History - Grade 7

Day One:

**Activating Knowledge**: Draw a picture that can remind someone of a way to be in a positive relationship with someone else. You could create an image that reminds people to share, be kind, be generous, be understanding, be gentle, or anything else you might think is important. Write 3 to 5 sentences explaining how your image represents the way of being you have chosen to illustrate.

**Task**: Read “Wampum Diplomacy”, excerpted and adapted from “Rooted In Resilience.” As you read the article, think about what messages you included in your image.

**Demonstrating Knowledge**: Consider how wampum belts are like the image you created above. To demonstrate your knowledge, do one of the following:

* write a paragraph that explains how wampum belts are **visual representations** (images) of ideas using at least one example from the article.
* make a list of different wampum described in the article that includes a description of how the wampum looks and what the wampum means
* create an image that you could use to help you explain what wampum belts are and how they are and have been used by First Nations peoples. This image can include words.

**WAMPUM DIPLOMACY**

**Wampum belts** (see photo below) are not just beautiful gifts offered during historic agreements between Indigenous and settler peoples, nor are they simply works of art or currency (used like money). They are part of an

important governance (how decisions are made for all) tradition, called wampum diplomacy, used by the Anishinabe, Haudenosaunee, Mi’kmaq, and others (Indigenous nations). Alongside other traditions, such as storytelling and the sharing responsibilities among each other, Wampum belts show unique (one of a kind) ways of governing (making decisions) and of understanding political relationships.

**Wampum** are small tube-like beads, made mostly from whelk shells and quahog clam shells found on the east coast of North America. Strings of these beads are woven into intricate (detailed) patterns, complex sets of icons (pictures) that show significant (important) relationships between Indigenous nations. The symbols (pictures meaning something) can be read using specific sets of rules, becoming records (what happened before) of the relationships they show.

**Contrary** (against) to the persistent (all the time) stereotypes of Indigenous peoples as only oral (speaking and listening) and non-literate (do not read or write), wampum belts illustrate (show) “widespread (all over) development of symbolic literacy (reading and writing) across multiple (many) Indigenous nations,” said Lynn Gehl, an Algonquin Anishinabe Kwe writer, advocate, and artist who holds a doctorate in Indigenous studies.

**Gehl**, who wrote “The Truth that Wampum Tells,” has analyzed (figured out) the wampum belts exchanged (taken and given) during the signing of the 1764 Treaty at Niagara. These belts confirm the terms set out in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which outlined the guidelines for European settlement on Indigenous lands in North America. She argues that these belts are constitutional (most important law in Canada) documents (papers): “It is with these three belts that the Indigenous understanding of Canada’s constitutional (law) beginnings is codified (written). And it is in this way that the [1763 Royal] Proclamation is only one of Canada’s first constitutional documents.”

The three wampum belts were exchanged following the lengthy (long) discussions and decisions that took place during the treaty process (steps). One of the belts shows “a chain secured (connected) to a rock on Turtle Island, running through the twenty-four Nations’ hands, and attached to a British vessel (ship),” Gehl wrote. “This represented the negotiating (figuring out an agreement) process Indigenous nations were to take to ensure (make sure) their equal share of the resources and bounty of the land (what the land can give people, e.g. food, water).” The belts codified (wrote down) an equal relationship between independent allies (different groups who wanted to help each other).

Dust Fan Belt of the Onondaga Nation represents (shows) the Tree of Peace and is used to explain the Great Law. It also represents the need for chiefs (leaders of Indigenous nations) to have clear vision. The belt symbolically wipes (cleans) the dust — issues that obscure (make it hard to see) clear vision — from the leaders’ eyes. As with contemporary (from now) constitutions, great care is taken to preserve (take care of ) wampum belts.

The belts are carefully kept by wampum keepers, individuals (people) who are responsible for preserving (taking care of) wampum records and knowledge. Over time, many wampum belts have been lost, stolen, or otherwise removed from Indigenous communities. Some have been repatriated (taken back by Indigenous communities). Remarkably, several of these belts’ meanings and stories have been kept alive underground (hidden), like much Indigenous knowledge over the last few centuries of colonization. Though they are often the subject of much debate (many argue about what each belt means), these belts and the alternative (other) narratives (stories) they embody (have) challenge national histories of Confederation (tell a different story about how Canada became a country). They offer important context (information) for the breaches (breaking) of treaties that followed the founding (making) of the country as well as land claims (Indigenous people arguing for land that is theirs) in present-day Canada.



Excerpt adapted from DeCosse, J. (2017). Canada’s history. Canadian Points of View Reference Centre, 97(3), 678-671.

Retrieved April 16, 2020 from Canadian Points of View Reference Centre.

<http://web.b.ebscohost.com/pov/detail/detail?vid=2&sid=716d2676-3320-4ab5-9778-78289c326c5a%40pdcvsessmgr04&bdata=Jmxhbmc9ZW4tY2Emc2l0ZT1wb3YtY2Fu#AN=123127335&db=p3h>

**Day Two**:

**Activating Knowledge**: Read an excerpt from The Canadian Encyclopedia’s article “Haldimand Proclamation.”

On 25 October 1784, Sir Frederick Haldimand, the governor of Québec, signed a **decree** (law) that gave land to the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois), also known as the Six Nations, in **compensation** (in payment) for their alliance (helping) with British **forces** (army, navy) during the American Revolution (1775–83). This land, known as the **Haldimand Grant** or **Haldimand Tract**, went for 10 km on both sides of the Grand River (southwestern Ontario), from its **source** (where it starts) to Lake Erie. Throughout the late 1700s and 1800s, the **Crown** (government) and Haudenosaunee argued about who owned the land. **Negotiations** (discussions, talking) about who owns **the Haldimand Tract** still continue between the Canadian government and the Six Nations Confederacy.

**The Haldimand Grant, 1784**

After the American Revolution (1775–83), the Haudenosaunee lost much of their ancestral (their family before them) homeland in upper New York, an area now the U.S.A.. Mohawk leader Thayendanegea (Joseph Brant), and some representatives of the Six Nations Confederacy, reminded the British government of the Haudenosaunee’s loyalty during the American Revolution, and tried to get the Crown (government) to provide (give) them with land in Canada to replace (take the place of ) the land that they had lost as a result (because) of the war. Thayendanegea picked the valley of the Grand River in present-day southwestern Ontario as a place for the Mohawk to live; in 1784, the governor of Québec, Frederick Haldimand, agreed to Thayendanegea’s request and made arrangements for the land grant.

On 22 May 1784, Haldimand signed an accord with Mississauga chiefs to cede (give) approximately 385,000 hectares (ha) of land to the Crown (government) for £1,180. The largest part of this land went to the

Haudenosaunee, who received a land 10 km deep on either side of the Grand River, beginning at its source to Lake Erie. This area became the Six Nations reserve.

**Early Land Title Disputes**

From the start, the Haudenosaunee and the British Crown disagreed over the meaning of the Haldimand Proclamation and who owned the Haldimand Tract. The Crown understood the Haldimand Proclamation as prohibiting (not allowing) the Haudenosaunee from leasing (lending) or selling the land to anyone but the Crown. However, Thayendanegea argued that Haldimand had promised the Haudenosaunee freehold land tenure (control of the land). Thayendanegea maintained (kept saying) that selling and leasing the land to white settlers was important to the economy of the Haudenosaunee, which had been hampered (hurt) by non-sustainable hunting (not being able to hunt for a long time) in the Grand River area. Thayendanegea argued that limited (some) white settlement in the area would promote (allow) the establishment (making) of model farms and foster (build) modernized economic development. These disputes (arguments) over land is part of a larger debate (argument) about Haudenosaunee sovereignty (control over land and their people). Thayendanegea wanted the Six Nations to be recognized (seen) as autonomous

Crown allies rather than British subjects. As an independent nation, they would be able to sell their land to whomever they wanted. The British, however, did not see the Six Nations as political entities (as a separate government), but rather as a group that was to receive special consideration (thinking), but was still under Crown (government) control.

In 1791, the dispute about the Haldimand Tract was further complicated (made more complicated, made more difficult). In this year, the Canadian government created (made) the province of Upper Canada, adding another

bureaucratic layer of government with which the Six Nations would have to negotiate (talk, figure out) in order to gain (get) the land they wanted.

Excerpt from The Canadian Encyclopedia, Haldimand Proclamation, 2016.

https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/haldimand-proclamation

**Task**: Complete the table noting at least three different changes to British or Canadian ownership/control of land in one column, and in the next column a description of the way these changes affected the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. Please include the dates that these changes occurred.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **Changes to ownership/control of land, including date** | | Effects on Haudenosaunee Confederacy |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Demonstrating Knowledge**: Identify and write about at least one way that the Haudenosaunee understanding of the Haldimand Proclamation differed from the Canadian government understanding of it. How did this different understanding affect the Haudenosaunee Confederacy then and now?

**Day Three**:

**Activating Knowledge**: Activating Knowledge: Fur is a natural resource of Canada. Which articles of clothing do you own or see people wearing that have fur on or in them? (i.e. Canada Goose jackets). Make a list of all the clothing items that you can think of that consist of or are made of fur. Where do you think this fur comes from? Which animals?

**Task**: Read the following excerpts of this article and answer the questions at the end.

**Title: Fur Trade: An Overview**:

The trading of animal fur and pelts for other necessities (needs) has been a human activity since the beginning of humanity. For hunting and gathering societies, the capture of animals helps for three most basic human needs of food, clothing, and shelter. As civilizations and agriculture developed, so too did the practices of bartering and trading. Then, as now in some parts of the world, successful hunters could trade some of their animal kills for other necessary (needed) items (things). Skilled hunters who were able to capture more animals than they needed to survive could then trade the excess for other goods. Before Europeans arrived in Canada, Indigenous peoples in

North America traded different goods, including skins and furs, as an essential (needed) aspect (part) of each of their cultures. The abundance (lots) of furs that could be obtained (got), especially in what became Canada, was a major driving force (big reason) as European influence overtook the Indigenous cultures of North America. The hunger (wish) for beaver pelts and other fine furs was the basis for the foundation of the Hudson’s Bay Company, which still exists today, and the settlement of the North American continent.

From the beginnings of the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1670 through to the early 1980s, the Canadian fur trade grew from individual trappers each bringing in as many pelts as they could harvest in a year to 70,000 trappers and fur farmers in Canada getting over 5 million pelts annually. The size of the harvests (collecting of pelts) was noticed and targeted (focused on) by animal rights activists and environmental groups, who questioned the methods used by some trappers and hunters. In 1976, Greenpeace launched (started) an ongoing campaign against commercial seal hunting (hunting seals for money) in the waters near Newfoundland. The campaign continues to have a profound (big) effect on the fur trade twenty-five years later. It was the first of many protests against the use of animals for fur and led to a worldwide decline (going down) in fur sales. To mitigate (make) the impact that is still felt, the fur industry (buying and selling fur) has taken steps to improve public opinion by changing the ways in which animals are treated and trapped.

**Understanding the Discussion**

**Coureurs de Bois (French, “runner of the woods”)**: Early French fur traders who went into the wilds of North America to trade furs and other goods with Aboriginal people.

**Farmed Fur**: Fur from animals raised on farms solely for the purpose of harvesting their fur. The most common farmed furs are mink, fox, and chinchilla. Farmed fur comprises 85 percent of the world’s fur market.

**Greenpeace**: A non-governmental activist group committed to environmental issues. Greenpeace is based in British Columbia.

**Leghold Traps**: A trap with steel jaws that, when triggered, clamps around the leg of an animal, holding it in the trap. Leghold traps are illegal in Canada and over sixty other countries around the world.

**Pelt**: The skin of an animal, including the fur.

**Wild Fur**: Fur from animals trapped in the wild. The most common wild furs are beaver, muskrat, and raccoon. Wild fur comprises 15 percent of the world’s fur market

**History**

When European fishermen began to bring their fish on to the Eastern Canadian coast to dry before the return trip home, they met Indigenous people, and began to trade with them. The Indigenous people were very interested in metal goods, since they had no way of producing (making) them. In return, they gave the Europeans beaver pelts and other furs. At the same time, beaver populations throughout Europe were dwindling, and there was not enough of a supply to fuel the demand for felt hats made from beaver fur.

The first major effort to take advantage of the seemingly limitless supply of beaver in the territories of North America was Samuel de Champlain. In the early 1600s, Champlain set up an encampment at Hochelaga, which

is now Quebec City, and began actively trading with the Aboriginal people for furs. The Huron tribes were particularly important in the early fur trade. They controlled the area around the Ottawa River, which was the main waterway for bringing the abundant furs from northern Ontario down to trade. Competition grew between the Huron people and their rivals, the Iroquois, for control over the river; the French sided with the Hurons. As the Iroquois gained the upper hand in battles, the fur trade slowly ground to a halt.

In the 1660s, two coureurs de bois, Médard Chouart des Groseilliers and Pierre Radisson, discovered that beaver were plentiful in the area surrounding Hudson’s Bay. After having their furs taken away by the French for not having a licence to obtain them, the two went to England to find financial backing for further ventures. On May 6,

1670, the “Company of Adventurers of England trading into Hudson’s Bay” was given the exclusive right to trade for furs in the land surrounding Hudson’s Bay, an area that comprises almost a third of present-day Canada.

For the next 200 years, the Hudson’s Bay Company, as it came to be known, was the primary exporter of Canadian furs. More importantly, they established trading forts and explored the country, leading the way for settlements across the west. The company continued in the fur trade into the 1980s, when it sold off its fur sales division to management and producer groups. The new company, called North American Fur Auctions, is the world’s largest handler of wild fur today.

Fur farms began in North America in the late 1800s. Mink and fox are the most commonly farm-raised animals. Eighty-five percent of furs sold today are from farmed animals, and many farming operations are based in European countries. Fur farmers and trappers are subject to regulations developed to ensure that animals are treated humanely. Measures to ensure that animals are healthy and well-treated are in the best interest of the farmer or trapper, since healthy animals produce more attractive, higher quality pelts, which can be sold for higher prices.

The Greenpeace protests against the hunting of harp seals in the late 1970s were the first of many factors that led to a decline in the fur trade at the end of the twentieth century. At the time, hunters were particularly interested in very young seal pups, which are born with white fur. After only two weeks, the fur begins to darken to the mature color of grey. The white fur was highly valued, so hunters tried to find as many newborn pups as they could. The pups were usually killed by hitting them in the head with a club, an image that Greenpeace broadcast around the world to cast the hunt in a negative light, an action that was successful.

In 1983, the European Union implemented bans on the import of seal pelts to its member nations. This ban had dire effects on Canada’s Inuit people, for whom seal hunting was a primary source of income. For centuries, the Inuit had relied on the seal for food, clothing, and shelter. Modern-day sales of seal products brought much needed income into their communities. The European ban had a devastating impact; by 1987, welfare rates in Inuit communities had tripled, and rates of suicide and alcoholism had quadrupled.

Other factors worsened the problem. A combination of poor economic conditions, warm winters, and intense anti-fur campaigns led to a worldwide decline in fur sales in the late 1980s. The decreased fur sales had other unintended consequences. Since the beginning of the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1670, trappers were an essential source of information regarding the state of the environment. Their unique relationship with the

land they trapped on put them in a unique position to be able to report on environmental damage and any unusual developments, such as widespread disease in forests and among animal populations. Equally threatening to the environment, Aboriginal people who made their living from the fur trade turned to large oil and gas companies to make use of other, less environmentally-friendly natural resources on their lands. From its lows in the early 1990s, the fur trade began to climb again as world economies improved. As a luxury item, sale of furs moves up and down with economic conditions. Consumer backlash against the animal rights movement also drove up sales. In 1995, the government of the Northwest Territories began to support the seal harvest, and recognition of its importance to the Inuit economy has led to a growing market for seal products.

Improvements in the way animals are treated have also been a factor in increased acceptance of fur. The Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards, signed by Canada in 1997, sets out standards for trapping methods and the type of traps that can be used. Leghold traps, which were featured prominently in anti-fur campaigns, are now prohibited. No endangered species may be trapped, and trapping operations are limited to the fall and winter to prevent interference with breeding times.

**The Fur Trade Today**

In 2003, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) came under fire for one particular part of their traditional uniform: the muskrat hat. In use since 1933, the winter hat drew protests from animal rights activists, who called on the RCMP to find alternatives. Activists put out videotapes showing muskrats caught in leghold traps in their demonstrations against the fur hats. (Paradoxically, muskrats are considered to be pests in certain countries due to the damage caused by their burrowing, and due to the damage they cause in agricultural settings.) The RCMP investigated the possibility of using hats made from fake fur, but found that they didn’t perform as well as the real thing. Since their officers are spread throughout the country, including areas where winter temperatures are regularly below -30° Celsius, the RCMP decided not to change the hats, which use the fur of two or three muskrats each.

This is one example of the nature of the fur trade today. While there are still campaigns against the use of animals for their fur, the fur industry is promoting its product as an earth-friendly, renewable resource that is responsibly managed. In Canada today, the fur trade contributes $800 million to the economy and employs some 85,000 people. Worldwide, retail sales of fur fashions top $11 billion USD. A major influence in the

upsurge of sales has been the marketing campaigns of the fur industry and the opening up of the Asian market to luxury items. In China, especially, where shopping malls dedicated to selling only furs appearing all over the country, Canadian furs have become big business. By targeting young fashion designers, the industry has brought fur back into fashion, and improvements in processing techniques have led to furs that are lighter, easier to care for, and available in a wide range of colours.

**Article found at**:

Baskey-East, S. R., & Renneboog, R.M.J. (2016). Canadian points of view: Fur trade.

http://web.b.ebscohost.com/pov/detail/detail?vid=2&sid=801a85ef-7638-4407-b94d-5ad5d7bd247f%40pdcvsessmgr02&bdata=Jmxhbmc9ZW4tY2Emc2l0ZT1wb3YtY2Fu#AN=28674938&db=p3h
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**Demonstrating Knowledge**:

1. Where was this resource (fur) developed?

2. Was there a time when it was heavily developed within Canada?

3. Did this resource assist Indigenous communities? If yes, which ones?

4. Why was this resource developed? Is it still used today and if yes, how so?

5. How is this resource harvested?

6. What are the lasting effects (positive or negative) on Canada as a result of this resource?

**Day 4**:

**Activating Knowledge:** Where do you think rocks come from? How are they formed (made)? Where can you find rocks within your community? Write down your ideas.

**Task**: Read and review the following

Rock formations and patterns can be found throughout Canada:

Balancing Rock in Nova Scotia

<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/the-rocks-provincial-park>

Rocher Perce in Quebec <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/perce-rock>

Hopewell Rocks in New Brunswick



Image: Tourism NB - Hopewell Rocks 2020

Image: <https://www.thehopewellrocks.ca/index.php/en/page/park-overview>

**Read the following articles**:

Canadian Encyclopedia 2020

<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/sedimentary-rock>

Sedimentary Rock





Image: Canadian Encyclopedia 2020

<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/sedimentary-rock>

Sedimentary Rock



Image: Canadian Encyclopedia 2020

<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/petroglyphs-provincialpark>

Petroglyphs Provincial Park

**Demonstrating Knowledge**:

How can you help to preserve the Petroglyphs?

How can you protect the petroglyphs from further damage?

Are rock formations affected by weather or other natural occurrences?

If you could draw a message on a rock formation for the world to learn from, what would you draw?

Please draw that message and label it.

**Day Five:**

Given what you learned this week, write a letter that you would send to the Prime Minister. Consider what you may ask him questions about and what facts you may provide him with. Remember to organize your letter with an opening, supporting arguments and a summary.