



mistahi-maskwa (Big Bear) Trading at Fort Pitt, 1884.
University of Saskatchewan Archives, Edgar Mapletoft fonds
(MG 364), file “Fort Pitt.”

***nêhiyawak* (Plains Cree) Leadership on the Plains**

Liam Haggarty

The *nêhiyawak* (Plains Cree) have produced some of the most famous and revered Aboriginal leaders in Canadian history, including *mistahi-maskwa*, *pîhtokahânapiwiyin*, and *payipwât*. These men shaped not only the history of their people, but the history of a nation and a continent. Although they are remembered as extraordinary individuals, they also were part of a culture that encouraged the emergence of such leaders and nurtured their growth. This cultural foundation is integral not only to these three men, but to every leader produced by the *nêhiyawak* nation. Understanding Aboriginal leadership in this region therefore requires engagement with *nêhiyawak* culture and what it means to be a leader.

nêhiyawak Leadership

nêhiyawak culture is not easily analysed or summarised. As a fluid, ever-changing and evolving set of interconnected relationships and meanings, it cannot be succinctly described or condensed. Even if this were possible, the result would not represent the experiences of all *nêhiyawak* peoples at any given time, much less through time. That is to say, cultures are complex and multifaceted across both time and space. What follows, then, is a snapshot of *nêhiyawak* culture as it was experienced by some of its members, and often as reported by outsiders, during the early to mid nineteenth century. Although neither conclusive nor authoritative, this snapshot provides an outline of the world in which the leaders later described lived and prospered.

***okimaw* (Band Chief or Leader)**

In *nêhiyawak* culture, chieftainship was earned. Although normally inherited from his father, an *okimaw*'s son had to demonstrate he was worthy of the position; nothing was guaranteed by birthright. According to anthropologist David Mandelbaum, a certain level of prestige was required to become *okimaw*, and although chiefly bloodlines accounted for some status, it was incumbent on the individual to accumulate enough prestige to be a recognised leader. *okimaw* often were accomplished warriors, skilled hunters, persuasive orators, able executives, and liberal thinkers – these were prestigious traits *nêhiyawak* people expected of their leaders.¹

Of these traits, bravery in combat was perhaps most highly regarded. “One who had not distinguished himself on the warpath could not be chief,” Mandelbaum wrote. Some *okimaw* even ceded their power to others who had “outstripped them” in battle achievements. But peacemaking could be an even more courageous act. Speaking with Chief Broken Arm in 1847, American artist Paul Kane recorded that “The highest deed of all was to make peace with a hostile tribe. It required great courage to approach the enemy unarmed....”²

okimaw also had to be selfless in their caring for the rest of the group. They had to feed and house guests and give freely of their own possessions as a way to recognise the contributions of others and provide for the destitute. In *Voices of the Plains Cree*, Edward Ahenakew was told by Chief Thunderchild that “There was no selfishness. It is an Indian custom to share with others. That has always been so; the strong take care of the poor; there is usually enough for all.” Gift giving was also used to maintain order and mediate disputes by mollifying aggrieved members of the group.³

In *Ahtahkakoop*, Deanna Christenson provides a detailed description of leadership qualities. According to her research, the ideal band chief was

an outstanding warrior acclaimed for his courage, skill, and leadership. He was recognized for his abilities as a hunter, trapper, and provider. His generosity and concern for others were well known, and his skills as an orator were demonstrated during councils with his own band members and in larger gatherings involving a number of bands. Often, he was also a man who had powerful spirit helpers....

A successful chief attracted families and individuals from other bands and his camp grew in size. ...

A good chief listened carefully when others spoke during council meetings. An outstanding orator, he was able to sway people to his view. As a visionary, he was able to make choices that would ensure survival, and as a realist, he was practical. A strong chief was also able to control the restless young men in his camp. And when a number of bands gathered together, he was among those chosen as spokesmen. In times of war, however, authority was turned over to a war chief who took control of the camp and directed war activities.⁴

Clearly, this was not a position taken lightly. As Fine-Day, a *néhiyawak* elder, told Mandelbaum:

It is not an easy thing to be chief. Look at this chief now. He has to have pity on the poor. When he sees a man in difficulty he must try to

help him in whatever way he can. If a person asks for something in his tipi, he must give it to him willingly and without any bad feeling.⁵

But *okimaw* were not alone; they received aid from family members and other respected people in the group. Relatives helped *okimaw* both in the acquisition of wealth and other items of prestige and the duties associated with chieftainship. Because the *okimaw* was expected to be more generous than anyone else and because he was responsible for housing and feeding visitors, “the chief,” Christenson noted, required

a large tipi, a good supply of horses, buffalo robes, and hides, as well as abundant amounts of buffalo meat, pemmican, berries, root vegetables and other foodstuffs. Beautifully decorated shirts, moccasins birch bark baskets, and other such items were also needed for gifts. Male relatives contributed to the expenses and assisted with the responsibilities of the chief, and thus gained prestige in their own right.⁶

According to Joseph Dion, author of *My Tribe, The Crees*, “The *okimaw* or leader of a group or band was always well looked after by his followers. They gave him the choicest cuts of their kill and his larder was supposed to be amply supplied at all times so that he in turn could treat his many visitors to the best.”⁷

Even more important were the contributions made by the leading women. “They made sure their tipis were a suitable size and well equipped for guests,” Christenson wrote. “They prepared the food, tanned the hides and furs, made the special gifts, and ensured that the chief and his family were appropriately dressed for their position in the band.” Dion

recounts how “teenaged girls and elderly women did the bulk of the work” setting up camp and errands.⁸

Beyond the family, *okimaw* received advice from councils of respected elders, some of whom also served as criers, men who communicated the *okimaw*'s messages to the rest of the group and made gifts on the his behalf when he was away or unable to do so himself. Criers also ensured that *okimaw* generosity was recognised by the group as a prestigious act and a form of intangible wealth. During summer months, an *okimaw* and his council would appoint a camp leader, usually a man with powerful spirit helpers, to select group camp sites. At the other end of the age spectrum, *okimaw* also received help from young boys, usually orphans or members of impoverished families, who would live with the *okimaw*, care for his horses, and hunt for him. These young workers were called *octockinikima*.⁹

***kihtockinikiwak* (Worthy Young Men) and *okihtcitawak* (Warriors/Dancers)**

Second to *okimaw* in leadership importance were *kihtockinikiwak*, or worthy young men, and *okihtcitawak*, or warriors/dancers. *kihtockinikiwak*, many of whom were sons of chiefs, were men who performed valorous deeds in battle and who acted as junior chiefs but had no specific responsibilities. *okihtcitawak*, on the other hand, had a number of important duties, including dancing, feasting, providing for those in need, guarding the column of women, children, and old people (as well as their belongings) when the camp was being moved, and preparing corpses for burial. They also policed the buffalo hunt, which meant ensuring individual hunters didn't begin the hunt prematurely or break any other rule. According to Ahenakew, “Those who were great hunters and could look after many were known as the Providers. They were the

captains of the buffalo chase.... In camp, the men who enforced law were greatly respected. They belonged to the society of Dancers....”¹⁰

okihtcitaw were organized into societies, called Warrior’s or Dancer’s Society, and were led by a warrior chief. Unlike the band chief, who was appointed tacitly, the chief of the *okihtcitawak* was elected by his peers. He was not, however, a war chief nor was he equal in power to the band chief, though warrior chiefs often did rise to that post. According to Christenson, the warrior chief, who was responsible for leading dances and directing the activities of the warriors, had to be a courageous and skilled fighter and wealthy. During gatherings in the Warrior’s or Dancer’s Lodge, age and prestige, symbolised by back-rests, stratified the members with the chief sitting directly behind the fire at the back of the lodge. Beside him were the next highest ranking members and so on, with the lowest ranking ones next to the door. The same arrangement occurred when different groups gathered together. The highest ranking chief would be at the “head” of the circle, directly behind the fire opposite the entrance, with the rest of the chiefs following in ranked order.¹¹

okihtcitawak, therefore, were somewhat more prestigious than *kihtockinikiwak*, but the two groups were not mutually exclusive. In fact, most *okihtcitawak* were *kihtockinikiwak*, though some were simply good hunters and wealthy. As Mandelbaum notes, these leaders faced high expectations:

Both Warriors and the Worthy Young Men maintained prestige by demonstrating their dissociation from sentiments held by common people. They had to part with their material possessions freely and willingly; they were expected to be above sexual jealousy; they took

it upon themselves to prepare corpses for burial, and unpleasant and dread task. When a Worthy Young Man died in battle the usual manifestations of mourning were foregone because he had willingly courted death.¹²

Today, *okihtcitaw* (Warrior) now refers to people who are generous or who are recklessly brave.

Together, the *okimaw*, his family, aides, and councillors, along with the *kihtockinikiwak* and *okihtcitawak* provided leadership in *nêhiyawak* communities, from family organisation through inter-group cooperation. This leadership structure, however, was never fixed or unchanging. *nêhiyawak* culture continually adapted to their changing environments and social contexts. Feast or famine, epidemic disease or population growth, peace or war, climate change, technological advancements, or new trading resources: all these things and the innumerable others like them required a flexible, dynamic culture that could take advantage of new resources just as quickly as it could protect itself from potential disaster. According to John Milloy, *nêhiyawak* leadership was “a prime determinant in the cohesiveness and longevity of the band.”¹³ In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, this adaptability and longevity would be put to the test as prominent *nêhiyawak* leaders struggled to reconcile tradition and innovation in a changed world.

***nêhiyawak* Leaders**

From this culture developed a multitude of prominent leaders, three of whom are discussed here: *mistahi-maskwa*, *pîhtokahânapiwiyin*, and *payipwât*. Revered by their friends and enemies alike, they defended their people and culture in the face of unprecedented challenges according to the values instilled in them early in life. Although success is difficult to

measure, it may be said that these men were champions of their culture, pre-eminent examples of *nēhiyawak* leadership.

mistahi-maskwa (Big Bear)

Born circa 1825 near Fort Carlton, *mistahi-maskwa* was believed to be the son of a *nēhiyawak* woman and a *nahkawininiwak* (Saulteaux) chief of mixed *nahkawininiwak-nēhiyawak* decent named *Mukitoo* (Black Powder). His spirit power was the Bear Spirit, the most powerful animal according to the *nēhiyawak*. Although little is known of his early life, he allegedly contracted smallpox around 1837, leaving his face partially disfigured. By the 1860s, he had risen to be *okimaw* of a small *nēhiyawak* band but was relatively unknown to European traders and missionaries, choosing instead to live a traditional, autonomous lifestyle. After taking part in the war between the *nēhiyawak* and the *siksikáwa* (Blackfoot) in 1870, *mistahi-maskwa* clashed with Métis leader Gabriel Dumont in 1873 regarding proper techniques for hunting buffalo. By this time, he was the leader of perhaps the largest *nēhiyawak* band, consisting of approximately 65 lodges.

As a powerful and popular leader, however, *mistahi-maskwa* could not long avoid the spotlight, and his strict adherence to a *nēhiyawak* lifestyle produced conflict with anyone who wanted him to live differently. When Hudson's Bay Company trader William McKay was sent by the Canadian government in 1874 to gift tea and tobacco to Aboriginal leaders, *mistahi-maskwa* refused, believing they were bribes aimed at facilitating treaties. A year later in reaction to the proposed Treaty 6, he scolded government officials for their tactics, stating “when we set a fox-trap we scatter pieces of meat all round, but when the fox gets into the trap we knock him on the head. We want no bait; let your chiefs come like men and talk to us.” When the treaty was finally signed in 1876, *mistahi-maskwa* refused,

warning his *nêhiyawak*, *nahkawiniwak*, and Nakota counterparts to “Stop, my friends. . . . I will request [the governor] to save me from what I most dread – hanging; it was not given to us to have the rope about our necks.”¹⁴

Over the next six years, *mistahi-maskwa* continued to withhold his signature and became a leader to those dissatisfied with the treaty process. But adherence to a traditional lifestyle was difficult. Land and food became increasingly scarce until *mistahi-maskwa* finally relented following the near-extinction of the buffalo and a failed attempt to create a pan-Indian reserve in the Cypress Hills. However, after signing the treaty he remained defiant, a troublemaker in the eyes of the government. He continued to demand better terms from the government and advocated a single large reserve on the North Saskatchewan River for all Aboriginal people. He also continued to practice traditional dances and other aspects of *nêhiyawak* culture, some of which had been outlawed. Again, his popularity as an able leader swelled.

But *mistahi-maskwa* did not want to go to war with Canada. He would defy the nation’s officials and stand up for his people, but he did not want the fight that some younger members of his band, including his son, called for. When hostilities broke out between Métis peoples and Canada in 1885, his reluctance to join forces with Louis Riel, Gabriel Dumont, and the rest of the Métis warriors provided the impetus necessary for the war chief *kâ-papâmahcahkewêw* (Wandering Spirit) and the Warrior Society to assume control of the band. Following an unimpressive military campaign, *mistahi-maskwa*’s band eventually disintegrated after the battle at Loon Lake and the fall of the Métis at Batoche. Although *mistahi-maskwa* and several other witnesses testified to his attempts to maintain peace and safeguard those most vulnerable, including captives, the old *okimaw* was convicted

of Treason-Felony and sentenced to three years imprisonment at Manitoba's Stony Mountain Penitentiary.¹⁵ While incarcerated, he fell gravely ill and was released from jail shortly before his death in January 1888. He is buried in the Roman Catholic Cemetery on the Poundmaker Reserve.¹⁶

pīhtokahânapiwiyin (Poundmaker)

Born around 1842 to a Stony Indian named *sikakwayan* (Skunk Skin) and a prominent mother of Métis ancestry, *pīhtokahânapiwiyin* was a privileged youth. In 1873, this prestige grew when *siksikáwa* head chief *isapo-muxika* (Crowfoot) adopted him in memory of a son he lost in battle. For several years, *pīhtokahânapiwiyin* remained with the *siksikáwa* and acquired much wealth, including the name *makoyi-koh-kin* (Wolf Thin Legs). When he returned to live with his *nēhiyawak* family, he was made a minor *okimaw* and councillor to *pihew-kamihkosit* (Red Pheasant). Like *mistahi-maskwa*, *pīhtokahânapiwiyin* was wary of the Treaty 6 negotiations but did eventually sign his name. Soon after, he became a *okimaw* in his own right and continued to hunt the diminishing buffalo herds until 1879 when he finally accepted a reserve at the junction of Battle River and Cut Knife Creek.

In 1881, *pīhtokahânapiwiyin* escorted the Governor General of Canada on a tour from Battleford, near his reserve, to Blackfoot Crossing, where he was born. Extolled by the Canadians as an intelligent leader and peacemaker, *pīhtokahânapiwiyin* learned much about Canadian society and culture, later stating that “the whites will fill the country and they will dictate to us as they please. It is useless to dream that we can frighten them, that time has passed. Our only resource is our work, our industry, our farms.” This approach led him, in 1885, to pursue peaceful reconciliation with the government in the face of famine and destitution, but like *mistahi-maskwa*,

he was unable to dissuade the more militant aspirations of the young warriors in his band. *pîhtokahânapiwiyyin*'s band played a prominent role in conflicts in and around the Battleford area and intended to join Riel's forces at Batoche prior to their defeat.¹⁷

Following the end of the Rebellion, *pîhtokahânapiwiyyin* surrendered peacefully at Battleford and was put on trial for Treason. Defending himself against charges of treason, he spoke of his attempts to stop the violence. "Had I wanted war, I would not be here now. I should be on the prairie. You did not catch me. I gave myself up. You have got me because I wanted justice." But like *mistahi-maskwa*, *pîhtokahânapiwiyyin* was found guilty and sentenced to three years at Stony Mountain. After spending only a year in jail, he was released due to serious illness and died four months later on the *siksikáwa* reserve where his adopted father lived. In 1972, the Canadian Government organised a celebration commemorating the life of *pîhtokahânapiwiyyin*.¹⁸

payipwât (Piapot)

Known also as Hole in the Sioux, *kisikawasan*, and Flash in the Sky, *payipwât* was born around 1816 near the border separating present-day southern Manitoba from Saskatchewan. As a child, he, along with his grandmother, was taken prisoner by the Sioux and lived among them until being captured by the *nêhiyawak* in the 1830s. Impressed by his knowledge of Sioux medicine, he received the name *payipwât* which may translate as "one who knows the secrets of the Sioux." By the 1860s, he had become a highly respected spiritual leader and *okimaw* of a *nêhiyawak* band that included many Sioux-speaking people. Like *mistahi-maskwa*, he showed little desire to cooperate with the HBC or the Métis, leading British and Canadian officials to label him a troublemaker as early as the 1850s.

Facing rapidly declining buffalo herds, *payipwât* moved his band into the Cypress Hills area, one of the buffalo's last refuges, after a bloody struggle with a Blood village near present-day Lethbridge. While there, *payipwât* missed the Treaty 4 negotiations but did, in 1875, sign what he considered to be a "preliminary" treaty that was to be amended to include more resources and opportunities for his people. The government, however, had not, in the opinion of its officials, agreed to *payipwât*'s amendments, leading to ongoing misunderstandings about the intent and terms of Treaty 4. Along with *mistahi-maskwa*, *payipwât* then turned his attention toward the creation of a large reserve for all *nêhiyawak* people. Famine, however, forced them out of the Cypress Hills area, with *payipwât* accepting a reserve for his band at Indian Head alongside the Assiniboine. Life there was difficult, however, and starvation quickly compelled *payipwât* to move again, this time near Fort Qu'Appelle where he intended to resurrect his plan for a pan-Indian reserve. With the help of *mistahi-maskwa* and others, the plan seemed to be working until hostilities erupted in 1885.

Although *payipwât* was not directly involved in the Rebellion, he was labelled as a troublemaker and a traitor by the Canadian government due to his power and influence among both *nêhiyawak* and Sioux peoples. Nonetheless, *payipwât* continued to practice traditional dances, ceremonies, and other cultural expressions outlawed by the government as a way to resist other assimilationist strategies designed to break-up *nêhiyawak* society and weaken its culture. Despite continued harassment and several arrests, *payipwât* remained a powerful and respected leader until his death in April 1908.¹⁹

nêhiyawak Leadership in Native-Newcomer Relations

One of the greatest challenges faced by *nêhiyawak* culture and its leaders was the emigration of thousands of Europeans to the lands that eventually would become the Canadian prairies. The first manifestation of this Native-Newcomer relationship was the fur trade, led on side by England's Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) and on the other by *nêhiyawak* and other Aboriginal leaders. Outnumbered and largely powerless, HBC officials relied on significant cooperation with, and at times dependence on, local Indigenous people. Acquiring furs and sustaining immigrant populations in a foreign land thus compelled them to recognise and respect these leaders and their structures that gave them power.²⁰

To do this, the HBC granted *nêhiyawak* leaders preferential treatment, "including special gifts and gratuities such as flour, tea, sugar, and other trade goods ... [which] they shared ... with band members," Christenson noted. "They were also given coats and high silk hats decorated with a broad gold lace band and three plumes of three different colours called 'coloured cocktail feathers.' ... These garments were known as chiefs' coats and were a mark of their rank. Lesser chiefs received scarlet coats." According to one HBC official, "we give to Chiefs and Councillors good and suitable uniform [sic] indicating their office, to wear on these and other great days."²¹

Mandelbaum, however, noted that this practice also had the potential to disturb traditional leadership patterns if the HBC chose to recognise "peaceful trappers" rather than "troublesome warriors." As Newcomers became more numerous and powerful, they tried to alter the leadership patterns more explicitly as it suited their interests. In the nineteenth century, as the new country of Canada expanded across the prairies, disease decimated Indigenous populations,

residential schools removed Aboriginal children from their homes, Indian agents replaced HBC officials, settlers staked “new” land, and numbered treaties displaced Aboriginal people from their traditional lands and alienated them from their means of livelihood. Of the many disastrous consequences wrought by this period of history was a challenge to *nēhiyawak* leadership. On reserves especially, the power of *okimaw*, many of whom, like Big Bear and Poundmaker, were deposed by the Canadian government, was usurped by Indian agents. Legitimised by the *Indian Act*, they controlled who travel and exchange on and off reserves and exercised broad judicial powers, and made the position of chief an elected one.²²

According to Dion, this was not the original arrangement:

At the outset these [*nēhiyawak*] leaders were to hold office for life. Their title would be “chief” and they were to have a helper or councillor for every 100 people of a following. ... A drastic change, however, began to develop as the reserves became burdened with new laws and regulations. The *okimaw* as chief no longer held supreme command; he was expected by the Indian agent to set an example for his followers, and to adhere strictly to the dictates imposed on all treaty Indians.

As time went by, the poor chief began to realize that he was not the *okimaw* of old, but simply the servant of all....

The Indians themselves clung to the age old tradition that they could always get what they needed at the *okimaw*'s. ... The chief tried as long as he could to live up to the custom of sacrificing everything for the good of his followers, but the painful result was that he soon

went broke. As incredible as it may seem, the grand total of the chief's salary per annum was \$25.

To top off the sad situation, the chief got the blame for his people's wrong-doings while the credit for their hard-earned achievements went to the Indian agents, who always had the last word....

The title *okimaw*, once revered by the Cree, was getting to be only a figurehead. Elected leaders came and went so fast that chief became known as *okimakan*, which means "imitation *okimaw*."²³

Combined with the cultural fractures caused by disease and residential schools and the economic hardships resulting from the slaughter of the buffalo and the end of the fur trade, these political transformations stripped *okimaw* of much of their power and rendered their traditional leadership structures less effective.²⁴

In the twentieth century, Aboriginal leaders began to organise collectively to combat the negative consequences of Native-Newcomer relations. On the Thunderchild Reserve in 1921, John Tootoosis, a *nêhiyawak* leader of mixed ancestry, helped organise the League of Indians of Western Canada, one of several prairie-based organisations designed to lead Aboriginal resistance. Two decades later, the League merged with the Protective Association for Indians and their Treaties and the Association of Saskatchewan Indians to form the Union of Saskatchewan Indians (USI) with Tootoosis as president. The USI had six overarching goals: 1) the protection of treaties and treaty rights; 2) the fostering of progress in First Nations economic, educational and social endeavours; 3) co-operation with civil and religious authorities; 4) constructive criticism

and thorough discussion on all matters; 5) the adherence to democratic procedure; and 6) the promotion of respect and tolerance for all people.

New aims and external political events led to further changes in the second half of the twentieth century. In 1958, USI changed its name to the *Federation of Saskatchewan Indians* which, following the publication in 1969 of the federal government's infamous "white paper," made land claims and the recovery of other treaty rights its main focus. The white paper, which advocated the termination of Aboriginal treaties and rights in Canada, also led to the creation of the National Indian Brotherhood (NIB) which focused more broadly on self-determination and civil rights. NIB leadership has included Saskatchewanians Edward Ahenakew and Walter Deiter, the Brotherhood's first president. In 1982, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations (FSIN) succeeded the FSI as the political advocate for the collective interests of Saskatchewan's First Nations. Along with education, housing, and economic development, self-determination and governance remain key issues for the FSIN.²⁵

This history of leadership on the plains testifies to the drastic changes that have enveloped the *nēhiyawak* world over the last two centuries and to the significant adaptations required of its leaders and leadership structures. In recent decades, this adaptation has seen *nēhiyawak* leadership become more bureaucratic and westernised in order to deal effectively with different levels of government in Canadian society. Claims to lands and resources as well as education and religious rights require an extensive network of relationships based on cooperative action and, often, intergroup solidarity. The leadership structure that was in place two hundred years ago was not equipped to handle these situations; change was necessary.

But the underlying traditions have not been lost. Leaders today exhibit many of the traits and qualities their forefathers did and the values that made them leaders are timeless. Culture is inherently fluid and flexible, dynamic, and ever-changing. Leaders produced within these cultural contexts, therefore, will continue to adapt themselves and their leadership structures, using both traditional and more recently developed strategies, to meet the needs of an ever-changing world.

Endnotes

¹ David Mandelbaum, *The Plains Cree: An Ethnographic, Historical and Comparative Study* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, 1979), 106.

² Ibid., 106-108; and John Milloy, *The Plains Cree: Trade, Diplomacy and War, 1790 to 1870* (Winnipeg: The University of Manitoba Press, 1988), 76.

³ Mandelbaum, *The Plains Cree*, 106-108; and Edward Ahenakew, *Voices of the Plains Cree* (Regina : Canadian Plains Research Center, 1995), 17.

⁴ Deanna Christenson, *Ahtahkakoop: The Epic Account of a Plains Cree Head Chief, His people, and their Vision for Survival, 1816-1896* (Shell Lake, SK: Ahtahkakoop Publishing, 2000), 64-65.

⁵ Quoted in Mandelbaum, *The Plains Cree*, 106.

⁶ Christenson, *Ahtahkakoop*, 64-65.

⁷ Joseph Dion, *My Tribe, The Crees* (Calgary, AB: Glenbow-Alberta Institute, 1979), 8.

⁸ Ibid.; and Christenson, *Ahtahkakoop*, 64-65.

⁹ Mandelbaum, *The Plains Cree*, 109-110.

¹⁰ Ibid., 110-111; Christenson, *Ahtahkakoop*, 63-64; and Ahenakew, *Voices of the Plains Cree*, 17.

¹¹ Ibid., 110-120; and Christenson, *Ahtahkakoop*, 63-64.

¹² Mandelbaum, *The Plains Cree*, 120.

¹³ Milloy, *The Plains Cree*, 75.

¹⁴ Quoted in Rudy Wiebe, “Mistahimaskwa,” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, 2000
<<http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=39835>> (retrieved 31 May 2008). For more information on the prairie treaties, see Frank Tough, Jim Miller and Arthur J. Ray, *Bounty And Benevolence: A History Of Saskatchewan Treaties* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).

¹⁵ For more information on the uprising, see Bob Beale and Rod McLeod, *Prairie Fire: The 1885 North-West Rebellion* (Edmonton: Hurtig, 1984); and Blair Stonechild and Bill Waiser, *Loyal till Death: Indians and the North-West Rebellion* (Calgary: Fifth House, 1997).

¹⁶ For more information on the life of Big Bear, see Hugh Dempsey, *Big Bear: The End of Freedom* (Vancouver, B.C.: Douglas & McIntyre, 1984); J. R. Miller, *Big Bear (Mistahimusqua)* (Toronto: ECW Press, 1996); Stonechild and Waiser, *Loyal till Death*; and Wiebe, “Mistahimaskwa.”

¹⁷ Quoted in Hugh Dempsey, “PÎTIKWAHANAPIWYÎN”, *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, 2000
<<http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=39905>> (retrieved 31 May 2008).

¹⁸ Quoted in Dempsey, “PÎTIKWAHANAPIWYÎN”. See also Norma Sluman, *Poundmaker* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967); and Stonechild and Waiser, *Loyal till Death*.

¹⁹ For more information on *payipwât*, see John Tobias, “Payipwat,” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, 2000
<<http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=41111>> (retrieved 31 May 2008); and Stonechild and Waiser, *Loyal till Death*.

²⁰ For more information on the fur trade, see Arthur J. Ray, *Indians in the Fur Trade: Their Role as Trappers, Hunter, and Middlemen in the Lands Southwest of Hudson Bay 1660–1870* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974); Arthur J. Ray and Donald B. Freeman, “Give Us Good Measure”: *An Economic Analysis of Relations Between the Indians and the*

Hudson's Bay Company Before 1763 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978); and Sylvia Van Kirk, *'Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur-Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670-1870* (Winnipeg, Man.: Watson & Dwyer, 1980).

²¹ Christenson, *Ahtahkakoop*, 77.

²² Mandelbaum, *The Plains Cree*, 108.

²³ Dion, *My Tribe, The Crees*, 79-80.

²⁴ For more information on assimilationist policies of the government and Aboriginal-government relations, see F. Laurie Barron, *Walking In Indian Moccasins: The Native Policies Of Tommy Douglas And The CCF* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997); Sarah Carter, *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990); J.R. Miller, *Shinguak's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996); Milloy, *The Plains Cree*; Katherine Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind: Government Repression of Indigenous Religious Ceremonies on the Prairies* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1994); and E. Brian Titley, *A Narrow Vision : Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada* (Vancouver : University of British Columbia Press, 1986).

²⁵ For more information on twentieth century Aboriginal political organization, see Blair Stonechild, "Aboriginal Peoples of Saskatchewan," *The Encyclopedia of Saskatchewan*, (2006) <http://esask.uregina.ca/entry/Aboriginal_peoplesof_saskatchewan.html> (31 May 2008). For more information of similar organizations in Alberta, see Dion, *My Tribe, The Crees*, 172-181.