG 10, Vol. 1745, File 63-32 Part 15, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1922).

⁴⁰⁷ Gordon J. Smith's Summery of Six Nations Council Minutes, 23 July 1922 (RG 10, Vol. 1745, File 63-32 Part 15, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1922).

government's compulsory enfranchisement policy coming to being, the staff editor of the Expositor published the statistics of enfranchisement nation wide. According to the editor, from 1860 to 1918, only 160 Native people nationwide were enfranchised. Since the government passed the Act in 1918 allowing for easier enfranchisement, over 200 Native people nationwide have been enfranchised with 100 of them being Six Nations.⁴⁰⁸ By 15 March, a letter by "One of the Six Nations" replied to the editor's column. In their letter to the editor, "One of the Six Nations" said that although many Six Nations veterans were against enfranchisement, they were, in the main, the targets of the compulsory enfranchisement with one veteran stating that "Enfranchisement...is no reward for the services our men have offered to the British, much less compulsory enfranchisement."⁴⁰⁹ The letter further charged that the compulsory enfranchisement bill was inconsistent as the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs admitted that many First Nations communities could manage their own affairs, but these people obviously could not make up their own minds about whether or not they should be enfranchised. The author concluded that "It will not make one lots of difference if the enfranchisement be given to the good Indians a hundred times over, they will still remain Indians."⁴¹⁰ In another letter to the editor, another person attributed the compulsory enfranchisement bill not a desire or will to reward Native peoples for their service during the war, but instead it was a way to take away Native reserves and give them to non-Natives, as the Canadian Government had tried to do in 1913 with the passing of the Oliver Act.⁴¹¹ Others would also weigh into this debate within the pages of the Expositor including Superintendent Smith himself on 18 March 1921. By the end of

⁴⁰⁸ Brantford Expositor, 10 March 1920.

⁴⁰⁹ Brantford Expositor, 15 March 1920.

⁴¹⁰ Brantford Expositor, 15 March 1920.

⁴¹¹ Brantford Expositor, 22 April 1920. The Oliver Act allowed for the removal of a Native Reserve nine miles away from a town or city with a population of ten thousand or more. A.G. Chisholm, legal advisor to the Six Nations, in an article that appeared in the Brantford Expositor 29 March 1921, also made this comparison.

the 1920-1921 fiscal year, 40 heads of family, along with 90 other family members, were enfranchised from the Grand River community.⁴¹²

Editorials about the Six Nations relationship with the British Crown also appeared in the pages of the *Expositor*. A staff writer for the *Expositor* wrote that “It has always been the boast of Britain that the Indians have been treated justly, kindly and generously and in return for this they [the Native people] have loyally served the British Crown...Canada is greatly indebted to the loyalty of the Six Nations’ Indians, and in dealing with them this should not be forgotten.”⁴¹³ This writer further stated that “The rights and privileges of the Six Nations under any treaties they made with Great Britain must be frankly recognised and fully honored.”⁴¹⁴ Another article in the *Expositor*, written about Six Nations’ stated that “from the time of their earliest contact Great Britain has recognized their [the Six Nations] rights and sovereignty. She [Great Britain] considered them as nations competent to maintain the relations of peace and war, governing themselves in their own way, with a distinct country of their own, with boundaries well defined.”⁴¹⁵ In this same issue of the *Expositor*, Elan Barefoot also reminded readers that contrary to what some people had stated in the *Expositor*, the Six Nations were never conquered by the British.⁴¹⁶

With all of these pro-Six Nations opinions in the *Expositor*, the Department of Indian Affairs made sure that their opinions were also represented within the *Expositor*’s pages. In an article entitled “The Indian Department”, the Department of Indian Affairs outlined what the role of the Department was to be in the post-war years. This article outlined for the reader the role of

⁴¹² Scott R. Thevithick *Conflicting Outlooks: The Background to the 1924 Deposing of the Six Nations Hereditary Council* (MA Thesis: University of Calgary), 87.

⁴¹³ *Brantford Expositor*, 12 May 1922.

⁴¹⁴ *Brantford Expositor*, 12 May 1922.

⁴¹⁵ *Brantford Expositor*, 13 May 1922.

⁴¹⁶ *Brantford Expositor*, 13 May 1922.

superintendent, how annuity money was provided for and how it was distributed, and the nature of the Mohawk Institute. The article also explained that “not one cent of public money is spent in the Reserve. The Indians build their own bridges, put in their own culverts, pay a doctor and teachers and mend roads.”⁴¹⁷ The only public money that was spent on the Six Nations was for the employees at the Indian Office in Brantford. On 7 April 1923, a similar article about the Mohawk Institute appeared in the pages of the *Expositor*. During 1922, two articles appeared claiming that all Native people in Canada were self-supporting and were no longer “shiftless and poverty-stricken”.⁴¹⁸ These articles used data collected across Canada to prove that the Native population held vast amounts of land, timber, and agricultural wealth, while not addressing specific communities that may have needed more assistance or Native treaty rights. With stories like these making their way to the *Expositor*’s reading audience, some from the Grand River Territory were questioning whether or not there may be propaganda stories against the Six Nations being published for the public’s consumption.⁴¹⁹

With these varied opinions about Six Nations war time participation, enfranchisement, relationship to the British Crown, and the role of the Department of Indian Affairs, the minds of the *Expositor*’s reading audience would have been flooded with varying ideas and opinions about the Six Nations. Although it is hard to tell exactly what people’s opinions of the Six Nations were, clear lines can be seen in certain instances. In some cases, Brantford’s citizens would write the Department with concerns about Six Nations issues. In March 1921, W.F. Cockshutt wrote a letter to Duncan Campbell Scott with a clipping of an *Expositor* newspaper article written by J.S. Johnson about enfranchisement. In his letter to Scott, Cockshutt said “I think he

⁴¹⁷ Brantford *Expositor*, 24 November 1920.

⁴¹⁸ Brantford *Expositor*, 25 March 1922 and 30 June 1922.

⁴¹⁹ Elias Johnson as cited in the Brantford *Expositor*, 1 February 1923.

puts the case fairly well from his standpoint, though I, of course, do not subscribe to all that he says, by any means.”⁴²⁰ To this, Scott replied to Cockshutt saying:

The article is worded in such a crafty manner that it would seem to be an Indian production, although some of the arguments are flavoured with the style of certain lawyer friends of ours. I need hardly say that the whole article is based on incorrect and fantastical assumptions I do not think it does any harm to have these matters discussed. I wish, however, that there would be a counter-blast from one of the Indians who appeared before the committee of the House of Commons last year and to like effect.⁴²¹

Whether or not Cockshutt agreed completely with Scott’s remarks is unknown. When compulsory enfranchisement was being debated, the Dufferin Rifles Chapter of the I.O.D.E. passed a resolution at their meeting on the 11 April 1921 “urging all that all steps be stopped in the matter of giving the Indians full citizenship, because of the rebellious feeling it was causing.”⁴²² In a letter to the editor, Evelyn H.C. Johnson, sister of Pauline Johnson, wrote from New York applauding this action by the I.O.D.E. In this letter, Johnson stated that “I doubt if there is another like instance whereby any public interest and friendly sympathy has been manifested towards those of their brothers who dwell in at their gates.”⁴²³ Johnson further reminded her readers that this was not the first time the Six Nations had been given the franchise: “That astute statesman, Sir John A. MacDonald first gave the Six Nations the franchise. But there were no strings to that gift. He did not meddle with the land he knew belonged not to the individual to dispose of as he saw fit to unscrupulous white men with oily words and slim money

⁴²⁰ Letter from W.F. Cockshutt to Duncan Campbell Scott, 21 March 1921 (RG 10, Vol. 2285, File 57,169-1A Part 2, Reel C-11195, Headquarters – Correspondence, Accounts, Reports, Memoranda, Blueprint and Newspaper Clippings regarding the Political status of the Six Nations).

⁴²¹ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to W.F. Cockshutt, 23 March 1921 (RG 10, Vol. 2285, File 57,169-1A Part 2, Reel C-11195, Headquarters – Correspondence, Accounts, Reports, Memoranda, Blueprint and Newspaper Clippings regarding the Political status of the Six Nations). The House of Commons Committee that Scott is referring to is the House Committee on Indian Enfranchisement. At this Committee, a number of Six Nations people did give testimony for and against compulsory enfranchisement.

⁴²² Brantford Expositor, 12 April 1922.

⁴²³ Evelyn H.C. Johnson as cited in the Brantford Expositor, 23 April 1921.

bags, but, to the people forever, because the Six Nations Indians are Allies of Great Britain (sic).”⁴²⁴

When Charles Stewart came to meet with the Six Nations, the Brantford Expositor, along with many in the City of Brantford, saw this as a sign of hope that the issues separating the Six Nations and the Canadian government would and could be bridged.⁴²⁵ Another clear instance of opinion about the Six Nations could be seen when the Six Nations appointed George P. Decker as their legal advisor. According to the Expositor this appointment could be “interpreted only as an incitement of the Indians to discontent and violence. The treatment of the Indians in this country is a purely Canadian affair which no American citizen ought to meddle. For Attorney Decker to abuse this privilege...by criticizing Canada’s treatment of her Indian population is unpardonable impertinence.”⁴²⁶ Even when the Six Nations were asserting their ability to appoint a non-British subject to represent them in the Royal Commission, the Expositor’s editor said that “The advise which had been given to them by a foreign advisor had been mischievous enough already.”⁴²⁷ Although the Expositor was not happy with the performance of Decker, they did not censor his opinions. In April of 1923, for example, the Expositor printed an article entitled “Decker Attacks Indian Department” in which Decker’s opinions, were neither censored or commented on by the Expositor’s staff.⁴²⁸

The announcement of a Royal Commission to look into the affairs of the Six Nations was announced in the Expositor 12 September 1923. With this announcement, the readers of the Expositor were told that this investigation would be an impartial commission headed by Col. Andrew T. Thompson, a man whose family had a long connection with the Six Nations, with

⁴²⁴ Evelyn H.C. Johnson as cited in the Brantford Expositor, 23 April 1921.

⁴²⁵ Brantford Expositor, 5 December 1922.

⁴²⁶ Brantford Expositor, 6 September, 1922.

⁴²⁷ Brantford Expositor, 7 December 1922.

⁴²⁸ Brantford Expositor, 20 April 1923.

Thompson's grandfather and father fighting with the Six Nations during the War of 1812 and the Fenian Raids, and Thompson himself being made an honorary chief of the Six Nations. Curious as to what would be said during the commission, the Expositor reported that within the Haldimand Deed, the Six Nations were referred to as Allies, but since they had now been settled in Ontario for nearly 140 years and had been under the control of the British and Canadian government since coming to this land, this claim was now illegitimate. The Expositor furthered its about face in its opinions about the Six Nations when it stated that "Since the late war, some Indians in research among their archives noticed the expression "allies" and began to agitate for a declaration of independence...Until this agitation started harmony prevailed between the Dominion Government and their wards."⁴²⁹

The Expositor covered all open sessions of Thompson's commission and published summaries of people's testimony within its pages. During the first day of the commission, the Expositor again gave the impression that this was going to be a fair and impartial commission where the faults of both the Six Nations and the Department of Indian Affairs would be investigated. Chief A.G. Smith testified that although the majority of the people within the Six Nations supported the traditional Council, in his opinion, an elected council, as advocated by the Department of Indian Affairs, would be better as the Department would be more willing to heed the elected Council's decisions. This opinion was countered by shouts from others present in the room and by Emily Tobicoe, who testified after Smith. Chief J.S. Johnson also spoke in favour of an elected council, but wanted to see changes in the amount of power the council was to have. If the council's power was to stay as described in the Indian Act, the elected council would have the same power as the current traditional Council. Fredrick Loft also gave testimony where he said that both traditional and elected councils had their faults, but the biggest fault of both

⁴²⁹ Brantford Expositor, 12 September 1922.

systems was the people that administer them. He was also quick to point out that the Six Nations were still better off than many First Nations communities. The only testimony that dealt with the Six Nations role during the First World War was given by Mrs. Samuel Styres. In her testimony, although she noted that she was a practicing Christian, she defended the traditional Council. She further stated that two of her sons fought in the war and one of them had been seriously wounded, but was not able to receive a pension.⁴³⁰ This concluded the first day of the commission.

On the second day of the commission, David Hill gave testimony where he referred to a petition that was sent from the 30 Six Nations soldiers stationed overseas to the Canadian government advocating an elected council. Hill stated that he had a petition signed by 2000 Six Nations people in support of the traditional Council.⁴³¹ He also claimed that many of the instances of agitation within the Grand River Territory were caused by the Department of Indian Affairs themselves when they disagreed with the Council's decisions. The Council had tried to improve by-laws and education, but it was all rejected by the Department.⁴³² Hill's testimony was countered in the next day's testimony. John Lickers, a teacher within the Territory, claimed that Hill's petition was fraudulent as it contained names of children unlike the petition that was sent from overseas which not only contained the names of Six Nations who were of age, but also the name of Lickers' son who was killed in action in France. Lickers further stated that the education reforms that he tried to bring into the Territory was stopped when Hill, then a member of the school board, voted to fire Lickers for going against the curriculum set by the Council. William Powless, a returned soldier testified to the fact that the Council had marginalized and

⁴³⁰ Brantford Expositor, 19 September 1923.

⁴³¹ Brantford Expositor, 25 September 1923. In its 25 September 1923 edition, the Expositor reported the number of signatures on Hill's petition to be 200. In its 27 September 1923 edition, Hill said the Expositor had misquoted him and he actually had 2000 signatures.

⁴³² Brantford Expositor, 25 September 1923.

slandered Six Nations soldiers during and after the war. According to Powless, the Council hindered recruiting by threatening enlistees with expulsion from Six Nations if they enlisted.⁴³³

Samuel G. Lickers also gave testimony about the Six Nations attitude during the war. According to Lickers, the Council's actions during the war had become distorted. The Haldimand Patriotic League promised Six Nations soldiers that their families would be cared for by the League, but midway through the war, the League threatened the Council that if it did not start giving the League grants, the League would cut off its support to Six Nations families. The Council told the League that they did not offer the money to the soldiers, and the League should honour their promises to the soldiers.⁴³⁴ As far as the whether the Six Nations should adopt an elective council instead of their traditional Council, Lickers said that Six Nations veterans "have lined up on both sides of the question which showed that their must be justice in the contentions of both",⁴³⁵ but he also testified that in many cases where the elected system had been implemented in groups of just one Native nation, it had proven to be a failure. With this in mind, how was it to work for the Six Nations who had many different nations in one territory? Lickers also asked the commission how the authority of the Crown was transferred to the Canadian government and how during this transfer, the Six Nations and other Native groups were made wards of the state without any consultation from the Native groups involved?⁴³⁶ This question was not responded to.

Many of the supporters of the traditional Council stayed away from the commission as they felt the conclusions of the commission had been made up long before the commission

⁴³³ Powless' opinions were later countered by testimony given within the Commission that the Six Nations Council had voted \$1500 to the Patriotic Fund and the money it gave to the Six Nations Patriotic League.

⁴³⁴ Brantford Expositor, 27 September 1923. This testimony is also supported by the Six Nations Council minutes for 2 May 1917 (RG10, Vol. 1741, File 63-32 Part 7, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1916-1917).

⁴³⁵ The Brantford Expositor, 27 September 1923.

⁴³⁶ The Brantford Expositor, 27 September 1923.

began. Foreboding of this opinion was reported by the Expositor in November of 1923 when Superintendent Morgan wrote a letter to the Expositor claiming that “there was a rumour that instructions had been received by me from the Indian Department to announce an elective council...as this rumour appears to have reached Brantford, and possibly other adjacent cities...I would take advantage of your columns to say defiantly that no such instructions has reached me and that I know nothing whatever about it (sic).”⁴³⁷ Whether or not anybody, veteran or community insider or outsider, supported an elective council, the Brantford Expositor announced on 7 October 1924 that the Six Nations traditional Council, on the recommendation of Col. Thompson, was to be replaced by an elective council as outlined in the Indian Act. With this change, the oldest form of government on the North American continent was suppressed by the Canadian Government.⁴³⁸

⁴³⁷ The Brantford Expositor, 22 November 1923.

⁴³⁸ The Brantford Expositor, 20 August 1924. The traditional Council still operates in Grand River Territory today, but the Canadian government continues not to acknowledge the Council as the Territory’s official governing body.

Chapter 6: The Six Nations' Veteran

As seen in Chapter 5, there were many interpretations of what participation in the war by the Six Nations meant to others outside of the Six Nations community, but this does not explain what the war experience meant to the Six Nations men that went overseas. Although over 260 plus Six Nations men would enlist and did go overseas, no single soldier's experience in war was identical; therefore each soldier who came back from the war would have coped with their war experiences differently. For the veterans from Six Nations, this coping was compounded by the political turmoil found within the Grand River community during the post-war years. This made the Six Nations veteran's homecoming bittersweet. On the one hand, the veterans were finally home from war, but on the other, they were being forced to choose between their Six Nations heritage and the Canadian state, both of which they had fought for in France. The Six Nations' veteran would play a critical role for both sides of the Six Nations/Canada debates with both sides claiming that the veterans supported their side, but how could 200 plus men, all dealing differently with their war experience, come to a unilateral decision on whether or not the Six Nations belonged inside or outside the Canadian state? What did the Six Nations' veteran actually think during these debates and why were they thinking this way? To understand the veteran's support of both sides in this debate, the veteran's experience overseas and their reactions to their community upon their return will have to be analysed.

In studies about Six Nations' World War One veterans, it has been proposed that the veterans acted as a unified body to rid the people of Six Nations from their traditional Council. This idea was first proposed by G. Elmore Reaman in his book, The Trial of the Iroquois.⁴³⁹ In

⁴³⁹ G. Elmore Reaman The Trial of the Iroquois (Toronto: Peter Martin and Associates Limited, 1967), 83. Although Reaman is the first scholar to say outright that the Six Nations soldiers were responsible for the 1924 take over the Six Nations traditional Council, anthropologist John A. Noon, in his book Law and Government of the Grand River Iroquois did say that the Six Nations Council's resistance to the Canadian government administered

this book, Reaman stated that all Six Nations soldiers went against their traditional Council by the act of enlisting in the Canadian armed forces without the Council's approval. According to Reaman, the Council passed a resolution refusing to recognize any Six Nations man who enlisted as the Council itself had not declared war on Germany.⁴⁴⁰ Reaman further stated that this position by the Council was resented by the Six Nations soldiers overseas and it was this that began the Six Nations soldiers plot to rid the Six Nations of their traditional Council.⁴⁴¹ This idea, more recently, has been continued by Six Nations scholar John Moses. Moses has proposed two reasons why Six Nations enlistment was an act against the Six Nations Council: the soldiers were either declaring their allegiance to Canada by enlisting in the Canadian army or that the soldiers themselves were descendents of Six Nations people who were already petitioning the Canada government to get rid of the Six Nations Council for one elected by majority male suffrage. When these soldiers came back to the Grand River Territory, they continued to petition of the Canadian government for an elected council and since, in the eyes of the Canadian government, these veterans were a new and important class among the Six Nations, the Federal authorities complied.⁴⁴²

These theories simplify the Six Nations veterans experience during and after the war. In fact, Six Nations veterans in the post-war period were not a unified group and were adjusting to being home from war as individuals. By placing the Six Nations veteran's homecoming

Soldier Settlement for the Six Nations veterans within the Grand River Territory fueled the returned soldiers against the Council (John A. Noon Law and Government of the Grand River Iroquois (New York: Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology (No. 12), 1949), 64).

⁴⁴⁰ No resolution claiming anything close to this statement has been found by the author in the Six Nations Council minutes.

⁴⁴¹ G. Elmore Reaman, 83.

⁴⁴² John Moses "The Return of the Native: Six Nations Veterans and Political Change at the Grand River Reserve, 1917-1924" in Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Creig Leslie Mantle eds. (Kingston: Canadian Defense Academy Press, 2007), 117 and 121 and John Moses "Political Change at the Grand River Reserve, 1917-1924" The Canadian Historical Association Bulletin 32, 3 (2006), 11.

experience in Rutherford's hometown horizon's theory, we can begin to understand the varying opinions of the veterans and the internal struggles these veterans encountered during this period.

The problems in re-adjusting to home life for the Six Nations veteran actually began while the men were still overseas. While overseas, all soldiers during the First World War were exposed to an alien environment marked by long periods of inaction with sporadic periods of intense and often violent action.⁴⁴³ This resulted in many cases of work exhaustion, lack of sleep, and in some cases, complete mental breakdown. One of the most important comforts a soldier had to look forward to were provided to them by their home country. Although the Grand River community did support their soldiers with various comforts, many Six Nations soldiers were completely unaware of this. This was because all the comforts produced by the Six Nations were added to larger local holdings of either the Brant or Haldimand branches of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. When these comforts were distributed to men overseas by the Canadian forces, it was unknown that the Six Nations community had contributed.⁴⁴⁴ For those affected Six Nations soldiers, it would have looked as though the people from Brant and Haldimand Counties were the only ones providing for them and that they were completely forgotten by their home community.

Material comforts were not the only thing being provided to soldiers by the Canadian government. Mail was distributed to Canadian soldiers by 27 Canadian Post offices. A single post office would receive, on average, 100 letters a day, but this average would triple during the

⁴⁴³ Dennis Winter *Death Men: Soldiers in the Great War* (London: Penguin Books, 1978), 81 and A. Fortescue Duguid *Official History of the Canadian Forces in the Great War Vol. I: From the Outbreak of the War to the Formation of the Canadian Corps August 1914-September 1915* (Ottawa: Printer of the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1938), pullout chart.

⁴⁴⁴ This may explain why the Six Nations Council wanted an accounting of the goods produced by the Six Nations Patriotic League for Six Nations soldiers with the Council's money. See Chapter 4.

first week of December with the arrival of Christmas packages for soldiers.⁴⁴⁵ Although some families and charitable groups sent individual packages for their loved ones or specific local units, the Canadian government also sent a generic package that contained cake, candy, gum, socks, trench mitts, cards,⁴⁴⁶ two packages of tobacco, two packages of cigarettes, chocolate, handkerchiefs, and a letter from the Prime Minister and his cabinet.⁴⁴⁷

For men who enlisted out of Brant County, their packages in 1914 also included a message from the Brantford Patriotic and War Relief Association.⁴⁴⁸ Although some of the food that was in these packages would be mouldy by the time it reached the boys at the front, the food the packages contained was still better than what the men were eating in the trenches and provided the soldier a break from his everyday food ration. Men in the trenches would merely scrape off the mould, share it with their friends, and eat it nonetheless.⁴⁴⁹ According to authors Tim Cook and Dennis Winter, these packages from home showed to the soldiers overseas that the people back home had not forgotten them. Both authors further state that the soldiers needed, and some relied on, this home support to sustain them in the emotionally stripping environment of the Western Front.⁴⁵⁰ To supplement these gifts, the Ontario government alone gave \$20,000 in grants to various Ontario based fighting units for other comforts like heating appliances, furniture, desks, blankets, flooring for tents, rubber sheets, telephones, forges, oil,

⁴⁴⁵ W.A. Willson "War Politics and Christmas Cheer at the Front" in Canada in the Great World War Vol. 5: The Triumph of the Allies (Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1930), 43-44.

⁴⁴⁶ It is unknown whether the cards in these packages were playing cards or greeting cards. Although playing cards may have been included in these packages, many of the Protestant women who made up these groups would have seen playing cards as the equivalent of sending liquor. Therefore, concerned for the morality of their boys while overseas, these packages most likely would have been simple Christmas greeting cards from the individual home Patriotic League.

⁴⁴⁷ W.A. Willson, 44 and J. Castell Hopkins The Province of Ontario in the War: A Record of Government and People (Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1919), 30.

⁴⁴⁸ Barbra M. Wilson Ontario and the First World War: A Collection of Documents (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1977), 6.

⁴⁴⁹ Tim Cook At the Sharp End: Canadians Fighting the Great War, 1914-1916 (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007), 247.

⁴⁵⁰ Tim Cook Shock Troops: Canadians Fighting the Great War, 1917-1918 (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008), 179, 180 and Dennis Winter, 165.

harness cleaning kits, rubber boots and other such things.⁴⁵¹ All these items, letters, and packages, delivered to the men by the Canadian Postal Service, were key to a man's mental survival while overseas.

The Canadian government was determined to pay for the Canadian Expeditionary Force in its entirety so that they could retain some control over their troops from the Imperial authorities. Signifying this, every service offered to the Canadian soldiers was branded with the maple leaf. The Canadian government entered into partnerships with other charitable groups, like the Y.M.C.A., the Salvation Army, and the Knights of Columbus, to provide various services for their troops. Beginning in the trenches, dugouts, and billets for the men, these groups provided areas for men to relax in close to the front. In these huts there could be found books, magazines, writing supplies for letters, tea, sweets, coffee, tobacco, chewing gum, free concerts, films in the evenings which cost the soldier 5 cents for admission, and on Sundays, these places offered religious services for the soldiers.⁴⁵² In the rear, the Y.M.C.A. organized sporting events, concerts, and sing-songs. These events greatly improved the men's moral: "A man could come out of the line, change and wash at divisional baths, and then proceed to any one of the half dozen places of entertainment to forget the sights he had so lately seen and the deeds he had been called to do. Not only did the entertainments preserve moral; they saved many a man's sanity."⁴⁵³

Soldiers on leave also relied heavily on the services provided by these groups. When C.E.F. soldiers received leave, they became virtually tourists in a foreign country. Being overwhelmed with a new environment that was not home and not the trenches, some soldiers felt

⁴⁵¹ J. Castell Hopkins, 69.

⁴⁵² Various Authors "Religions and Social Activities" in Canada in the Great World War Vol. 7: Special Services, Heroic Deeds, Etc. (Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1921), 147 and Tim Cook At the Sharp End, 393-394 and 402.

⁴⁵³ Various Authors "Religions and Social Activities", 146.

disconnected to their surroundings. Some soldiers sought the tourist hotspots like London, Buckingham Palace, and St. Paul's Cathedral, while others sought hostels or other friendly places to sleep, think of friends at the front, or try their best to adjust to the new surroundings they found themselves in.⁴⁵⁴ Before leaving the lines, the Y.M.C.A. established information bureaus, kit storage and tourist agencies to aid soldiers in planning their leave.⁴⁵⁵ At one point during the war, there were at least five hostels dedicated to soldiers of the C.E.F. in London alone.⁴⁵⁶

For Six Nations soldiers, there were similar services provided to them by private citizens who housed Six Nations soldiers on leave in her homes, but for the majority of soldiers, there were Canadian run hostels. One of the more famous London hostels was the Y.M.C.A.'s Beaver Hut. For the average C.E.F. soldier, the Beaver Hut provided a rotunda, lounge, quiet room, billiard room, kitchen, dining room meals, and 165 bed dormitory. With an 18 cent per night fee, the Beaver Hut would also provide kit storage, use of the lavatories, a towel and a bar of soap, and access to the showers and baths. The Beaver Hut also arranged for a free orchestra concert from 3-4 pm and a free theatre from 2-10:30 pm everyday.⁴⁵⁷ Other Canadian government branded hostels for soldiers in London, like the Maple Leaf Clubs, provided meals, baths, beds, fresh linens, reading and writing rooms, billiard rooms, and recreations rooms for C.E.F. soldiers on leave.⁴⁵⁸

Other vital services for soldiers were also provided for by the Canadian government. If a C.E.F. soldier was wounded, after being cared for at the front and in France, they were probably sent to one of three Canadian operated hospitals. In 1915, the Canadian government set up two

⁴⁵⁴ Tim Cook *Shock Troops*, 172, 178 and Dennis Winter, 167.

⁴⁵⁵ Various Authors "Religions and Social Activities", 141.

⁴⁵⁶ Tim Cook *Shock Troops*, 173.

⁴⁵⁷ Various Authors "Religions and Social Activities", 142.

⁴⁵⁸ J. Castell Hopkins, 104

such hospitals, Queen's Canadian Military Hospital and the Duchess of Connaught Hospital, in Folkestone and Cliveden, England respectively. In 1916, the provincial government in Ontario also established its own military hospital in Orpington, Kent, England and by 1917, this facility was expanded to aid more soldiers.⁴⁵⁹ Dental services were also paid for by the Federal government.⁴⁶⁰ The Canadian government even saw to their own prisoners of war. Through the Red Cross, P.O.W.'s received, until 1916 when parcels to "other ranks" were stopped in order to ensure rank and file soldiers did not receive any contraband, three ten pound parcels every two weeks.⁴⁶¹ These parcels could contain half a tin of tobacco, 250 cigarettes, a new supply of clothing every six months, a new overcoat yearly, white bread, which by the time of receiving it, was mouldy, canned food, which was taken and rationed to the P.O.W. by the German authorities, oatmeal, rice, milk, meats, jams, sugar, and tea.⁴⁶² Although this would have effected very few of the Six Nations soldiers, as only two were possibly taken prisoner during the war,⁴⁶³ these packages would have been a source of comfort for these men and would have aided their health.⁴⁶⁴ After the war, while men were waiting to come home after the armistice, the Canadian government established the Khaki University which gave free education at English and French universities for those who qualified. By the time its closure in 1919, 1000 men were enrolled in universities across England and France while another 50,000 were instructed at the

⁴⁵⁹ J. Castell Hopkins, 99, 101, and 103.

⁴⁶⁰ Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up: The Canadian Soldier in the First World War (Toronto: Random House, 1993), 184 and Tim Cook At the Sharp End, 569.

⁴⁶¹ Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 212.

⁴⁶² Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 212 and H.W. MacDonnell and T.W. Morse "Canadian Prisoners of War in Germany" in Canada in the Great World War Vol. 4: The Turn of the Tide. (Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1920), 357 and 362.

⁴⁶³ It was speculated that Lt. James Moses, R.F.C., may have been taken prisoner after his airplane went down, but he is officially listed as missing in action and presumed dead.

⁴⁶⁴ H.W. MacDonnell and T.W. Morse, 357. This would have been especially true for Pte. William (Bill) Lickers. He was captured in 1915 and beaten regularly, sometimes with a block of salt, by his captives to see if Native people felt pain, as they did not according to the popular culture at the time. These beatings left Bill paralyzed for the rest of his life (Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 220).

junior levels.⁴⁶⁵ With all of these services provided to the men of the C.E.F. during the war, it can be understood why some of the veterans who returned to the Grand River were conflicted about whether to support their home government, who on face value provided them nothing, or the Canadian government.

Upon returning home, some veterans, including those from the Six Nations, received a rude awakening about the support their families had received at the hands of the Canadian government. Even with the support of separation allowances or the C.P.F., some of the soldiers came home to shacks of houses, failed farms, or worse yet, their families had been turned out and were living on the streets.⁴⁶⁶ For the Six Nations veteran, this would not be the only slight they would face at the hands of the Canadian government during the post-war period. Legally, the position of the Native veteran during the post-war period was unclear. They were still considered veterans, but they were also wards of the state under the Indian Act. This double distinction would wreak havoc for the administrators of veteran's benefits as the administrators would have to decide whether or not Native veterans were more Native or more veteran when it came to what benefits they would receive.⁴⁶⁷ Since Native soldiers were wards of the state and administered under the Department of Indian Affairs, they were not subject to the Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment Commission.⁴⁶⁸ The only way for First Nations veterans to receive benefits

⁴⁶⁵ Tim Cook Shock Troops, 589.

⁴⁶⁶ Desmond Morton "Supporting Soldier's Families: Separation Allowance, Assigned Pay, and the Unexpected" in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honor of Robert Craig Brown David Mackenzie ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 221.

⁴⁶⁷ John Moses "Aboriginal Participation in Canadian Military Service: Historic and Contemporary Contexts" The Army Doctrine and Training Bulletin Vol. 3, No. 1 (Fall 2008), found on-line and Scott Sheffield "Indifference, Difference, and Assimilation: Aboriginal People in Canadian Military Practice, 1900-1945 in Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Creig Leslie Mantle eds. (Kingston: Canadian Defense Academy Press, 2007), 64.

⁴⁶⁸ L. James Dempsey Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War I (Regina: Canadian Plains research Centre, 1999), 76.

from the Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment Commission was to renounce their Native status and become enfranchised.⁴⁶⁹

Re-training for veterans in Ontario was administered by the Provincial and Federal governments with separate programs with separate aims. The Federal programs were to restore and retrain the returned veteran to the place where they were socially before the war began while the Provincial programs were in place to help the returned soldier find work.⁴⁷⁰ For all First Nations veterans, they were only able to apply to the Federal programs due to their status as wards within the Indian Act. Most vocational training programs, whether they were offered by the Ontario or Canadian governments, were off limits for First Nations veterans. The Ontario program limited the returned soldiers training to a six to eight month training program in which the veteran was re-trained in an occupation related to the job they held prior to the war. This program ended in failure as men were shoved into any available program which resulted in demoralized men and very resentful employers who employed the badly trained men. This failure caused the Federal government to institute a parallel program in Ontario run out of the University of Toronto which used ex-soldiers as teachers, unlike the Ontario program which used trained Ontario teachers.⁴⁷¹ In all, 40,000 veterans received training in 140 occupations nationwide through the Federal program⁴⁷², but in the end, the program was also unsuccessful. Although it is true that 90% of the veterans that entered into the programs completed them, 80% of the veterans that applied to the programs were rejected on various grounds.⁴⁷³ Of the 90% that

⁴⁶⁹ John Moses "Aboriginal Participation in Canadian Military Service" and James W. St. G. Walker "Race and Recruitment in World War I: Enlistment of Visible Minorities in the Canadian Expeditionary Force" The Canadian Historical Review Vol. LXX, No. 1 (1989), 24.

⁴⁷⁰ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright Winning the Second Battle: Canadian Veterans and the Return to Civilian Life 1915-1930 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 18.

⁴⁷¹ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 94-95.

⁴⁷² Joseph Schull Veneration for Valour (Ottawa: Veterans Affairs Canada, 1973), 21.

⁴⁷³ Jonathan Vance "Aftermath" The Beaver: Canada's History Magazine Vol. 80, No. 5 (October/November 2000), 25.

did complete the courses, many remained unemployed because employers did not want to hire the retrained veterans because the program's requirements were too low and employment nationwide was beginning to diminish due to the great depression.⁴⁷⁴ This left nothing but civil service jobs open for the returned veterans which, in the end, would also be affected by the depression. Out of the 8,000 permanent and 29,000 temporary jobs that were available through the civil service, only 9,035 veterans were employed by the civil service in 1920. By 1925, however, this number shrank to only 2,190 veterans employed by the civil service.⁴⁷⁵

Although wounded Six Nations soldiers did meet with a vocational officer of the Soldier Civil Reestablishment in 1919,⁴⁷⁶ it was found that the only Six Nations veterans that were given vocational training were those who were permanently disabled during the war.⁴⁷⁷

In all, very few Native people applied to the program although the Department of Indian Affairs knew that a program such as this, if offered, would have been widely used by Canada's Native population. According to E.R. Tucker, the Assistant District Vocational Officer in Sudbury, the Native veteran population in his district saw the vocational training as something they had earned. Tucker also pointed out that this training would also assist Native communities as these men could be placed in their home communities and act as an example for others to emulate. Tucker noted that in 1919, few Native veterans were able to apply to the Vocational Training program as they were wards of the state, but thought they ought to be included due to the fact they did enlist although they did not have to, with many making long journeys to the recruitment stations to do so.⁴⁷⁸ Although this letter was forwarded to Duncan Campbell Scott

⁴⁷⁴ Jonathan Vance "Aftermath", 25 and Joseph Schull, 21.

⁴⁷⁵ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 137.

⁴⁷⁶ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to Duncan Campbell Scott, 15 September 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,023-1, Reel C-14790, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General).

⁴⁷⁷ Fred Gaffen, *Forgotten Soldiers* (Picton, British Columbia: Theytus Books, 1985), 36.

⁴⁷⁸ Letter from E.R. Tucker to G.L. Drew, 8 October 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-32 Part 1, Reel C-8515, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Vocational Training).

by the Director of Vocational Training on 16th October 1919, nothing seemed to come of this as none of the Native veterans who did apply to the program were accepted.⁴⁷⁹

Pensions were another contentious issue not only for the Six Nations' veteran, but for all veterans and their dependents across Canada. When the Canadian government conceived their pension scheme for the veterans of World War One, they did so with the objective of not wanting the veteran to become a burden on the state.⁴⁸⁰ With this in mind, many factors were taken into consideration when a pension was issued. The first factor was the rank of the individual at war's end; the higher the rank, the higher the pension with the maximum benefit for a private being \$480 a month plus an additional one dollar a month per child of the soldier.⁴⁸¹ Another factor for pension rates were the disabilities medical examiners noted when a soldier was discharged. The first problem with this method was that many of these discharge medical exams took place when the men were still overseas waiting to return home. Many veterans knew that if they complained about a medial problem, they would be delayed in getting home. To bypass this problem, many men agreed they were fit, although they were not, which disallowed them any pension benefit due to their medical issues.⁴⁸² Of the veterans that did claim a disability, their disabilities would be ranked according to their severity. For instance a person who lost both legs, both arms and both eyes were considered to be 100% disable and were given the highest payoff of \$900 annually, while a person who lost only one eye or the lower portion of a leg was considered only 40% disabled and would receive a possible \$360 a year.⁴⁸³ In all, only 5% of Canada's veteran population were able to claim the highest disability payout, with 80% of Canada's veterans

⁴⁷⁹ RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-32 Part 1, Reel C-8515, War 1914-1918 – Correspondence Regarding Vocational Training.

⁴⁸⁰ Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein, 251.

⁴⁸¹ Tim Cook Shock Troops, 604. Cook further notes that very few veterans received this amount (Tim Cook Shock Troops, 605).

⁴⁸² Tim Cook Shock Troops, 596.

⁴⁸³ Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein, 251 and Joseph Schull, 25-26.

receiving 25% or less than the highest payout.⁴⁸⁴ Widows and children were also able to claim their father's pension if certain qualifiers were met. Widows would receive a pension as long as they had no bad reports filed to the pension authorities against them.⁴⁸⁵ If they did, the pension would be revoked. The top pension payout that a widow would receive would have been \$720 dollars annually,⁴⁸⁶ but as found with veteran's pensions, very few received this amount. Children of soldiers could receive their father's pension until the age of 21 as long as they stayed in school.⁴⁸⁷ If they did not, they were no longer eligible for the pension at the age 16 for males and 17 for females as, by this age, they were viewed to be self supporting.⁴⁸⁸ Although soldiers' pensions were low in their payoffs and were given to few, by 1929, these pension payoffs would have been higher than the average worker's wage.⁴⁸⁹

For the Native veteran, pension payouts were either lower than the national average or did not happen at all.⁴⁹⁰ In 1932, the Department of Pensions and Health forwarded a memo to the Department of Indian Affairs stating that pensions would only be issued to First Nations people who were enfranchised and living off Reservations.⁴⁹¹ Six Nations' veteran, and head of the Six Nations Indian War Veterans Association, William F. Powless took exception to this policy and wrote a letter to Member of Parliament Franklin Smoke as the pension amount that the Department of Indian Affairs gave was half of what the veterans outside the Grand River Territory were receiving. To Powless, this was unfair as the veterans living within Reserve

⁴⁸⁴ Desmond Morton *When Your Number's Up*, 259 and Jonathan Vance "Aftermath", 25.

⁴⁸⁵ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 251.

⁴⁸⁶ Joseph Schull, 25.

⁴⁸⁷ Joseph Schull, 26.

⁴⁸⁸ Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein, 251.

⁴⁸⁹ Joseph Schull, 26.

⁴⁹⁰ One case of a Six Nations veteran not receiving his pension was mentioned in the testimony of Mrs. Samuel Styres during Col. Thompson's Royal Commission into the Affairs of the Six Nations in 1923 (Brantford Expositor, 19 September 1923). See Chapter 3 for Mrs. Styres testimony.

⁴⁹¹ Memorandum from E.H. Scarmell to the Department of Pensions and National Health, 9 May 1932 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

communities across Canada were in greater monetary need than their counterparts outside Reservations.⁴⁹² According to the Department of Indian Affairs, Native veterans were treated equally by the Veteran's Allowance Committee until 1931 when the committee found that Native veterans were considered wards of the state and under the protection of the Department. As far as the Department was concerned, they could not give veterans preferential treatment with their pensions and could only give the veteran the same amount of pension money as anybody else living within a Reservation.⁴⁹³ By 1933, the Simcoe, Ontario branch of the Royal Canadian Legion took up the cause for First Nations' veterans when, during their 2 August meeting, Legion Secretary Frank M. Bennett was asked to find out if Native veterans' pensions were paid directly to the veteran or not.⁴⁹⁴ According to the Department, pensions were originally paid out to the individual veteran until it was found that some of the veterans who received their pension money were not using it to provide for their families. When these cases arose, the pension cheque was made out to the Department and was given to the local Indian Agent for distribution to the family. The Department also admitted that the majority of their pension cases were administered in this fashion. Other veterans would have their pension cheques made out to the Department and had to present a voucher to the local agent in order to receive their pension money.⁴⁹⁵ It is unknown if this situation was rectified.

Later that year, the Pensioners' Protective Association from London, Ontario wrote the Department about the discrimination Native veterans from Muncey and Oneida were facing at the hands of the Department when it came to their pensions. According to the Association, these

⁴⁹² Letter from William F. Powless to Franklin Smoke, 4 November 1932 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

⁴⁹³ Deputy Superintendent General to Franklin Smoke, 17 November 1932 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

⁴⁹⁴ Letter from Frank M. Bennett to the Department of Indian Affairs, 4 August 1933 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

⁴⁹⁵ Letter from A.M. MacKenzie to Frank M. Bennett, 12 August 1933 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

Native men enlisted in the C.E.F. without discrimination, so they did not understand why they were facing it now? The Association asked the Department for a complete list of ex-servicemen from across Canada as they knew that many Native veterans from across Canada were in this position, and the Association wanted to distribute winter clothing to the many Native men who were in need of it. In a post-script, the Secretary for the Association gave the Department a not so subtle threat stating that he wondered “what the public would think if they knew the true facts of the...treatment that they [Native veterans from Muncy] receive [and] the amount they are allowed namely \$4-60 cents per month for a married man and a family. It is a known fact that all the Indian Reserves are treated likewise. How about it.”⁴⁹⁶ With this threat in place, the Department responded eight days later claiming all First Nations groups were treated differently as they all held different accounts with different monies available to them. As far as pensions were concerned, the Department was still unapologetic and pinned the blame for the unequal distributions of pensions on the Department of Pensions and National Health as they were the ones who made the decision not to pay Native veterans equally to their non-Native counterparts in 1932, while the Department of Indian Affairs always maintained that Native veterans should receive the same benefits as other veterans. The Department of Indian Affairs still maintained that they could not pay veterans a higher pension than that of other Native peoples within Reserve communities.⁴⁹⁷ When this complaint was forwarded to the Board of Pensions by the Association, the Deputy Minister of Pensions and National Health wrote the Department of Indian Affairs wondering why the Department agreed to administer pensions for Native veterans in 1932 and why did it now seem to support the pension goals of the Pensioners’ Protective

⁴⁹⁶ Letter from J.E. Pearce to Mr. Williams of the Department of Indian Affairs, 20 October 1933 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

⁴⁹⁷ Letter from A.F. MacKenzie to J.E. Pearce, 28 Oct. 1933, (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians)

Association?⁴⁹⁸ To this, the Department responded that there never was a case where a veteran went unassisted, but under their care, a veteran could only receive the same amount as any other pensioner. According to the Department, however, there should be a distinction between non-Native veterans and Native veterans as Native peoples do not have the same expenditures as people who live off the Reserve.⁴⁹⁹ It was not until 1936, due to public pressure on the Federal government by various veterans' associations, that the Native veterans received equal pensions and veterans allowance benefits as their non-Native counterparts.⁵⁰⁰ After these disputes, an average Native veteran's pension amounted to \$40 a month for a single man and \$70 if the man was married, which was still a higher pension than any other given by the Department of Indian Affairs.⁵⁰¹

The Last Post Fund, a fund established to pay for the burial of veterans, also saw this type of bureaucratic squabbling at the expense of the Six Nations veteran. In 1926, E.R. Martin, from Ohsweken, began sending the Last Post Fund information about Six Nations' veterans deaths. Possibly due to this egging by Martin, the Last Post Fund wrote the Department of Indian Affairs asking for information about Native veterans who may need assistance from the Fund.⁵⁰² According to J.D. McLean, the Secretary for the Department of Indian Affairs, Martin was to discontinue his writing as the Department had reached an agreement with the Last Post and it was the responsibility of the Department to pay for the funeral cost of Native veterans.⁵⁰³ By

⁴⁹⁸ Letter from R.E. Wodehouse to the Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs, (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

⁴⁹⁹ Letter from the Deputy Superintendent General to R.E. Wodehouse, 23 November 1933 (RG 10, Vol. 6762, File 452-1, Reel C-8508, Correspondence Regarding Payments of Pensions to Indians).

⁵⁰⁰ Jonathan Vance *Death So Noble*, 259 and Fred Gaffen, 37.

⁵⁰¹ Fred Gaffen, 37.

⁵⁰² Letter from Arthur H.D. Hair to J.D. McLean 12 February 1926 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

⁵⁰³ Letters from E.T. Scammell to E.R. Martin, 11 June 1926 and J.D. McLean to Lt. Col. C.E. Morgan, 23 July 1926 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

1928, the Last Post Fund, making sure the Department was keeping their end of the agreement, sent a letter to the Deputy Superintendent of the Department, A.F. MacKenzie, asking how Native veterans were buried: were they buried as paupers or did they receive a headstone, as all ex-servicemen should be marked and identified.⁵⁰⁴ MacKenzie responded that the Department, on average, spent \$20.00 for burials which was usually paid for out of the band's funds held by the Department.⁵⁰⁵ This amount, according to MacKenzie, rarely paid for a headstone. In some cases, the amount was sometimes not enough to provide a rough cut casket or hearse for the funeral.⁵⁰⁶ Mackenzie added that any money the Last Post Fund could grant for the headstone would be appreciated by the families of the diseased soldiers.⁵⁰⁷ By 1931 and into 1932, the Last Post Fund had changed its mind on their burial policy for Native veterans. If the Department of Indian Affairs paid for the burials of Native veterans, as they were technically wards of the state, the Last Post Fund was not going to pay for any of their funeral cost, unless the veteran lived off the Reserve.⁵⁰⁸ MacKenzie responded to the Last Post Fund that although Native veterans living on Reserves were wards of the state, as veterans, their funerals should be the same as any other ex-serviceman and should be paid for by the Last Post Fund.⁵⁰⁹ Lt. Col. Morgan, Superintendent for the Six Nations, even got involved in this debate. According to Morgan, the Last Post Fund was merely "bucking" their responsibilities to the Native veteran to the Department and the Fund

⁵⁰⁴ Letter from Arthur H.D. Hair to A.F. MacKenzie, 19 January 1928 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

⁵⁰⁵ Letter from A.F. MacKenzie to Arthur H.D. Hair, 21 January 1928 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund). Later in this file, in a letter from Lt. Col. C.E. Morgan, the Superintendent for Six Nations to Acting Secretary for the Department of Indian Affairs, T.R.A. MacInnis, the amount of the burial grant for Six Nations was \$10.00.

⁵⁰⁶ Gaffen, 38.

⁵⁰⁷ Letter from A.F. MacKenzie to Arthur H.D. Hair, 21 January 1928 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

⁵⁰⁸ Letters from E.T. Scammell to T.R.A. MacInnis, 26 September 1931 and E.T. Scammell to A.F. MacKenzie, 6 August 1932 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

⁵⁰⁹ Letter from A.F. MacKenzie to E.T. Scammell, 11 August 1932 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

should pay for all veteran's funerals be them Native or not.⁵¹⁰ By 1935, Morgan himself became the Last Post Fund's representative in the Brant country area and, during this time, was still advocating that all veteran's funeral costs, including those of First Nations' veterans, should be covered by the Last Post Fund.⁵¹¹ To this, the Fund explained to Col. Morgan it was not their policy to not pay for the burial of Native veterans, but it was the policy of the Royal Canadian Legion.⁵¹² Morgan wrote to the Department telling them that the Department should begin communicating with the Legion to sort this out.⁵¹³ Although, officially, the Last Post Fund was opened to Native Veterans by 1936,⁵¹⁴ this debate over Native burials by the Last Post Fund continued into 1938. By the end of the debate, the Last Post Fund was only responsible for providing the Native veterans headstone.⁵¹⁵

So what did the Native veteran receive for their service in the First World War? When any soldier was discharged, they received a \$35 clothing allowance, they were allowed to keep their uniform, including their helmet, and received a service gratuity.⁵¹⁶ All soldiers who served a year or more, even if this service was in Canada only, received a gratuity which varied depending on your length of service. If the soldier served for three years or more, they received a gratuity of \$420 and if they served for a year or less, the gratuity was lowered to \$210.⁵¹⁷ As far as soldiers benefit programs were concerned, the only two that were available to the Native veteran was Veteran's Insurance and the Soldier Settlement Program. The Veteran's Insurance

⁵¹⁰ C.E. Morgan to the Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, 17 January 1935 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

⁵¹¹ Letter from C.E. Morgan to E.T. Scammell, 23 March 1935 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund) and Gaffen, 38.

⁵¹² Letter from E.T. Scammell to C.E. Morgan 21 March 1935 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

⁵¹³ Letter from C.E. Morgan to Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, 23 March 1935 (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-37, Reel C-8515, war 1914-1918 Correspondence Regarding The Last Post Fund).

⁵¹⁴ Jonathan Vance Death So Noble, 259.

⁵¹⁵ Fred Gaffen, 38.

⁵¹⁶ Jonathan Vance "Aftermath", 25.

⁵¹⁷ G.W.L. Nicholson The Canadian Expeditionary Force 1914-1919 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1964), 533.

program was open to Native veterans soon after it was approved by the Federal authorities in 1920. Duncan Campbell Scott sent out a circular to all of his agents in the field explaining that this program was open to Native veterans in November of 1920.⁵¹⁸ Some Indian Agents reported back to Scott claiming that no veterans from their communities wanted to take part in this program as the veterans were either ne're-do-wells or were just unable to afford the insurance at this time.⁵¹⁹

The Soldier Settlement program, which allowed for First World War veterans to receive loans for land, machinery, seeds, and livestock in order to establish a farm, was theoretically open to Native veterans, but very few Native applicants were actually accepted by the Soldier Settlement Board. To be allowed to apply to the Board, the soldier had to be able to pay for 10% of the full price for the farm which had to be in a location where the soil, climate and "social development" (i.e. transportation, stores, etc...) were available.⁵²⁰ Most of this land would be taken from Native Reservations in Western Canada. The process for applying to the program was simple. First, the veteran would find a farm or piece of land and ascertain the lowest possible sale price for it. They would then submit the price and land location to the local committee responsible for the administering of the Soldier Settlement. The committee would send out an evaluator to see if the land was suitable for farming purposes.⁵²¹ The committee would also assess the man asking for the loan to see if he and his family were suitable for farming. After this, the committee would locate the applicant into one of three classifications: fit for settlement, likely to be successful but needs further training, and not fit. If the applicant

⁵¹⁸ Circular sent by Duncan Campbell Scott (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-34, Reel C-8515, War 1914-1918 Insurance of Returned Soldiers).

⁵¹⁹ Various Letters from Indian Agents (RG 10, Vol. 6771, File 452-34, Reel C-8515, War 1914-1918 Insurance of Returned Soldiers). It is unknown what Six Nations veterans thought of this insurance as Six Nations Superintendent Gordon J. Smith did not respond to this circular.

⁵²⁰ E.J. Aston "Soldier Land Settlement in Canada" *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* Vol. 39, No. 3 (May 1925), 493.

⁵²¹ E.J. Aston, 495.

received the second classification, they would be advised to seek employment with a farmer and apply again later.⁵²² Nationally, this program put anywhere from 20,000-30,000 veterans on the land.⁵²³

Although this program was available to Native veterans, only 130 loans were given to them by 1920. Of this number one-third of the loans were made out to Six Nations veterans from Grand River.⁵²⁴ By 1927, the number of Soldier Settlement loans given to Native veterans grew to 224 nationwide, but most of these loans were granted to Native veterans from Ontario.⁵²⁵ If the land granted to these soldiers was within existing Reserves, the veteran only received a certificate of possession, as individuals could not own land within the Canadian Reserve system.⁵²⁶ In rare cases, limited only to Ontario, Native veterans able to receive land off their Reservations and, if successful in paying off their loan, were able to gain full ownership of their farms.⁵²⁷

For the Six Nations, there would be one problem with the Soldier Settlement Program. The program's management was abrogated to the Department of Indian Affairs. This gave the Department the ability to locate and assign Six Nations land to an individual without the consent of the Six Nations Council who, prior to this, had the exclusive right to allocate land to their people. There was also some concern by the Council that since the Six Nations soldiers who were overseas were allowed to vote in Canadian elections, they were no longer considered to be

⁵²² E.J. Aston, 495.

⁵²³ E.J. Aston, 496, Joseph Schull, 23, and Jonathan Vance "Aftermath", 25

⁵²⁴ John Leonard Taylor Canadian Indian Policy During the Inter-War Years 1918-1939 (Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1984), 38.

⁵²⁵ Fred Gaffen, 184. John Leonard Taylor suggests that after 1924, the granting of Soldier Settlement packages to Native veterans began to dwindle (John Leonard Taylor, 39).

⁵²⁶ L. James Dempsey "The Indians and World War One" Alberta History 31, 3 (1983), 8.

⁵²⁷ Fred Gaffen, 36.

members of the Six Nations and were considered to be enfranchised into the Canadian state.⁵²⁸

The main concern for the Council was how the land was to be allotted to the veteran. The Council understood that the Soldier Settlement Act required that the land be purchased by the veteran through funds given to him through a loan. If the loan was defaulted on, what would happen to the Six Nations land the veteran was allotted? Was it to revert back to Six Nations land or was it to become private property and therefore out of the Six Nations land holdings?⁵²⁹ By October of 1919, the Department explained to the Council that if the land was defaulted on, it would not be given to anybody who was not Six Nations, but the issue of whose authority it was to allot land within the Six Nations Territory was never resolved.⁵³⁰ To protest this action by the Department, the Council advised their veterans not to participate in the program, and instead, offered to loan any soldier money out of the Six Nations trust fund to aid them in their farming endeavours.⁵³¹ Further supporting the Six Nations Council in this regard was veteran Lt. Milton O. Martin who wrote the Council from London, England proposing that the Council administer their own soldier settler program and grant each returned soldier 100 acres of land to farm.⁵³² Although the proposal was laid over for further consideration, it does show that some veterans were in support of the Council's position in this matter. This action by

⁵²⁸ Excerpt from the Six Nation Council Minutes, 9 June 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,023-1, Reel C-14790, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General) and Gordon J. Smith's Summary of Six Nations Council Minutes for 1, 2, 8, 15, October 1919, 22 October 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁵²⁹ Excerpt from the Six Nation Council Minutes, 9 June 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,023-1, Reel C-14790, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General) and Gordon J. Smith's Summary of Six Nations Council Minutes for 1, 2, 8, 15 October 1919, 22 October 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁵³⁰ Excerpt from the Six Nation Council Minutes, 8 October 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,023-1, Reel C-14790, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General) and Gordon J. Smith's Summary of Six Nations Council Minutes for 1, 2, 8, 15, October 1919, 22 October 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁵³¹ Six Nations Council Minutes, 3 June 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁵³² Gordon J. Smith's Summary of Six Nations Council Minutes for 2, 3, 8 July 1919, 17 July 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

the Council, however, was not approved by Duncan Campbell Scott and was therefore not allowed.⁵³³

Although the act of locating Six Nations veterans on Six Nations land infringed on the Six Nations Council's sovereignty, it also acted as a veiled insult to the Six Nations veterans. Although some Native soldiers did want their farms located within the communities they came from so they would not feel isolated from their own people,⁵³⁴ this idea was exploited by the Department as a cheaper way to run the Soldier Settlement program. By 1918, Duncan Campbell Scott was already proposing this idea in order to free up the land allocated to the Soldier Settlement Program outside Reserves for non-Native soldier settlers.⁵³⁵ In this way, the Department was allowing Six Nations soldiers to settle and gain possession of land that they, as members of Six Nations, already owned.⁵³⁶ The Department also lacked the administrative mechanisms to administer this program. For the most part, the program's local contact on Reserves was the local Indian agent. According to Dennis Nicholas, president of the Indian Veterans Association, some of these Indian agents saw to it that the money distributed for the program did not make it to the soldier settlers, and instead would pocket it for themselves.⁵³⁷ Whatever the truth of this allegation, it is proof of the aggravations the veterans felt at the hands of this program.

The Six Nations were assigned two agricultural representatives to administer the program: Mr. Robert H. Abraham was appointed the overall Soldier Settler program supervisor for Wapole Island, Sarnia, Muncy, Cape Crooker, Rama, Georgia Island, Moraviantown, New

⁵³³ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Gordon J. Smith, 24 June 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,023-1, Reel C-14790, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General)

⁵³⁴ Fred Gaffen, 36.

⁵³⁵ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to Arthur Meighen, 15 August 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001, Reel C-14778, General Correspondence Relative to Soldier Settlement).

⁵³⁶ Dennis Nicholas, President of the Indian Veterans Association, Speech given at the Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre's Warriors Conference, 13 November 1986. Audio recording of speech in author's possession.

⁵³⁷ Dennis Nicholas, 13 November 1986.

Credit, and Six Nations Grand River, while a Six Nations man Hilton Hill was in charge of the local agricultural supervision of the Six Nations men themselves.⁵³⁸ These men would advise on the issuing of loans which would be distributed to the soldier settlers by the Six Nations Indian agent Gordon J. Smith or his predecessor C.E. Morgan. In 1924, Elliot Moses, a member of Six Nations who trained at the Ontario Agricultural College, was added to the staff of the Brantford Indian Office to help administer the Soldier Settlement program.⁵³⁹ In 1923, there were at least 80 Six Nations men who had been accepted by the program with at least 75 of the returned soldiers being in good standing and with no farm being 'salvaged' by the Department.⁵⁴⁰ Thompson did report, however, that at least one or two of the men had to burn their barns for fire wood and one man sold most of the timber issued and did not pay back a single cent of his loan.⁵⁴¹

By all Department accounts to the Soldier Settlement Board, the Soldier Settlement program was a success within the Grand River Territory with Scott himself saying overall, the program was benefiting many Native communities across Canada.⁵⁴² Further, Department reports going into 1924 praised all Native settlers. The 1923 report claimed that Native settlers had paid 78% of what they owed on their loans for 1922⁵⁴³ with the 1924 report claiming that even with the bad farming season of 1923, Native settlers were still meeting their loan

⁵³⁸ Memorandum from R.H. Abraham to Duncan Campbell Scott, no date (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001, Reel C-14778, General Correspondence Relative to Soldier Settlement).

⁵³⁹ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to C.E. Morgan, 9 July 1924 (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25,001-1A Part 1, Reel C-14778, Correspondence Relative to Statements of Balances on Consolidated and Current Loans Under the Soldiers Settlement Act for Various Agencies in Canada).

⁵⁴⁰ Andrew T. Thompson's Report on the Six Nations, 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 3231, File 582,103, Reel C-11344), 30. Later in Thompson's report, however, he does make reference to salvage sale of a soldier settler where chattels that were issued by the program were sold at an extremely low price (Thompson, 32).

⁵⁴¹ Andrew T. Thompson's Report on the Six Nations, 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 3231, File 582,103, Reel C-11344), 30.

⁵⁴² Memorandum from Duncan Campbell Scott to unknown, 26 November 1920 (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25,001, Reel C-14778, General Correspondence Relative to Soldier Settlement).

⁵⁴³ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to John Bennett, 27 March 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001-1A Part 1, Reel C-14778, General Correspondence Relative to Soldier Settlement).

obligations.⁵⁴⁴ During his investigation of the Six Nations in 1923 Andrew Thompson reported that at least 10 veterans had paid back the entirety of their loan with the majority of the others being able to pay back at least 75% of their loan in the fall of 1924.⁵⁴⁵

Thompson also noted some concerns about the program. By 1923, Abraham reported to Thompson that some veterans were having trouble paying back their loans due to crop failures and the fact that many of the supplies bought for the program were purchased when prices were inflated due to the war, which, since the war's end, had begun to deflate.⁵⁴⁶ Many of the Six Nations veterans were calling on the Canadian Government for re-evaluations of their loan in order to account of the deflation.⁵⁴⁷

By 1927, however, the news about the Native Soldier Settlers was not good. Mr. Sexsmith, Abraham's replacement, complained to Scott that by March, the settlers had not received any seed, and if they did not get it soon, there would be no harvest in the fall.⁵⁴⁸ The Department was able to get seed to the settlers by the end of April.⁵⁴⁹ From 1928-1934, there were no reports on how well Native soldier settlers were doing, but there were many instances of the Department asking the Soldier Settlement Board for more and more money.⁵⁵⁰ Also issued during this time were many lists of Six Nations men who were not meeting their loan obligations.⁵⁵¹ Scott was beginning to see this trend in 1924 when he pointed out to

⁵⁴⁴ Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to John Bennett, 3 April 1924 (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001-1A Part 1, Reel C-14778, General Correspondence Relative to Soldier Settlement).

⁵⁴⁵ Andrew T. Thompson's Report on the Six Nations, 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 3231, File 582,103, Reel C-11344), 31.

⁵⁴⁶ Andrew T. Thompson's Report on the Six Nations, 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 3231, File 582,103, Reel C-11344), 31.

⁵⁴⁷ Andrew T. Thompson's Report on the Six Nations, 1923 (RG 10, Vol. 3231, File 582,103, Reel C-11344), 32.

⁵⁴⁸ Letter from Mr. Sexsmith to Duncan Campbell Scott, 28 March 1927 (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001-1 Part 3, Reel C-14778, Correspondence Regarding Soldier Settlements in General).

⁵⁴⁹ Letter from Mr. Sexsmith to Duncan Campbell Scott, 30 April 1927 (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001-1 Part 3, Reel C-14778, Correspondence Regarding Soldier Settlements in General).

⁵⁵⁰ Various Documents (RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001-1 Part 3, Reel C-14778, Correspondence Regarding Soldier Settlements in General).

⁵⁵¹ RG 10, Vol. 7484, File 25001-1 Part 3, Reel C-14778, Correspondence Regarding Soldier Settlements in General, RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,032-A Part 1, Reel C-14791, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General

Superintendent Morgan that there were some soldiers settlers who had not made a single payment on their loan in four years.⁵⁵² Scott's filing of these false reports show that Scott was either knowingly defrauding the Soldier Settlement Board of money or he had no real idea of what situation Native soldier settlers were finding themselves in with the dawning of the 1930s.

The sudden downturn in the Soldier Settlement program was mainly due to the Great Depression and not the individual soldier settler. According to E.J. Ashton, the Commissioner of the Soldier Settlement Board for all of Canada, success in the Soldier Settlement program was not based on whether or not you had a strong farming background as many of the successful farmers in the program were from industrial, not rural, areas before the war.⁵⁵³ The problem, according to Ashton, was the same as the explanation offered by Thompson: The fall of the agricultural markets in 1921.⁵⁵⁴ Prior to that, the Soldier Settlement Board had to purchase all things related to the program at inflated war-time prices.⁵⁵⁵ With the fall of the markets in 1921, the soldiers had a high debt and were making less, which meant that the soldiers could never pay off their loan. In the 1970s, Joseph Schull, writer for Veterans Affairs Canada, put the failure of the Soldier Settlement Program in the hands of the Board itself. According to Schull, the Board allowed for too many farms and some of them were located on poor plots of land. With a limited knowledge of farming, the farmers were doomed to failure. This, according to Schull was compounded with the failure of the markets in 1921. Whatever the reason for the failure of the program, all soldier settlers, Six Nations or not, were the ones that suffered. By 1923, there were

Correspondence, Accounts, Loans and RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,032-B, Reel C-14791, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General Correspondence.

⁵⁵² Letter from Duncan Campbell Scott to C.E. Morgan, 29 February 1924 (RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,032-A Part 1, Reel C-14791, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General Correspondence, Accounts, Loans).

⁵⁵³ E.J. Ashton, 497.

⁵⁵⁴ E.J. Ashton, 496.

⁵⁵⁵ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 151.

still 30,604 soldiers on the land.⁵⁵⁶ In December 1924, Ashton reported that 727 soldiers had paid off their loans in full, with one third of the soldiers steadily making good progress on their loans, while another third of the soldiers were farming, but not making any payments.⁵⁵⁷ By 1927-1930, the number of soldiers on the land dropped to 10,907.⁵⁵⁸ With the failure of the markets and with so many settlers still on the land, the Federal government had no other option then to come up with new ways to keep the soldiers on the land.⁵⁵⁹ In 1930, the Federal government wrote off \$11.3 million in settler debts⁵⁶⁰ and by 1931, the Soldier Settlement Board was abolished.⁵⁶¹ By 1939, only 8,000 soldier settlers were left on the land nation wide.⁵⁶² Realizing that the failures of the Six Nations soldier settlers was part of a larger national failure of the Settlement program, Superintendent Morgan fought Duncan Campbell Scott on some individual soldier settler cases. In 1924 and 1930, Morgan fought Scott on Soldier Settlement foreclosures citing that Scott was not aware of the circumstances of the Soldier Settlement within the Six Nations Territory.⁵⁶³ Although it is unknown how successful these measures were, Morgan tried every means at his disposal to try to save Six Nations' veterans farms.

For Native soldier settlers, the failure of the agricultural markets translated into a prolonged drop in income. Between 1929 and 1933, the total annual farming income of Native farmers dropped from \$2,388,435 to \$1,269,510. This 53% loss of income by Native farmers was not felt as badly by their non-Native counterparts whose total annual income, during the

⁵⁵⁶ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 153.

⁵⁵⁷ E.J. Ashton, 497.

⁵⁵⁸ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 204.

⁵⁵⁹ Joseph Schull, 23-24.

⁵⁶⁰ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 209.

⁵⁶¹ Jonathan Vance "Aftermath", 25.

⁵⁶² Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 223. Morton and Wright refer to these settlers as the lucky and the strong.

⁵⁶³ Letters from C.E. Morgan to Duncan Campbell Scott and A.F. MacKenzie, 20 October 1924 and 4 February 1930 (RG 10, Vol. 7504, File 25,032-1A Part 1, Reel C-14791, Six Nations Agency – Soldier Settlement – General Correspondence, Account and Loans).

same period, only dropped by 17%.⁵⁶⁴ The Native farmer's rebound potential was also not as strong as their non-Native counterparts. In the 1940s, the total annual income for Native farmers only rose to \$1,709,818 while non-Native farmers surpassed their 1925 income levels.⁵⁶⁵ This was, in large part, due to the failures of the Federal government and the Department of Indian Affairs. Although the Department did establish a Soldier Settler program that did create Native farms, the Federal government did not allow Native farmers to take out loans for new equipment.⁵⁶⁶ Although the Soldier Settlement Board and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment allowed for loans for this purpose,⁵⁶⁷ this program was not open to the Native veteran due to the Indian Act.⁵⁶⁸ The Native veteran was forced to use outdated farming equipment and practices that further demoralized the Native veteran.

Native veterans were only able to successfully address these problems through organized veterans groups outside their communities. During the inter-war years, it is estimated that two thirds of all veterans belonged to a veteran's group.⁵⁶⁹ For the Six Nations, three veterans organizations actively took up the causes of Native veterans directly to the Canadian government.⁵⁷⁰ These three groups were the Royal Canadian Legion, the Great War Veterans Association, and the Army and Navy Club. Another group that began in the inter-war period was the League of Indians by Six Nations Veteran, Fredrick Loft. Although not exclusively a veterans group, Loft's idea was the same as the Royal Canadian Legion: directly petition the Federal government for changes for Canada's First Nations people. Although Loft was able to

⁵⁶⁴ John Leonard Taylor, 92.

⁵⁶⁵ John Leonard Taylor, 92.

⁵⁶⁶ L. James Dempsey *Warriors of the King*, 76.

⁵⁶⁷ E.J. Ashton, 494 and Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 137.

⁵⁶⁸ Elliott Moses "Seventy-Five Years of Progress of Six Nations of the Grand River" *Waterloo Historical Society* Vol. 56, (1968), 21. Moses further states that the best Native farms bordered white farms as the Native farmers were able to borrow equipment from the white farmers. The farm machinery that did exist within the Territory, according to Moses, was used, run down, and bought second hand from white farmers (Moses, 22).

⁵⁶⁹ Jonathan Vance "Aftermath", 26.

⁵⁷⁰ Jonathan Vance *Death So Noble*, 259 and Fred Gaffen, 38.

attract many followers in Western Canada, many of whom were veterans, support from his own community's veteran population is unknown. In a letter written in 1919, Loft, supporting the Six Nations Council's stand against the Department's ability to allocate Six Nations land through the Soldier Settlement Act, hoped that Six Nations' veterans would support him, the Council, and the League on this point.⁵⁷¹

Where the Six Nations' veteran stood in support of the Six Nations Council is hard to determine. This is mainly to the changes the soldiers went through while overseas. The men that returned home were not the same men who had left the community. Some had assimilated into ideals of the Canadian forces, some had grown stronger in the ideals that were instilled in them prior to the war, and some were confused as to where they stood on anything after the war. Added to the confusion of what their post-war role would be were the numerous mental issues that may have affected veterans that the veterans themselves may not have been aware of. While overseas, psychiatric help was not given to soldiers and if they did complain about any mental issues, they were either told that they were making it all up to avoid work and were subsequently punished for it or they were discharged.⁵⁷² When the veterans came home, many of them were prone to mood swings, bouts of depression, fits of passion, severe tiredness, wanting immediate gratification of pleasure, trembling, had developed habits swearing and gambling, and some suffered from complete mental breakdown.⁵⁷³ The reality of war shook these men to their cores. It has been estimated that nine tenths of all of Canada's World War One veterans suffered from

⁵⁷¹ Letter from Fredrick Loft to an unknown League brother in Saskatchewan or Alberta, 25 November 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 3211, File 527,787, Reel C-11340, Formation of a Canadian League of Indians by F.O. Loft of the Six Nations Band).

⁵⁷² Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 198. Morton further states that at least 10,000 Canadian soldiers were discharged for mental disorders during World War One.

⁵⁷³ Dennis Winter, 243, Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 268, and Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 95.

an unseen or mental illness.⁵⁷⁴ In most cases, mental disorders became apparent months or years after the men were discharged from active service.⁵⁷⁵ Unfortunately for the veterans, psychiatric problems were not covered under veteran's pensions.⁵⁷⁶ Only those veterans who were physically disabled were taken care of by the Military Hospital Commission's and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment's hospitals, asylums and sanatoriums, but it was the physically disabled that were in the minority when it came to veteran's disabilities.⁵⁷⁷ For the most part, most veterans turned to alcohol to cope with the transition from war time service to civilian life. One of the most famous Six Nations veterans, Tom Longboat, found comfort in the post-war years this way.⁵⁷⁸ According to Enos T. Monture, many Six Nations' veterans who turned to the bottle stopped drinking through the help of programs that were available to them within their communities.⁵⁷⁹

As far as mental issues were concerned, only one case was documented with the Department from the Six Nations community. On 22 June 1921, Mrs. Samuel Styres complained to Superintendent Smith about the odd behaviour of her son, Claude Styres, a veteran of the 114th battalion. According to Mrs. Styres, Claude "had lost all sense of right and honor...he has been steeling harnesses, grain, pork and other things and selling them for almost nothing to anyone who will give him money. He will not work, spends most of his time in bed, and is out wandering around all night." He even threatened his brother, also a veteran, that he would kill him. Smith asked the Department if there was anything they or other agencies could do for this

⁵⁷⁴ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 95.

⁵⁷⁵ Tim Cook Shock Troops, 603.

⁵⁷⁶ Desmond Morton When Your Number's Up, 198

⁵⁷⁷ Jonathan Vance "Aftermath", 24.

⁵⁷⁸ Jonathan Vance Death So Noble, 248.

⁵⁷⁹ Enos T. Monture The Feather U.E.L.'s (Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1974), 72.

ex-soldier as all believed that his behaviour was a direct result from his service in the C.E.F.⁵⁸⁰

In a side note written on the Department's correspondence, it was clear that the Department was unsure what to do about the Styres case as Claude was no longer a soldier, but the Department forward the letter to the Department of Militia to see if they could help. The case was further sent to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment by the Department of Militia.⁵⁸¹ The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment washed their hands of the case as, according to their files, they had offered rehabilitation courses to Claude, but he refused to take part. R.S. Denning, the Director of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, further stated that "from the remarks made by Mr. Smith, it is quite apparent that it would have been a waste of time and money to attempt to train Styres for a useful occupation" and that "his present state is not in any way due to his service in the C.E.F., I am afraid there is nothing this Department can do in the matter."⁵⁸² This letter was forwarded to Smith on 29 July 1921, which seemed to be the end of this matter as far as the Department and military authorities were concerned.

Also confusing the issue of support or not to support the Six Nations Council was the existing community divisions that were apparent in the Six Nations community before the war. Many studies about this division have been completed by the academic community. Most, like John Moses, point to the Six Nations veterans as a single unified force that unanimously sided against the Six Nations Council and made way for the elected council. Each study bases their study on one document: a petition sent to the Canadian government in 1917 signed by 57 Six Nations soldiers in the 107th Battalion. According to Elliot Moses, this petition was circulated to

⁵⁸⁰ Letter from Gordon J. Smith to the Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, 22 June 1921 (RG 10, Vol. 6776, File 452-133, Reel C-8518, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence Regarding the Conduct of Corporal C. Steyres of the 114th Battalion).

⁵⁸¹ Letter from Eugene Fiset to Duncan Campbell Scott, 8 July 1921 (RG 10, Vol. 6776, File 452-133, Reel C-8518, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence Regarding the Conduct of Corporal C. Steyres of the 114th Battalion).

⁵⁸² Letter from R.S. Denning to J.D. McLean, no date (RG 10, Vol. 6776, File 452-133, Reel C-8518, Six Nations Agency – Correspondence Regarding the Conduct of Corporal C. Steyres of the 114th Battalion).

the men by their officers, many of whom were non-Native.⁵⁸³ One can only wonder if the men knew what they were signing or if they were ordered to sign it. Two more petitions were sent to the Federal government in 1919 advocating for an elected council. The first was a petition sent by Six Nations veterans, but this time, only 32 men signed.⁵⁸⁴ The second petition was sent to the Federal government by the families of Six Nations soldiers which was signed by 160 people.⁵⁸⁵ Both times the Department of Indian Affairs did nothing to change the form of government of the Six Nations. The last great movement for an elected council for Six Nations was 1922 with the formation of a group which called itself the Loyalist Association. Made up of Chiefs, ex-Chiefs, some veterans, and other Six Nations people, this group saw hope in the arbitration mission of Charles Stewart and thought that Chief Levi General had gone too far in claiming complete independence from Canada.⁵⁸⁶ Members of this group made up the majority of people that testified at Col. Thompson's hearings in 1923. Although the members of this group supported an elected council, the membership between the groups that supported the Council and those who advocated against the Council were fluid.⁵⁸⁷ During the post-war years, according to Sally M. Weaver, most of the Six Nations' veteran population supported the Six

⁵⁸³ Elliott Moses, 24.

⁵⁸⁴ Petition from Six Nations War Veterans to Duncan Campbell Scott, 1 September 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 7930, File 32-32, Reel C-13505, Six Nations Agency – Elections of Chiefs and Councillors on the Six Nations Reserve). Although suffering from psychological problems because of his service in the First World War, Claude Styres was one of the signatures that appeared on this petition.

⁵⁸⁵ Scott R. Thevithick Conflicting Outlooks: The Background to the 1924 Deposing of the Six Nations Hereditary Council (MA Thesis: University of Calgary, 1998). 62.

⁵⁸⁶ Letters from Asa R. Hill to the Department of Indian Affairs, no date (RG 10, Vol. 2915, File 185,723-18D, Reel C-11298, Headquarters – Ottawa – Returns to Parliament Regarding Right of Way of the Canadian National Railway Through Reserves Across Canada. Also Correspondence, Petitions and Reports Responding to Questions of Loyalty, and Claims and Conditions Existing on the Six Nations Reserve and RG 10, Vol. 3229, File 571,571, Reel C-11344, Six Nation Agency – Correspondence and Newspaper Clippings Regarding a Dispute Between the Federal Government and the Six Nations Council of their Right to Hereditary Rule).

⁵⁸⁷ Sally M. Weaver Medicine and Politics Among the Grand River Iroquois (Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1972), 31 and Sally M. Weaver Politics of Confrontation (Unpublished manuscript house at the Woodland Cultural Centre in Brantford, Ontario), 420.

Nations Council.⁵⁸⁸ Even after the elected council was in place on Six Nations, there were still dissenters. J.S. Johnson, a staunch supporter of an elected system during Thompson's investigations, by 1927, wrote the Duke of Cannaught claiming that 90% of the population on Six Nations was against the elected council.⁵⁸⁹ This defection by Johnson was noted by Superintendent Morgan in 1924, as he feared that Johnson's defection may cause his son, Fred Johnson, an elected councillor, to change sides also.⁵⁹⁰ Other councillors were also known to change sides. Morgan, in a letter to Scott in 1925, pointed out that not only had Fred Johnson defected sides, but councillors Sam Lickers and Percy Cayuga, a returned veteran, were also disloyal to the Federal government.⁵⁹¹ There were others that Morgan thought were disloyal to the Department also. In 1926, Archie Russell, the Chief Councillor, threatened his resignation as he felt there was no reason to be on a council that did not have control over their own money.⁵⁹² In the end, Russell did not resign, but Morgan forever cast him as being anti-Department of Indian Affairs.⁵⁹³

Although the Six Nations Council did support its soldiers, the events in the immediate post-war years made this support hard to see. While the City of Brantford held large celebrations

⁵⁸⁸ Sally M. Weaver *Politics of Confrontation*, 425.

⁵⁸⁹ Letter from J.S. Johnson to the Duke of Cannaught, 27 March 1927 (RG 10, Vol. 2286, File 57,169-1 Part 5, Reel C-11195, Headquarters – Correspondence, Reports, Memoranda, Publications and Newspaper Clippings Dealing with the Political Status of the Six Nations).

⁵⁹⁰ Letter from C.E. Morgan to Duncan Campbell Scott, 8 December 1924 (RG 10, Vol. 7931, File 32-32 Part 3, Reel C-13505, Six Nations Agency – Elections of Chiefs and Councillors on the Six Nations Reserve (Newspaper Clippings)).

⁵⁹¹ Letter from C.E. Morgan to Duncan Campbell Scott, 23 October 1926 (RG 10, Vol. 7931, File 32-32 Part 3, Reel C-13505, Six Nations Agency – Elections of Chiefs and Councillors on the Six Nations Reserve (Newspaper Clippings)).

⁵⁹² Letter from C.E. Morgan to Duncan Campbell Scott, 4 May 1926 (RG 10, Vol. 7931, File 32-32 Part 3, Reel C-13505, Six Nations Agency – Elections of Chiefs and Councillors on the Six Nations Reserve (Newspaper Clippings)).

⁵⁹³ Letter from C.E. Morgan to A.S. Williams, 11 November 1926 (RG 10, Vol. 7931, File 32-32 Part 3, Reel C-13505, Six Nations Agency – Elections of Chiefs and Councillors on the Six Nations Reserve (Newspaper Clippings)).

for their returned veterans throughout April and May of 1919,⁵⁹⁴ the Six Nations had yet to do so. For the Six Nations veteran, the celebrations, once they made it home, were mostly private homecoming dinners with family and friends.⁵⁹⁵ Some homecomings were bitter sweet. Family grief was a common problem. Although the veterans were coming home, if a family member or close family friend had lost someone during the war, the grief and guilt felt as others returned would have been hard to overcome.⁵⁹⁶ Family problems were also common as veterans tried to integrate back into family life. Some veterans had been away so long, their own children may not have recognized them. The war may have changed the veterans so much that the men were no longer the person their wives remembered.⁵⁹⁷ Socially, there were also changes that the men had to get used to. A simple example would be that between 1915 and 1919, the number of cars on the road in Canada tripled.⁵⁹⁸ Simple technological changes like this would have greeted and possibly confused the Six Nations veterans as they got off the train in Brantford and elsewhere. The veteran also did not understand the home front during the war. Some did not know or understand rationing and the temperance movement.⁵⁹⁹ For the people who lived through the conditions of the home front throughout the war did not understand the veteran either. With the added pain of the Great Depression and Spanish Influenza, many home front survivors tried to forget the war entirely.⁶⁰⁰ This would have conflicted with the position of many veterans who did not, or could not, forget the war.

⁵⁹⁴ Gary Muir Brantford: A City's Century (Brantford: Tampuna Press, 1999), 165.

⁵⁹⁵ Nina Burnham, Speech given at the Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre's Warriors Conference, 13 November 1986. Audio recording of speech in author's possession.

⁵⁹⁶ Warriors: A Resource Guide (Brantford: Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre, 1986), 21 and Dennis Winter, 247.

⁵⁹⁷ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 268.

⁵⁹⁸ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 268.

⁵⁹⁹ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 268.

⁶⁰⁰ Desmond Morton and Glen Wright, 268 and Dennis Winter, 244 and 247.

The Six Nations Council wanted to remember the service their veterans performed during the war but, as seen with the Council's refusal to pay for the burial of killed in action soldiers during the war, the Council also knew that the Canadian government had programs in place to pay for the reestablishment of the veterans. For the Council, this left them in charge of welcoming and memorializing the war for their veterans. To memorialize the war, the Six Nations Council wrote the minister of militia for four captured German cannons as war trophies for an Ohsweken park.⁶⁰¹ This request was later limited by the Minister of Militia to two captured German machine gun and one trench mortar.⁶⁰² The Council also saw to it that an official honour roll was completed and would have a bronze tablet struck with the names of the Six Nations soldiers who were killed in action, at the cost of \$285.⁶⁰³ Along with the memorial tablet, the Council also organized a homecoming reception to show their appreciation to their veterans. The movement for this reception was born during the 2 April 1919 meeting of the Six Nations Council.⁶⁰⁴ Although the Council struck a committee to organize this celebration, according to Superintendent Smith,

At the March General Council a request was made to the Chiefs to have a reception for soldiers but they then replied that they had nothing to do with sending soldiers overseas, they had nothing to do with their return and refused, but the minute was never recorded. Since that time a number of relatives of soldiers became interested in a reception and are making arrangements to have a reception of their own.⁶⁰⁵

⁶⁰¹ Six Nations Council Minutes, 19 November 1918 (RG 10, Vol. 1742, File 63-32 Part 10, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1918-1919).

⁶⁰² Letter from Director of War Trophies to Duncan Campbell Scott, 6 July 1920 (RG 10, Vol. 3094, File 2918,610, Reel C-11323, Six Nations Agency – Resolution of the Six Nations Bands to Authorize Repairs to Parks and Application of the Bands for war Trophies for Their Reserves).

⁶⁰³ Gordon J. Smith's Summary of the Six Nations Council Minutes, 17 July 1919 and 15 September 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 11, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁶⁰⁴ The lateness in the planning of this reception by the Council may have been due to the fact that not all the veterans from Six Nations were home yet. According to the Brantford Expositor, the last Six Nations veteran to arrive in the City was Clayton Miller, a soldier from the 114th battalion, who arrived home on 14 July 1919 (Brantford Expositor, 15 July 1919).

⁶⁰⁵ Gordon J. Smith's Summary of the Six Nations Council Minutes, 23 April 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 11, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

According to the Council, these statements were false and Smith was reprimanded by the Council for sending the anti-Council circular to many Six Nations veterans.⁶⁰⁶ For this reception, the Council voted in \$500 and scheduled it to take place on 20 June 1919. Invitations to this reception were also given by the Council to the Six Nations members of the Army and Navy Club and the Great War Veterans Association. The Council also held a memorial service on 19 October 1919 for all of the Six Nation's war dead.⁶⁰⁷ In the end, the homecoming celebration cost the Council \$30 more than they had originally voted for, which did not include the cost of the memorial tablet or the memorial service. The Council, possibly seeing that Federally funded programs for veterans were not being applied to Six Nations veterans, began loaning money to veterans if they could offer some collateral. In December of 1919, returned soldier Edward L. Martin applied to the Six Nations Council for a special loan of \$400 to make an addition to his home. Although Martin already had a loan with the Council for \$250, the Council approved the loan when Martin was willing to give five acres of land as collateral.⁶⁰⁸ Even in 1924, the Six Nations supported their soldiers. When Lt. Clifford Styres applied to the Council for the use of the Council House grounds for the drilling of the 37th Haldimand Rifles, the Council granted the request.⁶⁰⁹

The only time the Council looked to be not supporting their veterans was in their slowness in creating a permanent war memorial.⁶¹⁰ The idea of creating such a memorial was

⁶⁰⁶ Six Nations Council Minutes, 3 June 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 11, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁶⁰⁷ Six Nations Council Minutes, 30 September 1919 and Gordon J. Smith's Summary of the Six Nations Council Minutes, 25 October 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 11, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁶⁰⁸ Six Nations Council Minutes, 9 December 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 12, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919-1920).

⁶⁰⁹ Six Nations Council Minutes, 9 December 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1746, File 63-32 Part 17, Reel C-15026, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1923-1924).

⁶¹⁰ The decision to create a permanent war memorial would have been conflicting for the Six Nations Council. Although the war was over, the Council still had its obligation to keep the people of the Grand River Territory's

first proposed by the Council in July of 1919. After deciding to create an official Six Nations honour roll, the Council decided that the honour roll, which was to be stuck in bronze, would be illuminated and placed in the Council House and that “an honor roll of those who were killed or dead be inscribed on bronze and placed on some monument to be erected later on but nothing definite.”⁶¹¹ In August, a proposal to create a memorial for the fallen Six Nations soldiers was received by the Council from the Brock’s Rangers and the Six Nations Welcome Association. The Council, not deciding whether to do it or not, did, at the same meeting, agree to pay for and construct their bronze honour roll.⁶¹² When the City of Brantford’s War Memorial Committee sent an invitation to the Six Nations to become a part and aid them in creating their war memorial, the Six Nations, after thanking the committee for their invitation, declined the offer as they were in the process of erecting their own memorial.⁶¹³ It was not until 1924 the idea for a war memorial was raised again when a letter from Capt. C.C. Styres of the Six Nations Veterans Association was received by the Council asking them to appoint a member to represent the Council on the proposed memorial committee. The Council did so and also supported its former decision to appoint a memorial committee.⁶¹⁴ It is unknown what happened after this point as this was the last traditional Council meeting that was ever recorded in the files of the Department of Indian Affairs as the first elected council held their first meeting on 22 October 1924.

minds at peace. Although the memorial would have paid tribute to their veterans, it could also have acted as a permanent monument that glorified war. By approving the building of the monument, the Six Nations Council would have had to balance these two ideas and determine if a monument of this type would be beneficial to their community.

⁶¹¹ Gordon J. Smith’s Summary of the Six Nations Council Minutes, 17 July 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 11, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁶¹² Gordon J. Smith’s Summary of the Six Nations Council Minutes, 15 September 1919 (RG 10, Vol. 1743, File 63-32 Part 11, Reel C-15024, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1919).

⁶¹³ Six Nations Council Minutes, 1 February 1921 (RG 10, Vol. 1744, File 63-32 Part 13, Reel C-15025, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1920-1921). In a demonstration of closeness between the two groups after the war, although the Six Nations did not give any financial support for the erection of the Brantford war memorial, the Brantford War Memorial Committee still listed an honour roll for Six Nations on their memorial.

⁶¹⁴ Six Nations Council Minutes, 5 August 1924 (RG 10, Vol. 1746, File 63-32 Part 17, Reel C-15026, Minutes of Council – Six Nations 1923-1924).

The return of the Six Nations soldier forever changed the community they returned to. These physically and mentally wounded men descended into a community that was quite different from the one they had left. The dislocation these men must have felt upon their return was astronomical. The trauma of their war time experience, coupled with the support they had received from the Canadian state while overseas, was met with the shock of the treatment their families had received at the hands of the Canadian state and the general social changes that had occurred within the Territory while they were overseas. Although their compensation for their wartime service was miniscule compared to their non-Native counterpart, it was still something that some held on to as support from the Canadian state while others, noting the support the Six Nations Council had shown their soldiers while overseas and now at home, supported the Council. As the Six Nations veteran tried to cope and keep up with the new world they had returned to, their world continuously and rapidly changed during the post-war years, which ended with the biggest change of all, the expulsion of the Six Nations Council as the official and Federally recognized governing body of the Grand River Territory. Although these veterans supported both sides of this argument, their support would have been clouded by the transitional experience they were living through during the post-war years.

Conclusion: The Legacy of War

The First World War was a cataclysmic event in the Canada's history, which was fuelled by the ideals found and instilled in society prior to the war. These ideals are best scene on the micro level in local spaces. Robert Rutherford's hometown horizon's theoretical framework allows for the examination of these local spaces in order to understand the full impact the First World War had on state of Canada. The local examination of the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory shows that the Six Nations were living their own unique post-traditional culture and had unique ideas of what their role in the war was to be.

The assimilation theories of scholars like John Moses, G. Elmore Reaman, Sally Weaver, and Ian Kenyon, which insist that any societal conflict that appeared within the Six Nations community spelled the end for Six Nations culture, does not take into account the cultural continuity of Six Nations culture. Six Nations culture existed before contact with Europeans and still continues today. It did not stop when it came into contact with Europeans, their material culture, or their military conflicts. The more recent histories of the Six Nations, produced by scholars like Susan M. Hill, Deborah Doxtatdor, Neal Ferris, and Gary Warrick use the idea of cultural continuity to show that the Six Nations, as a people and culture, chose to adapt certain aspects of European life to fit into their exiting culture. In this way the Six Nations post-traditional culture could not have died during the post-war years and in the events that lead up to the 1924 dismissal of the Six Nation traditional Council. This post-traditional culture continued to develop and evolve long after 1924.

With their close geographical and historical relationship with the communities that surrounded them, the Six Nations participation in the war was closely scrutinized through local opinions and press. This scrutiny of the Six Nations war time participation brought the Six

Nations relationship with the surrounding communities closer as both groups suffered through the loss of loved ones and the effects of life on the home front. This can best be seen through local press coverage during the war⁶¹⁵ and the City of Brantford's willingness to include an Honour Roll for Six Nations on their cenotaph without the Six Nations giving them funding to do so.

As seen in chapter two, the Six Nations military tradition of supporting the Crown did not diminish in the pre-war years, but in many cases, grew stronger. In this way, when the war broke out in 1914, many Six Nations men felt that they should continue supporting their British allies. With the Six Nations' culture of allowing individual autonomy, these soon to be enlistees did not stand against their culture, but were continuing it as they saw fit. This position was also supported by the people of Six Nations and by their Council. The Council's only negative action was not handing over the power of the Council from the civil Chiefs to the war Chiefs unless the Crown came to the Council asking for their support. The civil Chiefs saw to it that the Council itself would remain on the issues of peace time administration of the Grand River Territory and not focused on total war. This action, similar to the allowing of Six Nations men to enlist in the war, was another way the Six Nations were living in a post-traditional culture based on their traditional customs.

For the Six Nations themselves, the war would have long lasting consequences. Not only did the war cost them some of their most promising men, but the men that did come back were changed forever by what they saw during their time overseas.⁶¹⁶ Worse yet, once these veterans returned home, the Canadian society at large continued to believe that First Nations

⁶¹⁵ Brantford Expositor, 1916-1919,

⁶¹⁶ Warriors: A Resource Guide (Brantford: Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre, 1986), 21.

peoples were a dying race.⁶¹⁷ With this in mind, there was no need to give them any political rights or the right of self-determination.⁶¹⁸ Native peoples and veterans alike were either to slip back into their pre-war roles as wards of the state or were to accept their new-post war roles of fully enfranchised Canadian citizens.⁶¹⁹ When it became obvious that the Six Nations Council was not going to comply with this plan, the Canadian government struck back. Not only were the Six Nations not given the right of self-determination, they had their existing government attacked and forcibly changed so the Department of Indian Affairs could maintain better control over them. Through all of these events, the Six Nations continued and maintained their unique culture in the face of the Canadian state.

When the Six Nations veteran did come home, some were wounded physically, but many were also wounded mentally. Their re-adjustment into home life was clouded with political turmoil, which made this readjustment all the much harder. Although there are few cases documented, many of these men would have been confused about their lives and possibly about where they stood when it came to the political controversies of the day. Although being forced by the Canadian government to make their political allegiance known, many of these veterans were still taking life day by day until they effectively learned to cope with their war time experience. In this way, the veteran's immediate confusion while re-integrating to home life was taken advantage of by the Canadian government and the Department of Indian Affairs. As the veterans learned the supporting role the people in their community played during the war and by experiencing continuing support the community gave the veterans after they returned home, the veterans began to see again how their service in the war and their new status as veterans would

⁶¹⁷ L. James Dempsey Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War One (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1999), 84.

⁶¹⁸ L. James Dempsey "The Indians and World War One" Alberta History 31, 3 (1983), 8.

⁶¹⁹ Jonathan Vance Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997), 259 and 261.

fit into the culture of the Six Nations. This realization brought the Six Nations veteran back to the unique ideals and culture of the Six Nations and enabled them to aid in its continuation into the future.

Bibliography

Primary

Library and Archives Canada

Various Attestation Papers accessed on-line through the Library and Archives Canada at <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/databases/cef/001042-100.01-e.php>.

Canada, Government of. RG 10, Department of Indian Affairs, vols. 242, 247, 261, 287, 335, 1739, 1740, 1742, 1743, 1744, 1745, 1746, 1869, 1905, 1922, 1930, 1934, 1935, 1942, 1944, 1948, 1949, 1976, 1987, 1988, 2010, 2285, 2286, 2398, 2409, 2437, 2606, 2837, 2915, 2959, 2919, 2991, 3007, 3010, 3018, 3094, 3121, 3122, 3123, 3150, 3173, 3185, 3189, 3193, 3194, 3210, 3211, 3195, 3224, 6762, 6763, 6765, 6766, 6767, 6768, 6770, 6771, 7484, 7485, 7504, 7505, 7516, 7530, 7747, 8027.

Brantford Public Library Local Reading Room, Brantford, Ontario

Brantford Courier, 8 September 1886.

Brantford Weekly Expositor, 10 July 1874, 28 December 1899.

Brantford Expositor, January-July 1879, 8 September 1886, 13 October 1886 (reprinted 16 September 2000), 25 May 1899, 23 May 1900, 15 February 1913, 9 May 1914, August 1914-December 1924.

Canadian Census 1911.

The General Council of the Six Nations and Delegates from Different Bands in Western and Eastern Canada. Hamilton: The Hamilton Spectator, 1870.

Woodland Cultural Centre, Grand River Territory via Brantford, Ontario

Department of Indian Affairs Annual Reports. Woodland Cultural Centre: Warrior Files.

Draft Copy of the Warriors Exhibit Resource Guide. Woodland Cultural Centre, Warrior Files

King, Lloyd. "114th Regiment in the Great War". Unpublished speech in the Woodland Cultural Centre's Warrior Files.

Warriors Conference Tapes, Woodland Cultural Centre, Brantford, Ontario.

Trent University Archives Peterborough, Ontario

William Paterson Fonds 1854-1814, found in the Trent University Archives, William Paterson, 1839-1914, 75-005.

Trent University Library, Peterborough, Ontario

Annual Report of the Ontario Historical Society, 1898. Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1898.

Annual Report of the Ontario Historical Society, 1911. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1911.

House of Commons Debates, 26 March 1920, 29 March 1920, 15 June 1920, 23 June 1920, 24 June 1920, and 25 June 1920. Ottawa: Thomas Mulvey, 1920.

House of Commons Debates, 20 March 1923 and 24 April 1923. Ottawa: F.A. Acland, 1923.

House of Commons Debates, 31 March 1924, 1 May 1924, 17 June 1924, and 8 July 1924. Ottawa: F.A. Acland, 1924.

House of Commons Debates, 15 February 1927, 21 February 1927, and 13 April 1927. Ottawa: F.A. Acland, 1927.

Bell Homestead National Historic Site, Brantford, Ontario

The Unveiling of the Bell Memorial at Brantford, Ontario, on October the Twenty-Forth 1917. Bell Homestead National Historic Site Archives.

Secondary

Allen, Robert S. His Majesty's Indian Allies: British Indian Policy in the Defence of Canada 1774-1815. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1992.

Aston, E.J. "Soldier Land Settlement in Canada" The Quarterly Journal of Economics Vol. 39, No. 3 (May 1925).

Beaver, George. "Early Iroquoian History in Ontario." Ontario History 85, 3 (1993).

Beaver, George. Mohawk Reporter: The Six Nations Columns of George Beaver. Ohsweken: Iroquois Publishing and Craft Supply, 1997.

Belanger, Yale D. "Seeking a Seat at the Table: A Brief History of Indian Political Organizing in Canada." Ph.D. diss., Trent University, 2006.

Beniacasa, James E. "Cultural Division and Politics of Control: The Canadian Removal of the Six Nations Hereditary Council in 1924." M.A. diss., University of Western Ontario, 1994.

Bourgeois, Donald J. "The Six Nations: A Neglected Aspect of Canadian Legal History." Canadian Journal of Native Studies Vol.2 (1986).

Brant Aryan Society. Report of the Aryan Society and of the Six Nation Indians Women's Patriotic League, County of Brant. Brant Aryan Society, 1916.

Brant Aryan Society Women's Institute. The Voice of the Knight and his Lady, St. George and Maneita. The Knight of the Holy Grail. The Red Prince of the Sunlight and the Soil and Waneita, the Queen of the North. Brant Aryan Society, 1918.

Brant-Sero, John O. "The Six Nations Indians in the Province of Ontario, Canada," in the Journal and Transactions of the Wentworth Historical Society 2 (1899).

Britten, Thomas A. American Indians in World War I: At Home and at War. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.

Brown, Robert Craig and Ramsay Cook, Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart Press, 1974.

Buck, John. "What is Wampum?" in The Annual Archeological Report, Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education (1928).

Buckley, Helen. From Wooden Plows to Welfare: Why Indian Policy failed in the Prairie Provinces. Montreal: McGill-Queens Press, 1992.

Busby, Brian. Great Canadian Speeches: Words that Shaped a Nation. London: Arcturus Publishing Limited, 2008.

"Canadian Indians and World War One" Saskatchewan Indian Federated Collage Journal 1, 1 (1984).

Careless, J.M.S. "Some Aspects of Urbanization in Nineteenth-Century Ontario" in Aspects of Nineteenth Century Ontario: Essays Presented to James J. Talman. F.H. Armstrong, H.A. Stevenson, and J.D. Wilson eds. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

Chadwick, E.M. The People of the Longhouse. Toronto: The Church of England Publishing Company, 1897.

Cockshutt, W. Ashton. "Brief History of Cockshutt Farm Equipment Limited." Presented to the Brant Historical Society, February 1960.

Cook, Tim. At the Sharp End: Canadians Fighting the Great War, 1914-1916. Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007.

Cook, Tim. Shock Troops: Canadians Fighting the Great War, 1917-1918. Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008.

Copp, Terry. "The Military Effort, 1914-1916" in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honor of Robert Craig Brown David Mackenzie ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Cork, Ella. The Worst of the Bargain. San Jacinto, California: Foundation for Social Research, 1962.

Creerar, Adam. "Ontario and the Great War" in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honor of Robert Craig Brown David Mackenzie ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Cutherland, Stan. "The Native People of the Prairie Provinces in the 1920's and 1930's." In One Century Later: Western Canadian Reserve Indians Since Treaty 7. Edited by Ian A.L. Getty and Donald B. Smith. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978.

Dempsey, Hugh A. Red Crow: Warrior Chief. Saskatoon: Fifth House Ltd, 1995.

Dempsey, L. James. "The Indians and World War One" Alberta History 31, 3 (1983).

Dempsey, L. James. Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War One. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1999.

Dickason, Olive Patricia. Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples from the Earliest Times 3rd ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Doxtator, Deborah. "What Happened to the Iroquois Clans?: A Study of Clans in Three Rotinonhsyonni Communities." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Western Ontario, 1996.

Duguid, A. Fortescue. Official History of the Canadian Forces in the Great War Vol.1: From the Outbreak of the War to the Formation of the Canadian Corps August 1914-September 1915. Ottawa: Printer of the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1938.

Drummond, Ian M. Progress Without Planning: The Economic History of Ontario from Confederation to the Second World War. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Ferris, Neal. "In Their Own Time: Archaeological Histories of Native-Lived Contacts and Colonialisms, South Western Ontario A.D. 1400-1900" (Ph.D diss., Columbia University, 1999).

Gaffen, Fred. Forgotten Soldiers. Penticton: Theytus Books Ltd., 1985.

Gilkison, Augusta I. Grant. "Reminiscences of Earlier Years in Brant." in Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society 12 (1914).

Gilkison, Jasper T. Narrative. Visit of the Governor-General and the Countess of Dufferin to the Six Nation Indians. August 25, 1874 2nd ed. No Publisher, 1875.

Goodwill, Jean and Norma Sluman. John Tootoosis. Winnipeg: Pemmican Publications, 1984.

Goldenweiser, Alexander A. "On Iroquois Work 1912," in The Summery Report of the Geological Survey Branch of the Canadian Department of Mines, 1912 (1914).

Graham, Elizabeth. The Mushole: Life at Two Indian Residential Schools. Waterloo, Ontario: Heffle Publishing, 1997.

Granastein, Jack L. "Conscription and the Great War" in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honour of Robert Craig Brown. David Mackenzie ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Habkirk, Evan J. "Governing With the Crown: Six Nations Pleas and Crown Responses" Presented at the Wanapitei Aboriginal History and Politics Colloquium, Temagami, Ontario, September, 2009.

Hakwins, J.J. "Early Days in Brantford," Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society, (no publisher, no date).

Hale, Horatio. "Chief George H.M. Johnson, Onwanonsyshon" The Magazine of American History. (February, 1885).

Harring, Sydney L. White Man's Law: Native People in 19th Century Jurisprudence. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (for the Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History), 1998.

Hauptman, Laurence M. Seven Generations of Iroquois Leadership: The Six Nations Since 1800. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 2008.

Hill, Asa R. "The Historical Position of the Six Nations." Presented at the Annual Convention of the Ontario Historical Society, June 1921. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1922.

Hill, Bruce Emerson. The Grand River Navigation Company. Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 1994.

Hill, Susan Marie. "The Clay We Are Made Of: An Examination of the Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River Territory." Ph.D. diss., Trent University, 2006.

Hopkins, J. Castell. The Province of Ontario in the War: A Record of Government and People. Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1919.

Iarocci, Andrew. Shoestring Soldiers: the 1st Canadian Division at War, 1914-1915. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Indian and Northern Affairs (Treaties and Historical Research Centre). Indian Acts and Amendments 1868-1950. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs, 1981.

Johnson, Charles M.. "An Outline of Early Settlement in the Grand River Valley." Ontario History 54, 1. (1962).

Johnson, Charles M. "The Six Nations in the Grand River Valley, 1784-1847." In Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations. Donald B Smith and Edward S. Rogers eds. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1994.

Johnson, Charles M. ed. Valley of the Six Nations: A Collection of Documents on the Indian Lands of the Grand River. Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1964.

Johnson, Evelyn H.C. "Chief John Smoke Johnson. Sakayengwaraton-"Disappearing of the Indian Summer Mist"," in Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society 12 (1914).

Johnson, Evelyn H.C. "Grandfather and Father of E. Pauline Johnson" in Annual Archeological Report, Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education (1928).

Johnson, Evelyn H.C. "The Martin Settlement," Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society, (no publisher, no date).

Kenyon, Ian. "A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario, 1780-1840." Arch Notes, Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society 85:3 (1985)

Kenyon, Ian. "The Onondaga Settlement at Middleport." Kewa, Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society 85:3 (1985).

Kenyon, Ian. "Levi Turkey and the Tuscarora Settlement on the Grand River." Kewa, Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society 87:1 (1987).

Kenyon, Ian and Neal. Ferris. "Investigations at Mohawk Village, 1983." Arch Notes, Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society 84:1 (1984).

Kenyon, Ian and Thomas Kenyon. "Echo the Firekeeper: A Nineteenth Century Iroquois Site." Kewa, Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society 86:2 (1986).

Knight, Rolf. Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Indian Labour in British Columbia, 1858-1930. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1978.

Kulchyski, Peter. "A Considerable Unrest": F.O. Loft and the League of Indians." Native Studies Review 4, numbers 1 and 2 (1988).

Lackenbauer, P. Whitney. "'Pay No Attention to Sero": The Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte and Imperial Flying Training During the Great War." Ontario History 96 (2004).

Lackenbauer, P. Whitney and Katharine McGowen. "Competing Loyalties in a Complex Community: Enlisting the Six Nations in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1914-1917." In Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives. Edited By P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Craig Leslie. Kingston: Canadian Defense Academy Press, 2007.

Leggo, William. History of the Administration of the Earl of Dufferin in Canada. Montreal: Lovell Printing and Publishing Company, 1878.

Loft, Fredrick Onondayoh. "Militarism Among the Indians of Yesterday and Today," Selected Papers from the Canadian Military Institute 17 (1909).

MacDonnell, H.W. and T.W. Morse. "Canadian Prisoners of War in Germany" in Canada in the Great World War Vol. 4: The Turn of the Tide. Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1920.

MacKenzie, J.B. The Six-Nations in Canada. Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1896.

Macrae, J.A. "Report RE Sanitary and Other Matters Six Nations Reserve, 26 October 1899" (Sessional Paper No. 14, 5th Session of 8th Parliament, Session 1900).

Maracle, Brian. Back on the Rez: Finding the Way Home. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1997.

Mayers, Adam. Dixie and the Dominion: Canada, the Confederacy and the War for the Union. Toronto: The Dundurn Group, 2003.

McCalla, Douglas. Planting the Province: The Economic History of Upper Canada, 1784-1870. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

McLeod, Neal. Cree Narrative Memory: From Treaties to Contemporary Times. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Limited, 2007.

Miller, R.J. Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Montgomery, Malcolm. "The Legal Status of the Six Nations Indian in Canada." Ontario History 55:2 (1963).

Montgomery, Malcolm. "The Six Nations Indians and the MacDonald Franchise." Ontario History 57:1 (1965).

Montour, Enos T. The Feathered U.E.L.'s: An Account of the Life and Times of Certain Canadian Natives People Toronto: The United Church of Canada, 1973.

Morton, Desmond. Fight or Pay: Soldiers' Families in the Great War. Victoria: University of British Columbia Press, 2004.

Morton, Desmond. "Supporting Soldier's Families: Separation Allowance, Assigned Pay, and the Unexpected" in Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honor of Robert Craig Brown. David Mackenzie ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Morton, Desmond. When Your Number's Up: The Canadian Soldier in the First World War. Toronto: Random House, 1993.

Morton, Desmond and Glen Wright. Winning the Second Battle: Canadian Veterans and the Return to Civilian Life 1915-1930. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Morton, Desmond and J.L. Granatstein. Marching to Armageddon: Canadian and the Great War 1914-1919. Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys Limited, 1989.

Moses, Elliot. "Seventy-five Years of Progress of the Six Nations of the Grand River" Waterloo Historical Society (Vol. 56, 1968).

Moses, John. "Aboriginal Participation in Canadian Military Service" The Army Doctrine and Training Bulletin 3,3 (Fall 2000), accessed on-line.

Moses, John. "Political Change at the Grand River Reserve, 1917-1924" The Canadian Historical Association Bulletin 32, 3 (2006).

Moses, John. "The Return of the Native: Six Nations Veterans and Political change at the Grand River Reserve, 1917-1924." In Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives. Edited By P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Craig Leslie. Kingston: Canadian Defense Academy Press, 2007.

Moses, John, Donald Graves, and Warren Sinclair. A Sketch Account of Aboriginal Peoples in the Canadian Military. Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 2004.

Moss, Mark. Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Muir, Gary W. Brantford: A City's Century, 1895-2000. (2 Volumes) Brantford: Tupuna Press, 1999.

Muir, R. Cuthbertson. The Early Political and Military History of Burford. Quebec: La Cre D'Impromerie Commerciale, 1913.

Nicholson, G.W.L. The Canadian Expeditionary Force 1914-1919. Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1964.

Noon, John A. Law and Government of the Grand River Iroquois. New York: The Viking Fund, 1949.

O'Brian, Mike. "Manhood and the Militia Myth: Masculinity, Class, and Militarism in Ontario, 1902-1914" Labour/La Travail 42 (Fall 1998).

O'Neal, Doug. "Brant Monument Artistic Triumph for Sculptor" Brantford Expositor 13 October 1984.

Ontario Visual Heritage Project and Living History Multimedia Association Brant: Stories for the History of Brant County, Brantford, and Six Nations. Directed by Zack Melnick and Jeremy Lalonde, 2004, 126 minutes.

Orr, Robert B. "The Iroquois of Canada," in the 31st Annual Archaeological Report 1919 Being Part of Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario. Toronto: A.T. Wigress, 1919.

Palmer, Bryan D. Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991 2nd ed. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1992.

Parker, A.C. The Code of Handsome Lake, the Seneca Prophet. Ohsweken: Irocrafts Publishing and Craft Supply, 2000.

Pitawanakwat, Brock. "Indigenous War Veterans and their Struggle for Restitution." Presented for the International Seminar in Leadership, Education and the Armed Forces Challenges and Opportunities, La Paz, Bolivia, September 2004. Found on-line at http://www.cda.forces.gc.ca/bolivia/english/seminars/sep2004/papers/Pitawanakwat_sep_e.pdf.

Porter Tom. "Traditions and Customs of the Six Nations" in Pathways to Self Determination, Leroy Littlebear, Menno Bolt, J. Anthony Lang eds. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Porter, Tom. "Men Who are of the Good Mind." Northeast Indian Quarterly 4, no. 4 (1987).

Pulsifer, Cameron. "Narrative of the Volunteer Camp at Niagara June 1871" Canadian Military History 12,4 (Autumn 2003).

Reaman, G. Elmore. The Trial of the Iroquois. Toronto: Peter Martin and Associates Limited, 1967.

Reville, F. Douglas. History of the County of Brant. (2 Volumes) Brantford: The Hurley Printing Company, 1920.

Rioux, Marcel. "Some Medical Beliefs and Practices of the Contemporary Iroquois Longhouse of the Six Nations Reserve," Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences 41, 5 (1951).

Rogers, Edward. "Algonquin Farmers of Southern Ontario" in Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations. Donald B. Smith and Edward S. Rogers eds. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1994.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Looking Forward, Looking Back Vol. 1. Ottawa: Canada Communications Group, 1996.

Rutherford, Robert Allen. Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to Canada's Great War (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004).

Sample, Katherine Ann. "Changes in Agriculture on the Six Nations Indian Reservation." M.A. diss., McMaster University, 1968.

Schmalz Peter S. The Ojibwa of Southwestern Ontario. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Schull, Joseph. Veneration for Valour. Ottawa: Veterans Affairs Canada, 1973.

Scott, Duncan Campbell. "The Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada" in The Canadian Institute of International Affairs (1931).

Scott, Duncan Campbell. "The Canadian Indians and the Great War" in Canada and the Great War, Vol. 3: Guarding the Channel Ports. Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1919.

Scott, Duncan Campbell. "Traditional History of the Confederacy of the Six Nations." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada Series 3, Vol. 6 (1912).

Simon, Michael P.P. "The Haldimand Agreement: A Continuing Covenant." American Indian Culture and Research Journal 7, 2 (1983).

Sharpe, Roger. Soldiers and Warriors: The Early Volunteer Militia of Brant County 1856-1866. Brantford: Canadian Military Heritage Museum, 1998.

Sharpe, Roger. The Martial Spirit: A History of the Sedentary Militia and Six Nations Warriors of the Former Brant County Area 1784-1884. Brantford: Roger Sharpe, 2003.

Sharpe, Roger. The Village of Brantford in 1830. Brantford: Brant Historical Society, 2001.

Sheffield, R. Scott. "Indifference, Difference, and Assimilation: Aboriginal People in Canadian Military Practice, 1900-1945." In Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Military: Historical Perspectives. Edited By P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Craig Leslie. Kingston: Canadian Defense Academy Press, 2007.

Shenandoah, Audrey. "Everything has to be in Balance." Northeast Indian Quarterly 4, no. 4 (1987).

Shimony, Annemarie Anrod. "Conflict and Continuity: An Analysis of a Iroquois Uprising" in Extending the Rafters: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Iroquoian Studies. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

Shimony, Annemarie Anrod. Conservatism among the Iroquois at the Six Nations Reserve. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1994.

Smith, Allen. "Old Ontario and the Emergence of a National State of Mind" in Aspects of Nineteenth Century Ontario: Essays Presented to James J. Talman. F.H. Armstrong, H.A. Stevenson, and J.D. Wilson eds. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

Smith, Donald B. "Deskaheh (Levi General)." Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online. http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=8103&interval=25&&PHPSESSID=avoaugbdlb41d2m024455vai65

Smith, Gordon J. "Captain Joseph Brant's Status as a Chief, and Some of His Descendents" in Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society 12 (1914).

Smith, Gordon J. "Land Tenure in Brant County" in Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society. Brantford: Brant Historical Society, No date.

Smith, Gordon J. "Whiteman's Creek" in Some of the Papers Read During the Years 1908-1911 at Meetings of the Brant Historical Society. Brantford: Brant Historical Society, No date.

Summerby, Janice. Native Soldiers – Foreign Battlefields. Ottawa: Veterans Affairs Canada, 2005.

Staats, Sheila. "The Six Nations Council House: Historic Building at Ohsweken." Ontario History 85, 3 (1993).

Stamp, Robert M. "Empire Day in the Schools of Ontario: the Training of Young Imperialist" Journal of Canadian Studies 8 (Summer 1978).

Taylor, John Leonard. Canadian Indian Policy During the Inter-War Years 1918-1939. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1984.

Tehanetorens (Ray Fadden). Wampum Belts of the Iroquois. Summertown, Tennessee: Book Publishing Company, 1999.

The History of the County of Brant. Toronto: Warner, Beers, and Company, 1883.

Thevithick, Scott R. "Conflicting Outlooks: The Background to the 1924 Deposing of the Six Nations Hereditary Council." M.A. diss., University of Alberta, 1998.

Titely, E. Brian. A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986.

Tooker, Elisabeth. "Iroquois Since 1820," in Handbook of the North American Indians Vol. 15: Northeast, ed. William C. Sturtevant (Series Editor) and Bruce Trigger (Volume Editor) (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978).

Torok-Hamori, Charles. "The Iroquois of Akwesasne (St. Regis), Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (Tyendinaga), Onyota'a:ka (the Oneida of the Thames), and the Walhata Mohawk (Gibson), 1750-1945" in Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations. Donald B. Smith and Edward S. Rogers eds. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1994.

Trigger, Bruce G. "Indian and White History: Two Worlds or One?" in Extending the Rafters: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Iroquoian Studies. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

Vance, Jonathan. "Aftermath" The Beaver: Canada's History Magazine Vol. 80, No. 5 (October/November 2000).

Vance, Jonathan. Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997.

Various Authors. "Religions and Social Activities" in Canada in the Great World War Vol. 7: Special Services, Heroic Deeds, Etc. Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1921.

Various Authors. Canada in the Great World War Vol. 7: Special Services, Heroic Deeds, Etc. Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1921.

Voget, Fred. "A Six Nations Diary, 1891-1894" Ethnohistory 16, 4 (1969).

Waldie, Jean. Brant County: The Story of its People 2 Vols. (Brantford: The Brantford Historical Society, 1984 and 1985).

Walker, James W. St.G. "Race and Recruitment in World War I: Enlistment of the Visible Minorities in the Canadian Expeditionary Force." Canadian Historical Review 70:1 (1989).

Wallace, Anthony F.C. Death and Rebirth of the Seneca. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Warrick, Gary. "Historical Archaeology of the Six Nations of the Grand River." Presented at the 36th Annual Conference of the Canadian Archaeological Association, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, May 2003.

Warrick, Gary. "Six Nations Farming." Presented at the 41st Annual Meeting of the Canadian Archaeological Association, Peterborough, Ontario, May 2008.

Warrick, Gary. "The Archaeology of Early Nineteenth-Century Iroquoians on the Grand River, Ontario." Presented at the 31st Annual Conference of the Canadian Archaeological Association, Victoria, British Columbia, May 1998.

Warriors: A Resource Guide. Brantford: Woodland Indian Cultural Education Centre, 1986.

Weaver, Sally M. Medicine and Politics Among the Grand River Iroquois: A Study of the Non-Conservatives. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, 1972.

Weaver, Sally M. On Iroquois Politics, Unpublished manuscript. Found at the Woodland Cultural Centre, Brantford, Ontario.

Weaver, Sally M. "Seth Newhouse and the Grand River Confederacy at Mid-Nineteenth Century." In Extending the Rafters: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Iroquoian Studies. Edited by Michael K. Foster, Jack Campis, and Marianne Mithan. Albany: State University Press of New York, 1984.

Weaver, Sally M. "Six Nations of the Grand River, Ontario." In Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 15 *Northeast*. Edited by Bruce G. Trigger. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978.

Weaver, Sally M. "The Iroquois: The Consolidation of the Grand River Reserve in the mid-Nineteenth Century, 1847-1875." In Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations. Donald B Smith and Edward S. Rogers eds. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1994.

Weaver, Sally M. "The Iroquois: The Grand River Reserve in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century, 1875-1945." In Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations. Donald B Smith and Edward S. Rogers eds. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1994.

Weaver, Sally M. and Virginia Cooper. "An Early History of the Movement for an Elective Form of Local Government among the Six Nations of Grand River, 1861-1903." Unpublished Manuscript, 1970.

Whale, R.R. "A Short Sketch of Chief G.H.M. Johnson of the Six Nations Indians" in the Annual Archeological Report, Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education, 1928.

Winter, Dennis. Death Men: Soldiers in the Great War. London: Penguin Books, 1978.

Wilson, Barbra M. ed. Ontario and the First World War. Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1977.

Willson, W.A. "War Politics and Christmas Cheer at the Front" in Canada in the Great World War Vol. 5: The Triumph of the Allies. Toronto: United Publishers of Canada, 1920.

Wright, Glen T. "Serving the Empire: Canadians in South Africa, 1899-1902" Families 21,1 (1982).

Wright, Ronald. Stolen Continents: The New World Through Indian Eyes Since 1492. Toronto: Viking Press, 1992.