

2009

## The North American Fur Trade World System

Richard Wynn Edwards IV

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.uwm.edu/fieldnotes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Edwards, Richard Wynn IV (2009) "The North American Fur Trade World System," *Field Notes: A Journal of Collegiate Anthropology*. Vol. 1 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://dc.uwm.edu/fieldnotes/vol1/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UWM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Field Notes: A Journal of Collegiate Anthropology by an authorized administrator of UWM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [open-access@uwm.edu](mailto:open-access@uwm.edu).

# The North American Fur Trade World System

Richard Wynn Edwards IV

## Abstract

*The fur trade played an important role in determining the nature of the European-Native American relations. It acted as the framework for a developing world system, in which the European powers eventually formed multiple cores where a few Native American groups formed the semi-periphery and drew many more Native American groups into peripheral positions. To fit into this world system, the Native American groups restructured their lives in a variety of ways that can be seen archaeologically and historically. This is not to say that the Native Americans lacked agency within a deterministic system. To the contrary, the changes made to compete within the world system were often adaptations or intensifications of preexisting Native American practices in ways that would benefit them, at least in the short term.*

## Introduction

World Systems Theory (WST) offers a useful theoretical framework to analyze the North American Fur Trade. It is a helpful tool for understanding the structural and cultural changes that took place during the contact and early colonial period in Canada and the United States (Kardulias 1990). This paper will examine the cultural interactions of the fur trade and demonstrate that a world system did exist, though the power dynamics varied over time and by location. For the purpose of this paper, discussion will be limited temporally, spanning from the beginning of the fur trade until the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, and will focus geographically on the present day northeastern United States and southeastern Canada. Specific attention will be paid to two groups, the Huron and the Potawatomi in order to better illustrate two extremes in the nature of the fur trade, a core / periphery differentiation and a core / periphery hierarchy.

## Defining the World System

According to Wallerstein (1974), a world economy consists of many societies existing along a continuum between core and periphery, with semi-peripheries existing at a midpoint between the two. Traditionally a core or cores are political units with complicated, state level, political systems that allow for the control of production and distribution of goods. Traditional WST are based on three premises: first that the core dominates the periphery, second that the core maintains the upper hand in trade and third, that trade between the core and the periphery is the cause of change in peripheral societies. In this system the core develops as part of a larger exchange network, while they compete with other core polities. As the core separates from peripheral economies, the peripheral economies send raw material to the core, which the core then uses to develop “diverse economies that specialize in the manufacture of high-value finished products for home consumption and export to the periphery,” (Stein 2002:904).

Social and cultural change in a world system occurs from two sources: competition and division of labor. Because world systems consist of multiple groups (multiple cores and their associated peripheries) competition among these groups can lead to new strategies of offense and defense in attempts to either maintain the status quo or gain an economic advantage over the other groups. As a result, some groups will be unable to cope and will be forced to acquiesce to the pressures of the competition, while other groups may, in the long run, develop a competitive edge that allows them to displace a more powerful group and move closer to the powerful core end of the core / periphery continuum. This can be seen in Wallerstein’s (1974) description of the vacuum after Spain’s collapse as Europe’s superpower. As Spain’s economy collapsed, so did that of Antwerp (one of Europe’s cores) due to its close relationship with Spain’s economy. This left a core position available for another polity to occupy. Amsterdam took Antwerp’s place as it rose to prominence while England, the main competition of Amsterdam, was blocked, and the rise of England was delayed.

The second source of change comes from a division of labor based on regional specialization. By colonizing Mesoamerica forcefully, Spain was able to restructure the indigenous peoples' labor (and thus life ways) while freeing up Spanish laborers for other, more specialized jobs (Schneider 1991; Wallerstein 1974).

*Limits of and Problems with a World System Theory*

Since 1974 WST has received a great deal of attention both in the form of support and criticism. For example, while Chase-Dunn and Hall (1991) argue that it is too restrictive and, with a few modifications, can and should be applied on a wider scale (which will be discussed more fully later in this section) others, such as Stein (1999) argue that it is heavily flawed and in any of its present forms is not a valid analytical tool.

One difficulty can be determining the boundaries of a world system. This is especially true in archaeological contexts where the exact nature of relations between groups is unknown. The further groups exist from the core the more difficult it is to determine the nature of their relationship with the core. As a result, it may not be possible to determine which groups were part of the world system and which ones were near its periphery. However, information is necessary to determine which groups compose the world system, as well as how they interacted among one another, and how these relationships may have changed through time (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1991; Jeske 1999).

For Wallerstein the most important aspect of trade within a world system is the exchange of bulk goods such as food. He argues that trade in luxury or exotic goods is unimportant to social change, while trade in bulk goods can create or engender social change (Wallerstein 1974). This is where many critics take issue with Wallerstein (for a more full discussion see Schneider 1991) claiming that he underestimates the importance of the trade of luxury goods and the ability of such goods to create social change. Throughout history and prehistory the trade of luxury goods played an important role in

the rise and fall of chiefdoms and the formation of states. For example, Schneider (1991) claims that the European desire to limit the export of bullion (a luxury good and pseudo-currency) may have played a large role in the development of European industries such as the English textiles. While Wallerstein reduces luxury trade to an unimportant role, which limits the application of WST to the modern era (when bulk good trade is possible), many ignore this limitation and apply WST to regions where only luxury trade occurred. Critics argue that by expanding the theory to cover more groups through time, it loses any analytical power it may have had (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1991; Schneider 1991; Stein 1999).

Issues with WST go beyond its difficult applicability. As it has been applied, WST makes several assumptions about the nature of exchange between the core and the periphery, as well as about the people within both groups. By definition, a world system assumes total domination of the periphery where only the core is capable of influencing the periphery and never the other way around. This definition assumes homogeneity exists across the entire periphery, which ignores gender, class, and ethnic distinctions within and between the various peripheral polities. All of these factors combine to create a theoretical framework that is unable to account for the full variation of interaction between different groups (Stein 2002).

Stein also points out that many applications of WST fail to account for the difficulty that core states have in projecting the power necessary to control a peripheral group. A successful application of a WST therefore requires accounting for the role of competition between cores (resulting in multiple sources of manufactured goods), demographics, and comparative level of technology (between core and peripheries). These three limiting factors determine the distance a core can penetrate into a given region and are typically ignored by researchers using WST. It cannot simply be assumed that the core can penetrate a region (e.g. European states projecting economic control into North America), it must

also be demonstrated that the core has enough power to overcome the obstacles of core competition, demographics, and technology (Stein 1999).

Although WST has been applied to a wide variety of situations both temporally and geographically, Wallerstein only intended it to be applied to historic capitalist societies, not nomadic hunter-gatherers, classic empires, or the variety of other non-capitalist groups historically. Nevertheless, various social scientists have insisted on placing such societies into world systems with mixed results. As a result there is still debate over the use of WST in precapitalist societies. Chase-Dunn and Hall (1991), Schneider (1991) and Peregrine (1991, 1995) all argue that it is possible, with Peregrine going so far as to apply it to prehistoric groups in archaeological contexts, namely the chiefdom level Mississippians in prehistoric North American Midwest. Others such as Stein (1999, 2002) are more cautious about applying WST to precapitalist groups, especially in an archaeological context. This is due to the fact that to apply the WST to such groups requires modifications to its basic framework. In some cases significant modifications are necessary and alternative world system theories are created which are so generalized that they lack any analytical power.

Not all applications of World System Theory encounter these pitfalls. For example, Kardulias (1990) places the North American Fur Trade into a world system, but instead of describing it from the perspective of the core, as Wallerstein did, Kardulias described it from the perspective of the Native North Americans thus creating a new view of the world system with a dynamic periphery that actively adapted themselves in varying ways to best exploit the new intercontinental trade network. The result is a world system that incorporates agency as well as gender and also accounts for the variety of reactions by the many different groups involved in the fur trade. This is evidenced by his example of the Huron who chose to become traders of fur while the Iroquois chose aggression to secure their access to the raw materials.

Since 1974 there have been many modifications made

to WST and a variety of alternative world systems have been created. One modification allows for the application of a world system onto interactions between groups without complete core dominance. Chase-Dunn and Hall (1991) describe the typical world system relationship as a core / periphery hierarchy, where the core is totally dominant within the system. They argue that there are also core / periphery relationships known as a core / periphery differentiation, where the core is a more complex society than the periphery where the peripheral groups' economy is altered to fit into the larger world system, by choice and not force (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1991).

### **Defining the Fur Trade's World System**

While the WST is a useful tool to explain the dynamics of the fur trade, it is necessary to apply it properly. Prior to using the WST, one must determine which kind of core / peripheral relationship should be applied (i.e. core/periphery hierarchy or core / periphery differentiation). Even before this discussion can begin, it is necessary to define the boundaries of the world system and define what North American exchanges would look like as part of a core / periphery differentiation and core / periphery hierarchy.

Temporally and geographically bounding the fur trade is quite difficult. Depending on when and where the Europeans were located, they traded directly with a variety of different Native American middlemen. These middlemen often kept the identity of their suppliers secret and are now unknown (Heindrich 1988). Linguistically we can see the spread of *lingua francas* across northeast North America and then across Canada well beyond the areas Europeans and Euro-Americans physically controlled. Prior to the arrival of Europeans, there is no evidence of any *lingua francas*, but after the fur trade began, several *lingua francas* spread throughout northern North America (Silverstein 1996). Without knowing how many groups the middlemen traded with, or how far their trade networks extended, it is very difficult to determine the true

extent of the North American Fur Trade. For this paper artificial boundaries will be created for areas that are archaeologically or historically known to have participated in the fur trade. On the core side of the spectrum, discussion will be limited to three cores polities, including the French, British, and later the Americans. On the peripheral / semi-peripheral side, the boundaries will be limited to what is now southeastern Canada and northeastern United States, mainly the Upper Great Lakes region.

### *Expectations of a Core / Periphery Differentiation in the Fur Trade*

According to Chase-Dunn and Hall (1991), differentiation relationships do not necessarily include the core taking advantage of the periphery, and even argue that in some cases the opposite could occur. According to classic WST, it would be expected that the Native North American peripheries would adjust their economies to fulfill the European / Euro American core demand for furs; therefore time and manpower would be reorganized from traditional activities to procurement of furs to trade for European goods. In a differentiation relationship, the exchange of furs for manufactured goods between the core and peripheral groups would be on nearly equal terms, without either side taking advantage of the other. Without the ability to directly control the periphery, the various core polities would be forced to compete with one another for access to furs, potentially, giving the periphery an advantage while bargaining. Given comparatively equal status of core and periphery, it should also be expected that the core would be able to apply its power only to a limited and relatively small area of the continent. Therefore, European access to raw materials (furs), and to land further inland would be limited by their trading partners. Since the core is limited, and less able to project its power (military in this case) the periphery polities would be better able to defend their territory against core aggression (Stein 1999).

*Expectations of a Core / Periphery Hierarchy in a Fur Trade*

For a core hierarchical relationship to exist Stein's (2002) three assumptions must be met: uneven exchange controlled by the core, core domination of the periphery, and the core's ability to affect change in the periphery through long distance trade. In other words, exchange between the core and the periphery would favor the Europeans. Peripheral economies would be focused on gathering furs to trade for European goods and core power would be strong enough that competition among core polities would not be a significant factor (since they would be in control of the economic relationships). Core power would also enable penetration of European power farther into the continent allowing them to project their military strength throughout much if not all of the areas involved in the fur trade. The population decline from European diseases after extended contact between the core and peripheries also strengthened the position of the core (Stein 2002).

These expectations offer a very simple picture of what would actually happen in a core / periphery differentiation or hierarchy. The wide variety and sheer number of cultures within the area of study make specific expectations very difficult to establish, and the large number of roles within the world system (both for cultures as well as individuals) is large. Variables such as group kinship systems, proximity to European settlements, which European group they are closest to, and pre-fur trade subsistence patterns also need to be taken into account. (Eccles 1988). Only once these variables have been taken into account can WST be properly applied to the North American fur trade (Stein 2002).

**The Fur Trade as A World System**

A great deal of political and social change occurred during fur trade era. In the early years of the fur trade, for example France and England were the major competing core polities. However by the end of the fur trade era, France lost control of its North American territory, while England and the United

States each developed their own non-competing spheres of influence in the New World (Eccles 1988; Heidenreich 1978; Lavender 1965). The following sections will illustrate that through time the nature of the fur trade changed, therefore it is not possible to apply a statically defined world system to the fur trade as a whole. It is necessary to look at the fur trade diachronically and modify our interpretation of the world system as the contexts in which it is situated change. Simply labeling the fur trade as a core / periphery hierarchy or a core / periphery differentiation is insufficient since it does not account for the temporal changes in the power relationships between North America and Europe.

### *The Early North American Fur Trade: A Core / Periphery Differentiation*

*The French.* From a European perspective, the fur trade was driven by European fashion that created the desire to adorn oneself with a variety of accessories including jewelry and fur (e.g. hats and coats). Some, including the aristocrats, the rich upper middle class, and even the high-ranking clergy, were expected to don fur as a sign of status. The European desire for furs was significantly older than the North American fur trade and extended at least as far back as the medieval era. As a result, many of these animals were over hunted in Europe and by the 14<sup>th</sup> Century some fur types were available only to the politically connected. By the 15<sup>th</sup> Century, there were no longer enough fur-bearing animals available in Europe to meet the continent's demand (Phillips 1961).

The high price and apparent abundance of furs in North America enticed the French crown to invest in permanent trade with North America. Beginning in 1578, New France, in present day Canada, officially began to trade with the nearby tribes and export furs back to Europe (Phillips 1961). At the other end of the exchange, the fur trade was driven by the Native North American's desire for a variety of mass produced European goods including firearms and lightweight durable

tools, (Ray 1988). Specific trade goods included meal, sewing needles, fishhooks, shirts, knives, cauldrons, axes, gunflints, ammunition, food and more. While many of these tools may not have been drastically different than those tools Native North Americans possessed prior to European contact, they allowed work to be done more efficiently. European goods allowed for quicker processing of raw material and allowed Native North Americans the ability to redirect time usually spent making tools to procuring additional furs (Kardulias 1990).

*The Huron.* In an attempt to meet the European demand for furs, the Native North Americans often found their territories depleted of fur bearing animals. As a result they were either forced to adapt to a new role, or be abandoned by their former trading partners. The Huron were among the first tribes to over hunt the fur-bearing animals within their own territory. The strategic location of Huron near the French trading posts and preexisting trade networks with various allied tribes such as the Ottawa allowed them to adopt a new economic strategy (Heidenreich 1978; Kardulias 1990). In order to maintain the income from trade, the Huron became middlemen. They placed themselves between French and western tribes, vigorously defending their trade routes. As part of their adaptation to the new economy, they began to specialize in agricultural production, which allowed for surplus food to be traded to the hunter-gatherer groups in exchange for furs which in turn allowed hunter-gatherer groups to reduce or abandon many of their traditional food gathering practices and procure furs instead. As the European demand for furs continued to rise into the 1640s the Huron increased pressure on their trading partners for additional furs. In order to meet the demand more time would have to be taken from food procurement, thereby increasing reliance on Huron food. Through this process, the Huron traders were able to create or increase agricultural markets, allowing for increased agricultural production and a greater degree of peripheral

adaptation to the world economy (Heidenreich 1988; Kardulias 1990).

By controlling the trade from the west, the Huron were able to make themselves indispensable to the French and the tribes to the west and by 1615 the Huron became France's sole source for furs (Phillips 1961). As middlemen the Huron made every attempt to prevent others from infringing on the trade and as a result the French were not able to deal directly with western tribes (Kardulias 1990). Through historic records, it is clear that the French were not in a position to dominate their trading partners. The French were manipulated by the Huron into paying higher prices when the Huron threatened to trade with the English, creating an asymmetrical relationship in favor of the Huron. While the Huron and surrounding tribes changed their economic patterns, they were not subjects of French domination and their economies were not controlled by the French. They did however reformat their economies in order to participate in the world system brought to them by the French. Since the French did not dominate the Huron militarily or economically, their relationship fails to meet the expected criteria for a core / peripheral hierarchy. It does fit well into a core / periphery differentiation relationship, where the Huron and surrounding tribes altered their economies due to their interaction with the French (Eccles 1988).

### *Transition to a Core / Periphery Hierarchy*

*The English and Americans.* France was not the only European power involved in the fur trade. Initially, France imported more furs than any of their European competitors, and in 1680 alone, New France was responsible for shipping 140,000 beaver skins to Europe, far surpassing New England's 40,000 skins from the same year. Over time however, the French manufacturing base became flooded with furs and was unable to keep up. This gave England a competitive economic advantage as its manufacturing base was better able to absorb the incoming furs and in the end was more successful. The French and English were political, economic and military

rivals, which eventually resulted in open hostilities. After the Seven Years War (1756-1763), the French lost much of their territory in North America and were forced to withdraw from the fur trade (Eccles 1988; Wein 1994).

Without the competition of France, England had a virtual monopoly on the fur trade until the American Revolution. Since England was their only source of industrially manufactured goods, the Native North Americans were less able to manipulate the system to their advantage, leading to a loss of gifts that were once used to maintain the loyalty of their trading parties and the loss of land. Many tribes tried to react to these changes, Pontiac's Rebellion being one such reaction. While it met with early successes, the Native North Americans were unable to maintain an offensive long enough to achieve lasting results. Therefore the British remained the only source for European goods and rose to be the dominant economic, military and political force. At the end of the War of 1812, the Americans attempted to enter the market with trading posts of their own. With the help of congressional legislation, the American merchants were able to successfully oust British merchants from U.S. territory, and limited the British to Canada. Additionally the vast numbers of Canadians working in the fur trade within the U.S. were forced to either give up the trade or join American trading companies. As a result, tribes formerly trading with the British began to trade with the Americans, leaving the U.S. as the dominant political, military, and economic force in the U.S. territory and the British the sole power in Canada with little competition for furs between the two core polities (Eccles 1988; Lavender 1965).

As the British and the Americans were developing economically and militarily, the Native North Americans were becoming more dependent upon European goods. In the early phases of the fur trade, the Native North Americans were not dependent on European goods, but as these goods spread throughout northeastern North America the situation changed,

and dependencies developed on multiple levels. Without participating in the trade, Native North Americans would soon find themselves without allies, which could prove disastrous as groups like the Iroquois expanded to gain additional hunting grounds. Participation in the fur trade then became even more important as the lack of guns, metal arrowheads, and other European weapons would lead to a significant tactical disadvantage for tribes and they would likely be forced from their land. Another level of dependence was caused by disease, which decimated the population of entire tribes, reducing their capacity to produce food and furs while simultaneously reducing the number of available warriors and skilled craftsmen still capable of producing traditional native tools, further strengthening the Indians reliance upon European goods. Dependence upon these goods increased dependence on Europeans and Americans while the reduced population allowed the British and Americans to exercise power at greater distances (Eccles 1988; Gilman 1982; Kardulias 1990; Ray 1988; Stein 1999).

*The Potawatomi.* An examination of the Potawatomi may offer some concrete examples of the extreme changes experience by Native North American groups. Little is known about the prehistoric and early historic Potawatomi, however multiple lines of evidence place their original homeland in western Michigan (Clifton 1978). Indirectly, the fur trade forced them to relocate around Lake Michigan, as Iroquois aggression drove the Potawatomi from their traditional homeland. Like the Huron, the Iroquois quickly ran out of fur-bearing animals to hunt. One of the many ways Native North Americans adapted to the fur trade was through territory expansion to enlarge their hunting grounds. The Iroquois was one group to employ this strategy rather than finding new sources of fur through trade with other groups. After defeating the Huron (1649), the Iroquois expanded westward and pushed the Potawatomi, along with many other neighboring tribes, out of Michigan. However from the Door Peninsula in Wisconsin the Potawatomi were able to expand and take control of a much

larger region than they previously held and continue in the fur trade (Clifton 1978; Heidenreich 1978).

The Potawatomi were heavily involved in the fur trade, and adapted their economy to access furs in multiple ways. They procured much of their fur through trade with other groups and the rest through hunting. The archaeological record shows that muskrat were killed for their fur and meat in large numbers. Entire villages were known to just hunt and fish, rather than participate in corn agriculture typically associated with the Potawatomi. The fur trade was so important to the Potawatomi that some of their habitation sites were chosen just to trade furs. It is not known when the economic shift began, but by the time the Potawatomi arrived in present day Wisconsin, their economy was oriented around procuring furs (Clifton 1978; Sasso and Joyce 2006).

After the defeat of the French, the Potawatomi did not passively accept the British hegemony of the fur trade. The Potawatomi took part in Pontiac's Rebellion, but after their defeat they had little choice but to accept the new balance of political power and trade with the British or risk losing all access to European manufactured goods (Clifton 1978). Potawatomi reliance on manufactured goods was considerable, and by the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, the Potawatomi material culture had undergone a significant change from precontact periods. The vast majority of the surviving material culture from the 1800s is associated with the fur trade. After years of trade for manufactured products, little traditional Potawatomi material culture was still created or used into the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Most Potawatomi tools recovered have been metal, though there is some evidence of early stone tools and Potawatomi-produced gunflints. Overall, the majority of Potawatomi artifacts have consisted of European and Euro-American trade goods, including silver armbands, copper hair tubes, glass beads, horseshoes, trade lead and a variety of ceramics (Sasso and Joyce 2006; Wagner 2001).

The relationship between the Potawatomi and British

(and later Americans) can be seen as part of a core / periphery hierarchy. While the Potawatomi attempted to resist the growing British military dominance during Pontiac's Rebellion (and later American dominance when they supported the British in the War of 1812) they were unsuccessful. Economic relations with Europeans / Euro-Americans were dominated by the British and Americans. The Potawatomi reliance on manufactured goods meant that they were unable to sever economic ties and were forced into a submissive position. All three of the requirements of a core / periphery hierarchy were therefore; met, the British and Americans established themselves as the dominant military force after Pontiac's Rebellion and the War of 1812 respectively, and their level of control was strong enough to negate the affects of competition between the two core polities. As a result there was an imbalanced trade relationship in favor of the core, and the core was able to affect change in the periphery as illustrated by the effects of the American legislation to eliminate competition.

## **Conclusion**

Wallerstein (1974) imagined a world system that involved all parts of the world, spawned by European capitalism. Part of this world system would have included the fur trade, however, early encounters do not fit well with Wallerstein's version of a world system, but fit better with Chase-Dunn and Hall's (1991) modified world system based on a core / periphery differentiation. The Native North American economies all transitioned away from their original subsistence practices and adapted in many different ways in order to take part in the developing world system. This paper has illustrated several adaptations to a world system including an increased agricultural production to facilitate a role as middleman, increased exploitation of hunting resources including warfare to gain more territory, and a combination of the two. However, these early exchange networks were often asymmetrical, and when they were they did not necessarily favor the Europeans who were competing with one another for native allies. As

time went on, Europeans were better able to transmit their military, economic, and political power further into the North American continent. Aided by territorial wars among various tribes, such as the Iroquois wars, as well as disease, and an increased reliance on manufactured goods, the British and later the Americans were able to exploit a relatively competition-free fur trade to their own advantage. This left them in a dominant position where European and Euro-American economies were able to diversify and manufacture a wide variety of goods for home consumption to export to the periphery, and Native North American economies were specialized to procure foods or furs to ensure access to manufactured goods. Rather than simply applying a Wallerstein's WST, or Chase-Dunn and Hall's core / periphery differentiation, it is necessary see the world system that contained the fur trade as a temporal gradient, where the early fur trade resembled a core / periphery differentiation and the later fur trade resembled a traditional WST with a core / periphery hierarchy. Lastly, it is important to remember domination does not mean that there was a lack of agency in the periphery. Agency was exhibited through the freedom to choose the method for procuring furs (trade, hunting, or a combination) and also took the form of military resistance.

### References Cited

Chase-Dunn, C. and T. D. Hall

1991 Conceptualizing Core / Periphery Hierarchies for Comparative Study. In *Core / Periphery Relations in Precapitalist Worlds*, edited by Chase-Dunn and Hall, pp. 5-44. Westview, Boulder.

Clifton, J.A.

1978 Potawatomi. In *Northeast*, edited by B. G. Trigger, pp. 725-742. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 15, W. G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Eccles, W. J.

- 1988 The Fur Trade in the Colonial Northeast. In *History of Indian White Relations*, edited by W. E. Washburn, pp. 324-334, Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 4, W.C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C
- Gilman, C.
- 1982 *Where Two Worlds Meet: The Great Lakes Fur Trade*. Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul.
- Heidenreich, C. E.
- 1978 Huron. In *Northeast*, edited by B. G. Trigger, pp. 368-388. Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 15 W. G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute.
- Jeske, R. J.
- 1999 World Systems Theory: Core Periphery Interactions, and Elite Economic Exchange in Mississippian Societies. In *World-Systems Theory in Practice: Leadership, Production, and Exchange*, edited by P.N. Kardulias, pp. 203-222. Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham.
- Kardulias, N.
- 1990 Fur Production as a Specialized Activity in a World System: Indians in the North American fur Trade. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 14(1):35.
- Lavender, D.
- 1965 Some American Characteristics of the American Fur Company. In *Aspects of the Fur Trade: Selected Papers of the 1965 North American Fur Trade Conference*, edited by R. W. Fridley, pp. 30-49. Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul.
- Phillips, P.C.
- 1961 *The Fur Trade: Volume I*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Peregrine, P.
- 1991 *The Evolution of Mississippian Society: A World System Perspective*. Prehistory Press, Madison.
- 1995 Networks of Power: The Mississippian World-System.

In *Native American Interactions*, edited by M. Nassaney and K Sassman, pp. 247-265. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Ray, A. J.

1988 The Hudson's bay Company and Native People. In *History of Indian-White Relations*, edited by W.E. Washburn, pp. 335-350. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 4. V.G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Sasso, R.F. And D. Joyce

2006 Ethnohistory and Archaeology: The Removal Era Potawatomi Lifeway in Southeastern Wisconsin. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 31(1):165-202.

Schneider, J.

1991 Was there a Precapitalist World-System? In *Core Periphery Relations in Precapitalist Worlds*, edited by C. Chase-Dunn and T.D. Hall, pp. 45-62. Westview, Boulder.

Silverstein, M.

1966 Dynamics of Linguistic Contact. In *Languages*, edited by I. Goddard, pp. 117-136. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 17 W.G. Sturtevant general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Stein, G.

1999 Rethinking World-Systems Theory: Power, Distance, and Diasporas in the Dynamics of Interregional Interaction. In *World-Systems Theory in Practice: Leadership, Production, and Exchange*, edited by P.N. Kardulias, pp. 153-173. Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham.

2002 From Passive Periphery to Active Agents: Emerging Perspectives in the Archaeology of Interregional Interaction. *American Anthropologist* 104:903-916.

Wagner, M. J.

2001 *The Windrose Site (11Ka326): An Early Nineteenth-Century Potawatomi Settlement in the Kankakee River*

*Valley of Northeastern Illinois*. Illinois State museum Reports of Investigations, No 56. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.

Wallerstein, I.

1974 *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* 1. 2 vols. Academic Press, New York.

Wein, T.

1994 European Exchange Patterns for North American Furs and Skins, 1720-1760. In *Fur Trade Revisited: Selected Papers of the Sixth North American Fur Trade Conference, Mackinac Island, Michigan, 1991*, edited by J.S.H. Brown, W.J. Eccles and D.P. Hendman, pp. 19-37. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing.