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Abstract

The The’wá:lí Community Digital Mapping Project is a collaborative, scholarly project for which the final product is a digital, layered map of the reserve and traditional lands of the Stó:lō (Xwélmexw) community of The’wá:lí (Soowahlie First Nation). The map, containing over 110 sites and stretching from Bellingham Bay, Washington in the west to Chilliwack Lake, B.C. in the east, is hyperlinked with audio, visual and textual media that tell stories about places of importance to this community. The map is intended to give voice to many different senses of and claims to place, and their intersections, in the The’wá:lí environment, while also exploring the histories of how these places and their meanings have changed over time. It expresses many, often conflicting, ways of understanding the land and waterways in this environment, and presents an alternative to the popular, colonial narrative of the settlement of the Fraser Valley. Thus, the map, intended ultimately for The’wá:lí’s use, is also meant to engage a local, non-Indigenous audience, challenging them to rethink their perceptions about where they live and about the peoples with whom they share their histories and land. The essay that follows is a discussion of the relationship-building, research, writing and map-building processes that have produced the The’wá:lí Community Digital Map.
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Introduction

The‘wáːlí Community Digital Map Link: http://web.uvic.ca/~strimble/stolo/

Over the last two years, Stó:lō community of The’wáːlí (known more commonly by its Anglicized name, Soowahlie), has been navigating serious internal conflict, which came to a head in early spring 2016. On 10 April 2016, some members of the First Nation, joined by non-Indigenous residents of the nearby Cultus Lake and Sleepy Hollow communities, carried out a protest that included gathering and marching at Soowahlie Reserve. They did so to express their dissatisfaction with the plans of a member of the Commodore family to lease a 28-acre section of their Certificate of Possession (CP) lands for the development of a residential community of about 250 new homes, to be called Cultus Lake Crossing.

1 Stó:lō (translating literally to “the River” or “people of the River”) is the name of a supra-tribal affiliation (often considered both a political and a cultural affiliation) with which about 24-26 Coast Salish First Nations in the region of the Lower Fraser Valley and Fraser Canyon identify. The traditional language of this group of people is Upriver Halq’eméylem. Many Stó:lō people refer to their homelands as S’óhl Téméxw. For much of this essay, I refer to places and people in S’óhl Téméxw and specifically in The’wáːlí’s environment by their Halq’eméylem names. The word Xwélmxew (literally meaning “the people” or “the people of life”) also refers to the Indigenous peoples of this territory, but is an older word that does not carry the same, specific political meaning carried by the two affiliations called Stó:lō Nation and Stó:lō Tribal Council. Brent Galloway writes that the word is used to refer to the First Peoples of this area (“Indian person”). See Brent D. Galloway, Dictionary of Upriver Halkomelem, Vol II (Berkeley: UC Press, 2009), 926. See also Keith Thor Carlson, “Glossary of Halq’eméylem Terms,” in The Power of Place, the Problem of Time: Aboriginal Identity and Historical Consciousness in the Cauldron of Colonialism, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), 87. I tend to favour the term Xwélmxew in this paper, because it is more reflective of larger kinship and cultural connections and avoids the anachronism of applying the term Stó:lō to pre-twentieth century contexts. It also avoids misrepresenting those local Indigenous people (including some people from The’wáːlí community) who choose not to identify as Stó:lō.

2 I use the Anglicized form of The’wáːlí in this paper only when referring to the reserve and the First Nation or the band name. Otherwise, I always refer to the community by its Halq’eméylem name. This word (also spelled Th’ewáːlí) literally translates to “dissolved people,” probably referring to the community’s origin story, in which a settlement near Swí:lhcha (Cultus Lake) was devastated by a famine, flood or landslide and later amalgamated with another community that had travelled there after suffering a similar population loss. The word is of both Halq’eméylem and Nooksack origins. See Galloway, Dictionary, Vol I, 780.

3 Jennifer Feinberg, “Protest Held Sunday to Protect Soowahlie Land and Water,” Chilliwack Progress, 12 April, 2016. Chilliwack Progress Online. The CP system of land management in Indian Reserves came into operation in 1951 as a replacement to an older system, and grants individual band members a certain amount of power over a specific plot of land on reserve, for the purpose building houses, constructing businesses or extracting resources. According to the Indian Act, however, the transfer and use of CP lands require first that the band council allot the parcel of land to the recipient and then that the Minister of Indian Affairs approve that allotment. All rights to the CP lot are then subject to the discretionary powers of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Council (AANDC). The predecessor of the Certificate of Possession system was the “Location Ticket” system, which was altered in the 1951 Indian Act. Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Council, Consolidation: Indian Act, 1951. Last amended 2 April, 2015.
Many of the residents of Soowahlie First Nation firmly object to the idea of hundreds of new residents moving onto the reserve. While some are concerned with the potential effect of these new houses on water quality, others are concerned about increased vehicle traffic on reserve roads, and others are most worried about the effect this new residential community will have on the quiet, isolated and non-urban character of the reserve that many Th'ëwà:lí community members feel proud of. Many Th'ëwà:lí people are not keen to cut off a section of their quiet reserve at the edge of Cultus Lake and share it with new residents who would likely primarily be non-Indigenous.

The issue raises questions about who may claim the power to decide how places are used when more than one individual or group has a connection to or an interest in those places. Indeed, philosopher Jacques Rancière argues that a struggle on which all human societies and governments are built is in determining “who is qualified to say what a particular place is and what is done in it.”⁴ Places, and the ways people understand and value them, are always complex and often fraught with tension.⁵ What anthropologist Margaret Rodman calls the “multivocality of place” is the collision of many voices storytelling, giving meaning to, and making claims upon, particular environments.⁶

The Cultus Lake Crossing conflict sheds light on the diversity and multivocality of place in Th’ëwà:lí: a community whose history is full of often highly contentious interactions with particular, physical and biophysical outcomes on the land. While many are concerned with the environmental impacts of a new development, others are interested in the land as a symbol of band and community control (as opposed to colonial control). On the other hand, these members of the Commodore family have for a long time been making efforts to control the development of their CP lot. The conflict reflects how issues of race, gender and status, family and inter-community dynamics and colonial and community governance are all caught up in diverse senses of identity and place. These are what have

⁵ See my discussion below on the scholarship of space and place informing my work.
made the lands and waterways that The’wá:lí calls home what they are today. They are also what give life to the The’wá:lí Community Digital Mapping Project. The essay that follows is a discussion of this project: a scholarly collaboration between members of The’wá:lí community and students from the Universities of Victoria and Saskatchewan, including myself, to build a digital map of this First Nation’s reserve and traditional territories. The recent events involving the Commodore CP lot is just one among many that contribute to the contested histories of The’wá:lí’s many places. A discussion and analysis of such events and their stories, and the process of digitally mapping them, make up the substance of this essay.

This is not the first time the band has contested proposals for housing developments on that same section of reserve. Indeed, Soowahlie First Nation most recently declined a proposal for a housing development on the same CP plot in 2009. However, in 2013, new federal regulations under the Harper administration were established that allowed for CP holders to develop or use their lots without band council approval. Development need only adhere to local bylaws.7 Prior to the new regulations, families or individuals with CP lands could only lease or develop their lots with Band Council consent and only after a majority vote had been held by the whole Band in favour of the development. Chief Brenda Wallace told reporters of the Chilliwack Progress that Chief and Council had been surprised in 2014 after receiving a letter from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development (AANDC) approving the lease of the lands.8 Many members of Soowahlie First Nation are frustrated because they consider these new regulations, which allow developers, CP holders and AANDC to make potentially transformational decisions independently of elected band leadership and outside of the consent of the community as a whole, to be part of the colonial and paternalistic power structures that still in many ways unilaterally govern the lands affairs of Indigenous peoples in Canada. In late April 2016, the band, along with Cheam

8 Feinberg, “Protest,” Chilliwack Progress.
and Skowkale First Nations, passed a new land code that will provide band governments and voting community members more direct say on how reserve lands are used, and ensure any CP use proposals are congruous with general community values. Ultimately, the housing project may still proceed, but it and other future development projects will be governed and limited by stipulations laid out in the new land code.⁹

This story is significant for several reasons. First, it sheds light on some of the colonial processes and legacies that still govern land use, and drive and control local politics in Indigenous communities in Canada. While Certificates of Possession can give individual reserve members or families more freedom to determine what happens to their lands, the 2013 regulation is perceived by some to disempower and destabilize community power structures that help govern activity on reserve. It instead favours developers and CP holders (and in particular targets CP holders whose lots contain valuable natural resources with value otherwise untouchable to the federal and provincial governments), who now can receive approval directly from AANDC. Some people see the regulation as a means to silence dissent in communities divided over how to use lands. The story also sheds some light on underlying and persistent colonialist attitudes that assume that Indigenous communities are incapable of making valid decisions or working through conflict over those decisions on their own. While declining the proposal means turning down a one-time payment of $1 million and annual tax revenue of $400,000 for the community, for some The’wá:lí people it also means accepting policies that infringe on band governments’ and community members’ powers to collectively make decisions on their own.¹⁰ Larry Les, the developer at the head of the project and owner of Genica Corporation, felt he was making a fair offer to the community and expressed his belief that the community “needed” to accept it, since

---

⁹ Personal communication with Band Councillor Marcie Commodore and former Band Councillor Gracie Kelly. See also Henderson, Paul J., “Soowahlie Land Code Vote could be Nail in the Coffin for Housing Development,” Chilliwack Times, 28 April 2016.
Soowahlie “‘isn’t the wealthiest band right now.’” 11 Not only does Les’ comment suggest that development for capital gain is the best, and only, way to “use” band lands, despite the voices challenging this idea; it also implies that developers and settler governments with the authority to set such projects in motion are more qualified to make decisions about Indigenous community lands than the communities themselves.

At the same time, this conflict has exacerbated existing intra-familial tensions on reserve. The’wá:lí community, like any community, is by no means unified or homogenous, and families have their own histories that are often fraught with conflict and tension. Some families hold old grudges. As suggested above, this is not the first time this Commodore CP lot has been the subject of fierce disagreement. This iteration of the conflict in particular brings to light divisions in the community that are in some cases legacies of the colonial processes influencing and directing First Nations’ lands and lives in Canada. The Commodore holding the Certificate of Possession is a status-holding member of Soowahlie through marriage. Though she is Euro-Canadian by birth, after marrying a Soowahlie band member she received Indian status through the combined regulations of the Indian Act and Bill C-31. In the past, Commodore’s husband was the primary recipient of criticism from fellow band members for his development proposals. Now that he has passed away, however, Mrs. Commodore’s racial identity as a non-Indigenous status-holder has also become part of the argument against the new proposal.

Former chief Douglas Kelly suggested that, although she is a well-loved community member, this Elder is not a “real” Soowahlie band member who can justifiably make decisions about lands on reserve. “A non-aboriginal person that acquired (Indigenous) status under racist provisions of the Indian Act should not reap economic benefits intended for Soowahlie members,” Kelly said. 12

Whether Kelly’s sentiments might have differed if Commodore was a Kelly, if her husband was still alive, or if she were a man and not a woman who had received status by marrying into The’wá:lí, are

---

12 Ibid.
deeply important questions that fall outside of the scope and purpose of this paper. While I do not intend here to contest or even discuss the legitimacy of Mrs. Commodore’s claim to the CP lot, Kelly’s statement, and the conflict as a whole, are important because they reflect how issues of racial and gendered identity, often developed and complicated in critical contexts of colonialism, play into conflict over places and their uses and meanings.

Ultimately, this conflict reflects how, even within a single, small community, people often have conflicting views of how lands can and should be used or understood. For many First Nations communities and individuals, promoting the economic development of their lands (or CP lot in the Commodore case) is an important and necessary step to addressing huge socioeconomic gaps between First Peoples and non-Indigenous peoples.\textsuperscript{13} For others, preserving places and landmarks for their cultural and ecological value by preventing development is more important. Many people envision ways to do both.\textsuperscript{14} These debates should not, and cannot, be reduced to a simple divide between “traditionalists” and “modernists” or between developers and environmentalists. Most The’wá:lı’ community members are opposed to the development mostly because they anticipate it will bring more traffic through their quiet reserve, which already frequently trespassed by visitors to Cultus Lake. Indeed, this controversy is evidence of the ways in which Indigenous people’s relationships to lands, and ideas of development and environmentalism, are often “deeply ambivalent” and cannot be reduced to

\textsuperscript{13} In addition, many CP holders consider their certificate to be evidence of individual or family ownership over a parcel of land (development of which the CP holder, and not the Band, should manage). For a discussion of Certificates of Possession and ideas about property rights in First Nations reserves, see Christopher Alcantara, “Individual Property Rights on Canadian Indian Reserves: The Historical Emergence and Jurisprudence of Certificates of Possession,” \textit{Canadian Journal of Native Studies} 23, no. 2 (2003): 391-424 and Christopher Alcantara, “Certificates of Possession and First Nations Housing: A Case Study of the Six Nations Housing Program,” \textit{Canadian Journal of Law and Society} 20, no. 2 (2005): 183-205.

\textsuperscript{14} After passing the land code, the Band administration polled community members to find out how people wish to see land on reserve used in the future. A large percentage of voters felt that recreation and tourism and other forms of development (for increased band revenue) was necessary, but that the development should be low-impact. Most voters wanted improved infrastructure, including better band housing. Personal communication with Marcie Commodore, Soowahlie Band Councillor, 16 July 2016.
any “one-dimensional caricature,” as Paul Nadasdy writes.\textsuperscript{15} Whatever the ultimate resolution of the Cultus Lake Crossing controversy, it is clear that it will be contested and framed by the many-layered and diverse voices defining, claiming and making places in this community’s reserve and traditional territory.

The The’wá:lí Community Digital Map

The The’wá:lí Community Digital Mapping Project is a community-engaged mapping initiative intended to give voice to many different senses of and claims to place, and their intersections, in the The’wá:lí environment. It also explores the histories of how these places and their meanings have changed over time. The map seeks to represent and understand the multivalence of places, which is often a source of conflict (as in the case of the Cultus Lake Crossing controversy) and sometimes a cause for compromise. The mapping project was first initiated in 2013 by former chiefs Larry Commodore and Otis Jasper, who, in the critical context of a specific land claim in which the band is involved, wanted community members to learn about what had happened to their traditional places. They requested that students be assigned to do research (both in the archives and in the field) about the land, and about the histories of how it has been changed, understood, valued, claimed and used. They wanted this information represented in the form of a digital, layered map, hyperlinked with audio, visual and textual media and accessible online to community members. Assigned to this project as a student on the Ethnohistory Field School among the Stó:lō, co-hosted by Stó:lō Nation and the Universities of Saskatchewan and Victoria, I have worked the last three years with two other students and a number of The’wá:lí community members to build a digital map, layered with multimedia and stories, which expresses many ways of understanding the land and water, and presents an alternative to popular, colonial narratives of the settlement of the Fraser Valley that tend to elide Indigenous experiences or outright erase longstanding, unceded Indigenous claims to place. Thus, the map is also intended to engage a local, non-Indigenous audience, challenging them to rethink their perceptions about where they live and about the peoples with whom they share their histories and land.

What follows is a discussion of the relationship-building, research, writing and map-building processes that have produced the The’wá:lí Community Digital Map. After first being assigned the project in 2013, two other field school students, Anne Janhunen and Dallas Posavad, and I began the
research process. This included spending time in local and provincial archives to collect documents in order to trace a history of The’wá:lí and colonial place making and land use in this environment. It also involved speaking with as many community members as possible, and reading the interview transcripts and field notes of nineteenth- and twentieth-century ethnographers, to record individual community members’ stories, memories and histories of The’wá:lí’s places. The interview and collaboration processes are discussed in further detail in the section of this paper titled “Momíyelhtel: Learning Together.” 16 The past three years of working together within the context of a great many collaborative relationships have produced a complex digital map containing a diversity of features.

The map itself was largely produced in 2015 and 2016. The process of map-building, choosing the specific region and naming, describing and categorizing sites is explained in greater detail below. The base map, comprised of 757,226 OpenStreetMap tiles (downloaded and currently housed by the Humanities Computing and Media Centre at the University of Victoria), covers a rectangular area of about 330 square-kilometres from Coquitlam, B.C. in the northwest, to Lopez Island, Washington in the southwest, to Cascade Recreation Area, B.C. in the northeast, to the southernmost reaches of Ross Lake National Park in Washington in the southeast. Although the 100 features (which include lines, points and polygons) in the map do not spread out this far, the larger scale is significant because it provides broader context, revealing connections to a larger Coast Salish geography of which The’wá:lí’s places are a part. All of the sites are clickable in a sidebar. When a user clicks a site, she will see its associated point, line or polygon on the map and a small textbox appears with a brief description. She will also be given the option to “learn more.” If she clicks this link, she will see another HTML page (what I have called panels, inspired by interpretive panels in museum exhibits) containing pictures, audio clips and more text.

16 I learned this word, which translates to “learning together,” from The’wá:lí knowledge holder Gracie Kelly, who used it in 2013 to describe the work that we were doing with The’wá:lí in building the map. The literal translation is “helping one another.” See Galloway, Dictionary, Vol. 1, 340.
Each site or feature is associated with a primary category. So far, there are eleven categories with which sites have been identified. These include: Mountains, Waterways, Community Origins, Community Connections, Colonial Change, Contemporary Significance, Economic Activity, Environmental History, Family History, Recreation Places and Storied Places. Most of these categories (including Colonial Change, Contemporary Significance, Economic Activity, Family History, Recreation Places and Storied Places) were conceived in discussions with the community members most closely involved in the process. Others were produced after most of the research for the map was completed, when we discovered that some of our original ideas for category names did not adequately encompass the meaning of particular sites. Additionally, most sites are cross listed. For example, the story of the creation of Swí:lhcha’s (the lake commonly known as Cultus Lake) is primarily situated in the Storied Places category. It is also cross-listed, however, under the categories Community Origins and Community Connections because the story of the lake’s creation is closely tied to the story of The’wá:lí’s origins, which itself is a story of hybridity and amalgamation between two other communities. While the initial categorization of features provides a sense of order to some of the sites, the overlap and cross listing of many expresses the complicated, messy and multivalent nature of stories about place in The’wá:lí’s territory.

Critical cartographer Dennis Wood writes that mapmaking is “a lot more like talking, like writing,” than it is a science.¹⁷ According to him and other geographers including, for example, J.B. Harley, Cole Harris and Gwylim Eades, maps do not just neutrally present uninterpreted data about the physical world.¹⁸ They make arguments and serve political, social, academic or other purposes. The

---

¹⁷ Denis Wood, Rethinking the Power of Maps (London: The Guilford Press, 2010), 120.
Dominion government’s Lands and Works maps demarcating the boundaries of Indian Reserves in the Fraser Valley in the 1870s, for example, did not simply represent data about the lands they depicted. The polygons, lines and labels attached to various places on the land separated Indian space from non-Indian space, giving the impression that lands appearing on maps as “unused” by Indigenous residents were available for newcomer use. Reserve Boundary commission maps reflected dominant nineteenth century attitudes and stories about land use, settlement and property, and they were shaped by prevalent assumptions about race and gender. Such maps helped to establish, encode and protect Dominion control over Indigenous lands and peoples.19

The The’wá:li map not only aims to represent many stories about this community’s places, but also is intended to tell a story of its own. While it is impossible to settle on a single analytical argument that the map makes, a few unifying themes have become clear over the course of the last three years. I have tried to make these themes and connections apparent in my own textual interpretation included in many of the clickable features of the map. One key argument is that maps like the The’wá:li Community Digital Map can be made to speak. Maps tell stories about people and their varied, and often changing, senses of place. The people of The’wá:li, and perhaps Xwélmexw and Coast Salish peoples more generally, cannot be understood in isolation from their places.20 This community is characterized by its deep-rooted connections (expressed in many diverse ways) with the land and water, and with other communities and landmarks in the surrounding area. I hope that the map expresses how history and collective identity are fundamentally intertwined with places.

---

19 See Harris, Making Native Space, especially Part 2.
In addition, this map, like the story with which I began my discussion, expresses how places are always multivalent and many-layered, and often contested.\textsuperscript{21} Places and the idea of home, as Ted Chamberlin argues, are controversial things.\textsuperscript{22} Not only between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, but among families and individuals within The’wá:lí community, stories and senses of place vary, overlap and often conflict. Conflicted senses of place, and the ways in which I have sought to navigate diversity and simultaneously bring things together into the singular framework of the map, are discussed in the section that follows. The The’wá:lí map reflects the potential limitlessness and attendant messiness of trying to represent and comprehend people’s senses of a contested place.

Map users will also hopefully be struck, as I have continually been as I have listened to people talk about their places, by the emphasis on the power of places in Coast Salish ways of knowing. So many landmarks in the The’wá:lí landscape have stories attached to them that emphasize their inherent spiritual power. Whether stl’áleqem sites, metaphysical portals in lakes, sasq’ets trails or water babies’ homes, many places in the The’wá:lí landscape are reminders to this community that they live in a physical world that they consider to be inhabited by powerful, sentient, non-human beings. Stories in the The’wá:lí map make it clear that human beings do not act alone and unilaterally on the physical world, but are subject to the powers of that active and living physical world, as well as those of the non-human beings who live in it. As anthropologist Crisca Bierwert has written, in Coast Salish place-making epistemologies, social life involves, “wholly and unequivocally,” relationships to “other sacred beings that have agency in and of themselves…including features of the land itself.”\textsuperscript{23} The map’s many layers


\textsuperscript{23} Bierwert, \textit{Brushed by Cedar}, 7.
are revealing of the mutually constitutive relationship between the environment, its many inhabitants, and The’wá:lí’s history and collective identity.

In addition, the map tells a story of change over time. The The’wá:lí landscape is marked by histories of change and transformation, but these changes did not only begin when settlers entered the picture. Rather, as traditional stories of place and history called Sxwôxwiyám (transformer stories about how the world in ancient times was made “right,” transforming from chaotic to stable) suggest, Xwélmexw peoples have been experiencing and responding to transformation from the beginning of time. According to Xwélmexw ways of understanding the past and the world around them, human beings cannot always control the powerful world around them and live in expectation of change. Origin stories suggest the community of The’wá:lí itself is the product of transformation: oral histories explain that natural disasters in the eighteenth century wiped out the populations of two communities, and in response, their surviving members amalgamated near Swí:lh to make The’wá:lí. When Xwélitem peoples entered the environment of the Fraser Valley, bringing with them change of a new kind, transformation was not new. The’wá:lí histories were already in the making. Perhaps the scale and types of transformation brought with settler colonialism were drastically different from that which The’wá:lí already had experienced, but settler colonialism is not the central story of this map. Relations, conflicts and interactions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are a significant part of the history of how the environment has changed. Still, while the map will indeed tell a story of these relations, it will also, perhaps more importantly, reflect the creative, varied and adaptive ways by which this community has always been responding and adapting to change. Rather than positioning the history of colonialism

26 Translating literally to “the starving ones,” this is one Halq’eméylem term used to describe white people, referring specifically to the hungry state in which the earliest non-Indigenous explorers, gold miners and eventually settlers arrived in Sólh Témexw in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The term is still used today by some Stó:lō people to refer to non-Indigenous people. See Galloway, Dictionary, Vol II, 925-926.
as the turning point in The’wá:lí’s history, this map seeks to situate the story of the colonial past and present as one part of a much longer, The’wá:lí history of change, transformation and adaptation.

Further, The’wá:lí places, and the identity of the community itself, are marked by movement and connectivity. Responding deliberately to Brian Thom’s and Tad McIlwraith’s concerns that counter-mapping often has the potential to enable industry, governments and other interested parties to claim and exploit the “white spaces” (areas “in between” points and polygons where Indigenous peoples’ use and occupation do not appear on maps), this digital map does not simply mark up an area of land with a series of isolated points with nothing but white spaces in between. Rather, it deliberately indicates connections and movement throughout the territory of The’wá:lí and across a much larger, Coast Salish environment. The’wá:lí is neither isolated nor restricted to a single place. Many of this community’s stories emphasize the “in-between” kinds of places, and the process of movement between one site and another. Stories about the community’s amalgamated origins, narratives of non-human spiritual beings travelling long distances throughout the territory, and the community’s use of widespread and circuitous trail systems are all significant parts of the map. They reflect how this community is part of a widely and intricately networked world of movement and relationships.

Finally, I argue here that, just as many-storied places often generate conflict (as the Cultus Lake Crossing controversy demonstrates), they can also bring people together. This paper explores not only a diversity of places and the processes, but also the contours of collaboration that have made it possible. As a collaborative project, this map has not only explored diversity and heterogeneity, but also brought together members of The’wá:lí in a community-wide effort to share knowledge about, and learn from, places. From its very inception, the project began as a collaboration between the First Nation and three students, including me, from the Universities of Victoria and Saskatchewan. The process of building
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relationships and working alongside members of the community and experts at the universities to build this digital map is discussed in detail below.

Mapmaking is a kind of storytelling. Maps can be used to educate audiences on the perspectives, experiences and knowledge people have about their places. According to critical cartographer Denis Wood and ethnogeographer Gwyllim Eades, maps are not simply apolitical images produced through empirical, scientific research and pointing to places to help us get from here to there. They are also, perhaps more importantly, windows onto our ways of knowing about the past and the places we inhabit and reflective of how we think of each other. Inspired by this thought, I present a response to critical cartographer J.B. Harley’s 1988 challenge: “How then can we make maps ‘speak’ about the social worlds of the past” and of the present? The The’wá:lí Digital Map is an attempt to do just that. This project is testament to the importance of places to The’wá:lí people, and to Stó:lô people more broadly, and is an interpretation of how this community’s many places have changed over time. It focuses, through a local lens, on intersections of place, shared histories, and cultural identities. It also reflects the ways in which counter-mapping as a collaborative effort has the power to situate local Indigenous connections to and knowledge of place as living, complex and sophisticated. Further, collaborative counter-mapping has the potential to bridge gaps in native-newcomer and community-academia relations. In the following pages, I discuss the community-engaged process on which this

28 Wood, Rethinking, 20 and Eades, Maps and Memes, 10.
29 Harley, “Maps, Knowledge and Power,” in Iconography of Landscape.
30 In an important discussion about being an Indigenous scholar in the academy, Margaret Kovach explains how Western systems of higher education have historically been places of oppression and assimilation. Western institutions are to this day in many ways colonial institutions in which (as she observes from her own experiences as an Indigenous scholar) Indigenous scholars are “vulnerable” (53). Kovach suggests strategies for transforming academic institutions to address these issues. Margaret Kovach, “Being Indigenous in the Academy: Creating Space for Indigenous Scholars,” in First Nations, First Thoughts: The Impact of Indigenous Thought in Canada, ed. Annis May Timpson (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009). For other important discussions about shifting Indigenous-academic relationships and acknowledging and empowering non-Western knowledge systems, see for example, Raibmon, “Introduction,” in Elsie Paul, with Paige Raibmon and Harmony Johnson, Written as I Remember It: Teachings (ʔems taʔaw) from the Life of a Sliammon Elder (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014), 1-40; Robertson, “Introduction,” in Leslie A. Robertson with the Kwagu’l Gix’sgam Clan, Standing Up With Ga’axsta’las: Jane Constance Cook and the Politics of Memory, Church, and Custom. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012).
map is founded, the theoretical, historiographical and methodological backgrounds informing my part of the work, and some of the many ways the community of The’wá:lí has related to, and told stories about, their places since they first came to the environment in question.
The’wá:li Community

According to oral histories, the community of The’wá:li has a very old, uninterrupted claim to the unceded lands near Swí:lhcha (now called Cultus Lake), as well as in present-day Sardis. According to some, this claim even extends as far east as Chilliwack Lake. Stories suggest that the community has lived here for hundreds of years. The late Elder Amy Cooper described a devastating disaster to ethnographer Oliver Wells, which killed an entire Tselx’weyeqw community near the lake, except for one woman. This woman migrated to what is now considered The’wá:li territory and there met a Nooksack-speaking man who had experienced similar devastation and migrated north from present-day Washington. Their union was the starting point of The’wá:li, which became rooted in the environment around Swí:lhcha. The story not only points to the community’s longstanding connection to a large environment and especially to the area around this freshwater lake, but also reflects The’wá:li’s kinship networks, with their mixed Tsel’xweyéqw and Nooksack roots, which in many ways define their places and identity.

Today, Soowahlie First Nation is a Stó:lō Tribal Council community located eight kilometres south of Chilliwack, British Columbia. The community’s population is about 300, with nearly 200 people living on reserve. It stands out from neighbouring First Nation communities for several reasons. First, at 1,140 acres, the reserve is large compared to other Coastal reserves (though tiny compared to other Canadian reserves in general). Also, considering its proximity to the centre of Chilliwack and to other nearby, more “urban” reserves that have leased CP lots for residential and commercial development,
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32 Ts’elxweyéqw (literally, “the head,” and Anglicized to Chilliwack) refers to a group of people originally from Chilliwack Lake and the northern reaches of the Chilliwack River who migrated southwest into the Lower Fraser Valley and settled at various sites along the river in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, after their own settlements were destroyed by natural disasters. Many Xwélmexw communities, like The’wá:li, trace their ancestry to the Ts’elxweyéqw. See Carlson, The Power of Place, 117.
the community is characterized by remarkable, and in some ways beautiful, seclusion. In some places, the reserve is rich and dense with second-growth foliage, after having been entirely clear-cut in the 1920s. Many residences are difficult to spot from a distance because of their leafy surroundings. The reserve encompasses high terrain on its west side, the hills northeast of Vedder Mountain, and low floodplains on the east side, whose shape changes frequently due to shifts in the course of the Chilliwack River. In these floodplains, the terrain is in many places overgrown. Within the broader environment considered The’wá:lí territory is the popular freshwater Cultus Lake and surrounding woodland, as well as Sweltzer Creek. Vedder Mountain, northwest of Cultus Lake, is an important storied place.

The location of Soowahlie Reserve, relative to Vancouver, B.C. The Nation is about a hundred kilometres east of downtown Vancouver by car.

33 Otis Jasper (Former Chief, Soowahlie Band), interview with Dallas Posavad, Anne Janhunen and Sabina Trimble, Sardis, British Columbia, May 21, 2013. Interview recording housed at SNA, Sardis, B.C. and at the Soowahlie Band Office.
Environmentally diverse and quietly beautiful, The‘wá:lí’s territory is also rich in resources. Stó:lō stories suggest that the community has always hunted and fished in the Swí:lhcha and Sweltzer Creek area. Diverse species of salmon used to spawn in the creek, and Swí:lhcha is home to all five varieties of salmon (sockeye, chum, coho, chinook and pink). A genetically-distinct variety of salmon (commonly called Cultus Sockeye) that can be found nowhere else in the world breeds in the lake. Berry-picking (for salmonberries, strawberries, blackberries, and raspberries) and cedar bark stripping and cedar root gathering, for various uses such as basket weaving, still occur in some places on reserve. Some stories also suggest that the environment not only abounds materially, but that a rich, stratified Stó:lō economy based on access to local metaphysical resources has also thrived in this place. Cultus Lake used to contain spirit power, associated with a dangerous creature called stl’áleqem, which lives in the waters. Access to the power contained there was privileged; only powerful shxwlá:m (Elder Amy Cooper called them “Indian doctors”) were able to harness it. Those who incautiously approached the lake with bad intentions were drowned in the lake, and their flesh melted and consumed off their bones. Thus, the lake’s power was an important source of power and status available to certain people, in a stratified social world.

When explorers and settlers entered the The‘wá:lí environment in the late nineteenth century, the necessity to adapt to change was not new to the community, as Amy Cooper’s origin story suggests. However, the type of change colonialism brought, and its effect on the community’s relation to place, are significant elements in the digital map. Among the first and most substantial changes involved the introduction of reserve boundaries. In response to incoming outsider populations in the area and in
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34 Other stories point to stl’áleqem living elsewhere throughout S’ólh Téméxw. They are a particular type of spiritual being with whom an encounter can have “mixed outcomes.” See McHalsie, “Atlas Plate 2: Stl’áleqem Sites” in A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas, 8.
35 Cooper, “Amy Cooper at Soowahlie February 8, 1962” in Oliver Wells Interview Collection, 76-77.
36 Gus Commodore, “Gus Commodore Interview with Norman Lerman,” in Lower Fraser Indian Folktales Collected by Norman Lerman, 1950-1951, transcript, SNA, 226. Commodore explained that access to the power of the lake could make a person “a pretty good medicine man.”
other Indigenous places throughout what became British Columbia, Governor James Douglas tried to set aside and distinguish Indigenous land bases from what was being consumed by incoming settlers. In 1864, consulting with leaders from the area, Douglas’ surveyors laid out a 1618 hectare (4,000-acre) reserve for The’wá:li.\(^{37}\) The lands encompassed some of Vedder Crossing and reached northward to present-day Sardis, and went as far south as the northern shore of Cultus Lake. After Douglas’s time in office, demands from settlers and provincial leaders led to significant truncations of reserve acreage. In 1868, with the approval of settler government-instated chief Captain John, Joseph Trutch’s administration reduced the reserve to 279 hectares (690 acres) of what it considered to be all the “usable” land the community needed. Trutch claimed that McColl had misunderstood or misinterpreted Douglas’ original instructions and had, as a result, surveyed much larger reserves than he felt were

\[^{37}\text{William McColl, “A rough diagram showing the position of those ‘Reserves’ laid off for Government purposes on the Fraser, Chillukweyak, Sumass & Matqee Reserves,” 16 May, 1864. Maps collection, SNA.}\]
needed by the Xwellemexw communities of the Fraser Valley.\textsuperscript{38} Just a decade later, in 1879, nearly 182 hectares (about 450 acres) were repatriated to the reserve, making for the current 461 hectares (1140 acres) of Soowahlie reserve space.\textsuperscript{39} This 461 hectares, along with access to the Grass and TzCheacten reserves (shared with eight other Stó:lō communities), replaced a much larger expanse of territory.

Throughout the twentieth century, the community responded to further encroachments on their lands. Not only have places in unceded surrounding territory been commonly marked off as non-Indigenous space (such as the nearly 3500 acres of Cultus Lake Parks). Cutoffs within the current reserve boundaries have also affected The’wá:li’s relationships to place. In the early to mid-twentieth century, two major, public through-roads to Cultus Lake and Chilliwack Lake were built on cut off lands in the reserve.\textsuperscript{40} In the 1940s, about 100 acres of land in the southwest corner of the reserve, once used for pasturing horses and cattle, was transformed into a Department of Defence shooting range.\textsuperscript{41} While the DND lease ended in the 1990s, live ordnance still remains in this section of the reserve.\textsuperscript{42} The reserve was logged almost entirely in 1924, and control over the activity and rights to the timber mostly fell into the hands of local logging companies.\textsuperscript{43} Other kinds of interactions between settler governments, industry and The’wá:li have led to diverse economic activities, and environmentalist responses, on

\textsuperscript{38} J. B. Launders to the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, Joseph Trutch, 18 December 1868, in \textit{Papers Connected with the Indian Land Question, 1850-1875} (Victoria: Richard Wolfenden, Government Printer, 1876 Reproduction, 1987), 54-57. Also, J.B. Launders, survey maps, SNA maps collection.
\textsuperscript{40} The main public access road to Cultus Lake, for example, first called Mount Baker Trail and now called Cultus Lake Road, was built upon just over six acres of cutoff Soowahlie land in 1934, with no compensation to the community except a one-time payment of $75 and an assurance that “It is considered that this road is of sufficient benefit to the reserve to justify its transfer without compensation.” Department of Indian Affairs Surveys, P.C. 2932, 19 November, 1934. Also, Stó:lō Tribal Council, “Soowahlie Band: List of Land Transactions Documents on File at the Stó:lō Tribal Council Office,” 4 August 1988, SNA and Soowahlie Band Office, 1-2.
\textsuperscript{42} Bruce Sam, interview with Sabina Trimble, Soowahlie Reserve, B.C., 29 May, 2013, SNA and Soowahlie Band Office Records. See also, “Natives Seek $6 Million Dollar Cleanup, \textit{The Chilliwack Progress Online Archives}, 17 April, 1996.
\textsuperscript{43} “New Westminster Agency - Correspondence and Statistics Regarding Timber on the Soowahlie Reserve (Maps, Publications), 1906-1934.” Indian Affairs, RG 10, Vol. 7854, File 30153-7, LAC.
reserve. In April 1970, the Crown granted Vedder Crushing Co. Ltd. the right to use and occupy land, and remove and process gravel from the reserve. Two decades later, the Band established its own company called Th’ewali Resources Limited, to gain more control over extraction and development projects on reserve, such as gravel sites and dyking, and over the revenue produced by such projects. Many community members have voiced concern over the environmental impact of gravel extraction, and of the change these projects have brought to a generally quiet place. Conflicting ideas of how the land can and should be used underpin a history of change reflected in the digital map.

The community has adapted and responded in diverse and creative ways to shifting colonial policy and to restrictions and cutoffs. The’wá:li has a long, rich history of resident engagement in diverse social and economic endeavours. One means of responding to colonial administration and new forms of control over their relationships to the land has been to participate on reserve in new systems, but often in ways that make sense within an existing Xwélmexw sociocultural framework. Many families have engaged in such activities as growing orchards of pears, apples and berries (even up to the early 2000s), logging, fishing, farming (dairy, equestrian and wheat), and working in the gravel quarries. Among Fraser Valley farmers, Xwélmexw people were often very successful, and farmers and orchardists on Soowahlie Reserve were no exception. The’wá:li’s engagement in these kinds of activity is expressive of the many ways some members of the community have responded to change in their environments, and used and understood places in the face of changing economic structures.

This community’s long and rich past, and the many place-making stories it has produced, form the substance of the The’wá:li Community Digital Map. Histories of change and continuity, stories suggesting the persistent Xwélmexw character of the environment despite colonial change, and diverse economic activity and family histories in this broadly-interpreted geographical area make for potentially endless layers for our map. The eleven major categories of sites included in the digital map, and the

cross-listing of many sites within multiple categories, give expression to the diversity and multivocality of The’wá:lí’s places and their stories. They also help situate and contextualize the ethnohistorical analyses that I have written for many of the map’s sites. The following sections discuss the collaborative mapmaking process, explore and interpret related scholarly literature inspiring this project, and outline some of problems and practicalities various contributors and I faced over the course of the last three years.
Listening and Mapping:
The The’wá:lí Digital Mapping in Dialogue

The following is a discussion of the scholarship that has informed my approach throughout all stages of the The’wá:lí Community Mapping Project. The project is inherently and widely interdisciplinary, and has been guided and inspired therefore by discussions across a range of disciplines and specializations, especially history, ethnography, ethnohistory, geography, digital humanities and critical theory. I engage with scholars of space and place, including anthropologists, geographers and literary critics who reflect on the multiple and often conflicting ways in which people interpret their environments, and thus imbue them with meaning. I also refer to works by scholars of Stó:lō culture and history, while the works of historians and ethnohistorians have helped me to situate this local project within broader discussions about Indigenous and colonial pasts of British Columbia and Canada. Recent works of collaborative history have also inspired our participatory and collaborative research process. Finally, geographers have long been discussing the power of maps and the potential of counter-mapping to tell alternative stories about places and the past and to reach to broader, more public audiences than academic monographs and articles typically do. The following sections discuss this multidisciplinary scholarship in detail, explaining how particular conversations across the disciplines inform the research, approach and analysis for this project.

Community-engaged Scholarship

Because the The’wá:lí Community Mapping Project hinges, most importantly, upon human relationships, and because from its beginning it was intended to be collaborative, I think it is most important to begin by talking about other, recent community-engaged scholarship founded on collaborations between university scholars and Indigenous peoples. In her 2011 work First Person Plural, Sophie McCall describes some works of collaborative scholarship that had appeared in the 1990s,
especially those co-authored by Wendy Wickwire, Julie Cruikshank and Lee Maracle. She sees these works as having shifted emphases, with their approaches not validated by the scholarly authority of the academics, but by the “process, debate and exchange” they shared with their collaborative partners. My philosophy and approach in this project is inspired by a few recent works that have focused on this kind of dialogue, negotiation and relationship-building. ʔaʔamin Elder Elsie Paul and historian Paige Raibmon’s Written as I Remember It outlines an approach to collaborative work that ethnohistorians can and should attend to. Especially important, I think, is Raibmon’s discussion of “transformational listening.” This, she argues, requires that the researcher be self-reflexive and strive for “continual openness to learning something new and unknown.” Taking such an approach is the best way to do more transparent, reflexive and shared ethnohistorical research for the The’wá:lí Mapping Project.

“Transformational listening” in the context of my project partly means hearing and acknowledging multiple, varied and often conflicting perspectives and stories about the same place, to understand the diverse significance attributed to those places by various peoples.

Community-engaged research is also about shared authority, and about scholars engaging in research projects about which they acknowledge they are not the experts. It is about making space for what Wendy Wickwire calls “transparent, two way conversation.” In another recent, highly reflexive community-engaged work, Leslie Robertson writes of herself as learning from the community with whom she helped reconstruct the contentious history of the late Kwagu’ɬ Gixsam Elder Ga’axsta’las (Jane Constance Cook). She opens the work by locating epistemological authority within the Gixsam community. When she thanks the members of the Kwagu’ɬ Gixsam clan, she writes, “you generously
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45 See for example, Lee Maracle Bobbi Lee, Indian Rebel (Toronto: Women’s Press, 1990); Julie Cruikshank, Angela Sidney, Kitty Smith and Annie Ned’s Life Lived like a Story (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1991); and Harry Robinson and Wendy Wickwire’s Write it on Your Heart (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1992).
47 Paul with Raibmon and Johnson, Written as I Remember It, 5.
guided me through your history [...] I have learned much from you. It has been a great honour.\textsuperscript{49} This history, Robertson suggests, is not hers, but belongs to, and has been shared by, the family and community. Allowing transformational listening and shared epistemological authority to guide the mapping project means to me that even when we have tried to listen for every story and every voice we can possibly find, there are always more voices, and thus always room for expansion.\textsuperscript{50}

Some of the most important research relationships that produced this map have also transformed into personal relationships and friendships, which, I think, need to be openly and transparently acknowledged as central to any community-engaged work. The first time I met Gracie Kelly, for example, was in a room at the Stó:lō Research and Resource Management Centre (SRRMC)\textsuperscript{51} to discuss plans for the map. Over the last three years, I have come to know Gracie not only as one of the most significant contributors to this project, but also as a friend and a mentor. I have stayed at her home in The’wá:lí, where she has told me my invitation to return is always open. As I write this paragraph, in this very moment, I am wearing a beautifully-knitted sweater by Marge Kelly (from wool she handspun), Gracie’s generous and gifted mother. I have purchased knitted slippers and mittens almost every year from Marge for myself and for family Christmas gifts. I have been fortunate to participate in cedar pulling to make cedar hats, and even helped weave a hat when Gracie invited a group of Elders to her house to make their own cedar hats from the bark she had harvested for them. Gracie’s commitment to speaking across family divides, reserve boundaries, cultural differences and generational gaps has been

\textsuperscript{49} Roberton, “Introduction,” in Robertson with the Kwagu’ł Gixsam Clan, Standing Up With Ga’axsta’las, xxii.

\textsuperscript{50} Other important collaborative works of a self-reflexive nature include, for example, Robin Ridington, Little Bit Know Something: Stories in a Language of Anthropology (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1990); Cruikshank et al., Life Lived like a Story; Robinson and Wickwire, Write It on Your Heart; Andrea Laforet and Annie York, Spuzzum: Fraser Canyon Histories, 1808–1939, ed. Julie Cruikshank (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998); and Harry Robinson, Living by Stories: A Journey of Landscape and Memory, Wendy Wickwire, ed. (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 2005).

\textsuperscript{51} The SRRMC is one of the service-providers of Stó:lō Nation, a pan-tribal organization providing services, resources and programs to eleven member bands (Soowahlie First Nation is not one – they are affiliated with the other pan-Nation organization called Stó:lō Tribal Council). The centre is located at the Stó:lō Nation headquarters in Sardis, B.C. The Centre focuses on research initiatives and resource management for member bands. It is also among the primary organizers of the Ethnohistory Field School among the Stó:lō.
inspiring to me and is a primary reason that this project has been possible. Relationships between researchers and collaborators, whether momentary or enduring, are, more than anything, relationships between human beings. Sometimes these relationships can develop into deeper friendships, but always they require give and take, exchange, and a willingness to speak across imposed boundaries.

Reflexive and collaborative scholars committed to transformational listening must also be aware of the persistent and painful realities of a colonial past that continue to shape and affect relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and between collaborators. For Elsie Paul, the purpose of participating in collaborative work is to overcome the “the multiple instances of silencing imposed upon Indigenous people by colonialism.” These are “a crucial context for the act of sharing” her story, according to Raibmon. “The true history,” Paul says, “is never talked about, you know?” In a similar collaborative, told-to narrative, Xwélmexw Elder Rena Point Bolton writes that “it got easy to define us out of existence” through imposed categories of identity and stereotyping, residential schooling and other painful colonial realities she discusses. “We still have a long way to go to understand our years of silence,” she writes. One of the primary reasons that these Elders engaged in their historical projects was to set the record straight, and to challenge readers to acknowledge and fill in silences in Canada’s history: silences of voice and of self that were crucial to the colonial power structures that so affected these Paul’s and Ga’axsta’las’ worlds.

Telling stories their own way, these women also challenge processes in the past that have sought to erase them and their cultures from the present. Point Bolton’s words should serve as a reminder, first, that places like The’wá:lil’ territory continue today to bear different meaning to different people, and, second, that conflicting stories may also be reminders of tense and sometimes

52 Paul with Raibmon and Johnson, Written as I Remember It, 14.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid., 79.
56 Ibid., 214.
violent histories of contact and colonization. The map needs to tell stories that reflect the reality that even when seemingly dominant, Euro-Canadian stories about places persist in popular memory, histories of loss and profound change have profoundly altered the lands and its peoples, often in traumatic ways. Visibly documenting and interpreting the histories that have changed “what was traditionally ours,” as Gracie Kelly put it, is part of the process of challenging map users to rethink their assumptions about the history of the Chilliwack River Valley, the city of Chilliwack and Cultus Lake.

At the 2016 annual Congress of the Social Sciences and Humanities in Calgary, Alberta, nine Indigenous scholars (eight of whom were women) came together for a roundtable on teaching and doing history in the university in the wake of the 2015 Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Among this inspiring and powerful group of people was historian and Indigenous studies scholar, Winona Wheeler, from the University of Saskatchewan. Discussing what she felt it means to have “allies,” especially in humanities or history departments, she made some profound remarks. First, she suggested that good history is deliberately and unabashedly political. Collaborative scholars working with Indigenous communities to rethink and retell histories do so not just for the sake of obtaining knowledge. Rather, they are acting on a political decision to challenge and even correct power imbalances created and upheld through generations of colonial history-making that have silenced Indigenous peoples and marginalized their ways of doing history and knowing the past. The The’wá:li Mapping Project is not simply a project formed out of interest, but one with a deliberate aim: to explore the past with an eye to the future, and to retell stories that have been previously eclipsed or silenced.

Wheeler ended her talk with the comment that academic hiring committees needed to start actively searching out, and making room for, Indigenous scholars. One or two Indigenous hires in a department, she argued, was not enough. The fundamental challenge she made to the idea of a majority of non-Indigenous scholars at the helm of Indigenization and decolonization efforts was that “Indigenous peoples don’t need any more spokespeople. We need space makers.” That Indigenous
peoples have been doing history in their own viable, sophisticated and specific ways is an important implication of this statement. Wheeler was stressing the point that “allies” need to be ready to make sacrifices, to step aside, in order to make space for the voices of Indigenous historians telling their own stories about the past, in their own ways. Similarly, Margaret Kovach has stressed that “creating space in academia...is a social responsibility that demands the attention of all who seek a more respectful way of being in the world.” Wheeler’s and Kovach’s statements connect powerfully with Raibmon’s idea about collaborative scholars engaging in transformational listening. It is not good enough, Raibmon says, to self-identify as an ally, believing that “one has already ‘got it,’” and then to take the dominant role in telling history. My hope is that, in the role I have taken throughout this process, I have engaged the tools and privilege associated with being a non-Indigenous student working in the Western academy in such a way as to make space for many voices, rather than to assume control over the story being told. Although I do draw conclusions of my own and highlight what I see to be themes underlying the map, I do not see the story, or the process of storytelling, as belonging solely to me. Rather, the digital map, I hope, is a space in which many voices telling many stories about places and the past can be heard.

*Place Making in the The’wá:lí Environment*

In his contribution to the 2007 collection *Be of Good Mind*, Naxaxahlts’i (Sonny McHalsie) writes about some of the particularities of Xwélmxew place making. He begins by reflecting on some of the time he spent researching Halq’eméylem place names in S’ólh Téméxw as an employee of Stó:lō Nation in the 1990s. That, he writes, was really the first that he “began to learn what the places mean to the Stó:lō people.” He dedicates the chapter to explaining place-names and their stories, and the importance of specific places to Stó:lō collective histories and identities. He explains the protocol by which Xwélmxew peoples have always been taught to approach the physical environment. Naxaxahlts’i’s
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58 Naxaxahlts’i, “We Have to Take Care of Everything That Belongs to Us,” 84.
central focus, and indeed, as he argues, the crux of Xwēlmexw ways of knowing place, is bound up in a single statement: “S’ólh Téméxw te ikw’elo. Xolhme te mekw’stam it kwelat.” (translated “This is our land and we have to take care of everything that belongs to us.”). Naxaxalhts’i writes that the above words express a critical Stó:lō or Xwēlmexw way of understanding the world. The People of the River have a responsibility to acknowledge the importance and to respect the power of the physical environment.

“This is our land” is a clear Stó:lō claim to place. Indeed, writes Naxaxalhts’i, “that’s our statement of our Aboriginal right and title, the statement of our ownership.” The second half of the statement, “we have to take care of everything” defines the kinds of relations the Stó:lō are obligated to foster with and within the land: “that’s our obligation, to take care of everything that belongs to us.”

Carrying out that obligation, Naxaxalhts’i says, means listening for the stories of the land and heeding the messages contained in them. “Each place,” he writes, “talks about different things that are out there in our land, in our world,” and “I think it’s really important to actually have a connection to place.”

That kind of connection comes from knowing the stories and original place-names, Naxaxalhts’i argues. Places “talk” about how to live in the world, and the stories embedded in places help people to “hear” what places have to say. This section is an exploration of different kinds of places and place making in The’wá:lí territory, providing the theoretical basis for the map’s interpretation of how people and places are mutually constitutive in the The’wá:lí environment. In particular, I discuss Naxaxalhts’i’s and other scholars’ views on Xwēlmexw place making in light of theory and ideas drawn from a few specific works in the larger, transdisciplinary body of space and place scholarship.

Because the breadth of scholarship on space, place and place making is so large (especially in geography, literary theory and anthropology), this section will not be a cross-disciplinary survey or detailed description of all the works that theorize space and place. Rather, I discuss some of the more

59 Ibid., 85
60 Ibid., 92
general scholarship, but focus on Xwélmexw (and Coast Salish) place making, and non-Indigenous forms of place making in Stó:lō territory. I draw on the works and theory of a number of specific authors to enrich my more particular analysis of Coast Salish and settler place making in The’wá:li’s territory, as it is represented in the digital map. Applying theory from across the disciplines, this section explores what Naxaxalhts’i’s statement might mean in the context of The’wá:li’s contested and powerful environment. I also explore how non-Indigenous peoples in the Fraser Valley have also made the claim that “this is our land,” and the remarkably complex ways in which such conflicting claims have interacted and played out on the ground, in The’wá:li’s environment.

Scholars of place argue that humans give places meaning as they inhabit, pass through, build upon, and talk about them.61 Trying to define the complicated phenomenon of place, philosopher Edward Casey writes that “rather than being one definite sort of thing a given place takes on the qualities of its occupants, reflecting these qualities in its own constitution and description and expressing them in its occurrence as an event...Places not only are,” he writes, “they happen.”62 “Person and place pour into each other,” Clifford Geertz writes.63 Such anthropologists as Keith Basso, Stephen Feld, Margaret Rodman and others have written on what Geertz calls “the inseparability of the lives various peoples live and the settings in which they live them.”64 Indeed, these scholars argue that humans and places co-exist in a mutually-constitutive relationship. Any place, as Erin Gibson writes of the Cariboo Wagon Road, “is the sum of the relationships that make it up - the actions and interactions
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of the human and non-human world.”

These complex relationships define meaning and identity for people and their places. Basso writes that “when places are actively sensed, the physical landscape becomes wedded to the landscape of the mind, to the roving imagination.” As a result of this “active sensing,” people give sense and meaning to their places, and their places in turn give meaning to them. The imaginative process of making places happen, as people and environments interact, is called place making. On the one hand, human beings “constitute their surroundings and invest them with value and significance.” Simultaneously, the places being invested with meaning actively contribute to human beings’ senses of self. Places shape people’s lives. Historian William Turkel writes that, by the “constant interpretation” of space, Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike “make sense of the past, the world and their place in it and of their relationships to one another.” Recognizing, along with these scholars, that “places produce meaning and that meaning can be grounded in place,” The’wá:lí Digital Map traces and interprets the relationships that have defined places and people in the The’wá:lí environment for generations.

Other scholars of space and place emphasize that place can be a controversial thing. Investing places with meaning often means investing specific people with power. “There is no idea quite so bewildering as the idea of home, nor one that causes as many conflicts,” Ted Chamberlin writes. Where numerous peoples conceive of a single place in multiple ways, voices (and thus claims to places) often conflict. This makes place, as Chamberlin describes it, “a nest of contradictions.” Some space and place theorists discuss the power of place making to negotiate power relationships with and within
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environments and suggest that politics of social or cultural difference are fundamentally tied to the production of places. Edward Said observed in 1979 that “when it came to who owned the land, who had the right to settle and work on it, who kept it going, who won it back and who now plans its future – these issues were reflected, contested, and even for a time decided in narrative.” The “narrative” to which he refers is comprised of the individual forms of place making that define people and places. Narratives of place often operate as claims to place, and thus both define and stratify people.

Where one group’s meaning for a contested place wins out over another, that group may have the power to control and determine the future of that place. In the case of The’wá:lí, conflicting stories have invested places with multiple meanings and these have often led to uneven power dynamics on the land and contested access rights. While the most obvious example of this is in this area’s history of colonial place making and the erasure of Indigenous peoples from much of the Fraser Valley, other conflicts over places have existed. Whereas, for example, a number of The’wá:lí people emphasize the community’s mixed Nooksack and Tsel’xweyéqw origins, oral histories point to a time when these two distinct communities who did not always live harmoniously and competed over access to resources in the area. When or how the Tsel’xweyéqw claim gained hegemony is unclear, but ultimately the Nooksack residents either amalgamated or disappeared. Today, The’wá:lí people continue to stress the importance of remembering their Nooksack ancestry, while some at the same time self-identify as Tsel’xweyéqw people moreso than as Stó:lô people. Ultimately, the meanings certain people have given to places in this environment, and the claims they have made to them, have often conflicted and overlapped.
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Further, in this mapping project, I view place as both universal and fundamental to human experience, but also as culturally specific and historically contingent. In other words, where all human beings on earth have places and engage in place making, the way they do so, and the nature of those places, can differ across cultural, social, socioeconomic, geographic, temporal, generational and historical boundaries. As Clifford Geertz writes, place is the “most fundamental form of embodied experience,” and is also “pervasive in its very particularity.”\(^{75}\) Anthropologist Margaret Rodman also contends that places “are politicized, culturally relative, historically specific, local and multiple constructions.”\(^{76}\) On the one hand, applying more general place-making theory from across disciplines to the local case of The’wá:lí is important for thinking about more common means of place making, like storytelling. At the same time, it is also necessary to understand the intensely local ways in which people from The’wá:lí have given meaning to their environments, and how places in this environment have shifted over its particular history of interactions.

**Coast Salish Place Making**

A number of scholars of Coast Salish histories, places, languages and cultures have discussed in detail some of the key elements of Xwélmexw place making. These have also become apparent to me over the course of the The’wá:lí mapping research. One of the most common conclusions these scholars make is that in order to understand the languages, histories and social organizations of the Indigenous peoples of the Northwest Coast, it is essential to pay critical attention to places and their stories.

Without a doubt, this is the case in Stó:lō territory. “Coast Salish people,” writes Brian Thom, “have profound attachments to their home places which are foundational to their social organization and ontological orientation. These places...are richly imbued with meaning, and are sites of personal and community identity. They are encountered and experienced by the people who dwell in them, and are
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the centres for the experience of relationships with others and with the land itself.” Similarly, Keith Carlson contends that “to understand Stó:lō culture and history, one must appreciate the relationships that built them.” He writes that “the Stó:lō have developed relationships with the land water and air.” These profound attachments are connected with place-names, bound up in relationships and tied together through story.

The The’wá:lí mapping project gives special place to original place-names, and their meanings and power, in The’wá:lí territory. It also discusses the histories of how more commonly-known names have replaced them in common discourse. Xwélmexw knowledge-holder Naxaxalhts’i writes that “through the place names...each place talks about different things that are out there in our land, in our world.” Places in the Xwélmexw world are embedded with stories that define them and explain their importance to Xwélmexw peoples. In many cases these stories are attached to traditional place-names. The Halq’eméylem name for what is known by most people as Cultus Lake, for example, is Swí:lhcha. This word literally translates, according to Brent Galloway, to “swirling water” and “warn.” The two words together may refer to several things: oral sources suggest that Swí:lhcha contains underwater metaphysical portals, through which powerful shxwlá:m travelled to distant places, and in which other careless swimmers have drowned. It may also refer to the origin story of the lake (and of nearby The’wá:lì), in which a young man from a village that once existed in the empty basin of the lake warned his neighbours about a forthcoming disaster, and when they refused to listen, a devastating flood from Vedder Mountain destroyed the entire village except the young man and his family. He settled beside the newly-formed lake, and his settlement became The’wá:lì. In this case, important stories setting the
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lake apart as a powerful, dangerous and deeply significant place also define it as the starting point of contemporary The’wá:l’s collective identity. Thus, as Naxaxalhts’i writes, paying attention to Xwélmxew stories and Halq’eméylem place-names can help us to better understand the specific importance of places to Xwélmxew peoples.  

This story sheds light on another important feature of Xwélmxew place making, which is that the physical world can also be unpredictable and dangerous. Despite the transformers’ work making the world “right” long ago, environments still have the capacity to change and act on human lives – sometimes in devastating and traumatic ways. The flood that created Swílhcha and killed off an entire village, for example, is understood as the kind of event that should be expected from the unpredictable and dangerous environment. These kinds of disaster stories exist throughout S’ólh Téméxw (including disaster stories explaining the origins of Semá:th Lake and Chilliwack Lake). As ethnohistorian Carlson writes, the stories are definitive of Stó:lō collective identities. They also are central to Xwélmxew ways of knowing place. Listening to stories, attending to the wisdom of knowledge-holders (like the young man who warned his family) and paying attention to protocol are essential to surviving in a sometimes destructive and unpredictable world. Transformations and change – this very unpredictability – are, in Xwélmxew ways of knowing place, a predictable part of the physical world. Change is expected, and “‘things happen,’” writes Keith Carlson, “according to natural rhythms.”  

Relatedly, Crisca Bierwert observes that the physical world is alive and active, and that Stó:lō place-worlds are therefore made up of relationships between people and living world. Human beings are not isolated agents in a passive physical environment. Rather, according to Coast Salish epistemologies, all social life involves, “wholly and unequivocally,” relationships to “other sacred beings that have agency in and of themselves...including features of the land itself.” 
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world are like containers, according to Bierwert (drawing on Edward Casey’s work). They are “replete with animated beings, replete with signs,” and replete with interactions.  

Rena Point-Bolton, for example, describes water as a kind of container, filled with meaning and shaped by interactions. “Water is a powerful medicine among our people,” she writes. It is a source of power for shxwlá:m and sxwóyxwey people, who “take power from the world around them and they put it into the water...this way we share the power and the energy that flows from the ancestors.” Many elements of the The’wá:lí map reflect how Xwélmexw place making centres on reciprocal relationships among humans, the physical environment and the non-human sentient beings who make up the world of S’ólh Téméxw. The many meanings contained in Swí:lhcha suggest, too, that this landmark itself is one of the kinds of containers of which Bierwert writes.

Senses of place in the The’wá:lí environment are also informed by networks of human relationships among Xwélmexw communities and families. In an article titled “The Paradox of Boundaries,” Brian Thom discusses issues associated with identifying single, isolated and bounded “sites” or land-masses as the “territory” of a single community. The sometimes arbitrary boundary lines drawn on government maps (identifying, for example, reserves, “traditional territory” lines, or even nation-states) “offend a kin- and ancestor-centred sense of place.” They tend to represent more Euro-Canadian concepts of place and property. To better understand Coast Salish ways of knowing place, he argues, we must also attend to the “complexly networked social groups” of Coast Salish peoples “fluidly activating,” in part through story, “their community and kin connections to a broad land-base within their wide network of kin.” Though it does indeed contain some lines and boundaries (such as those around the edges of I.R.#14) The’wá:lí territory needs to be imagined as a place of movement and of
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multiple lines and networks of affiliation. The map tries to reflect the kin-based and regional senses of place that connect the community across a much broader expanse of land and water than what is considered traditional to Thew’á:lí. The community identifies as hybrid. Ancient trail systems have historically connected it to Semá:th and Nooksack (across the U.S. border), who are both represented on the map as important parts of The’wá:lí identities. Furthermore, many The’wá:lí people identify not just as Stó:lō but as Tsel’xwéyqw, a tribal affiliation whose places stretch as far east as Chilliwack Lake and as far west as Semá:th. This community’s many kinship connections make representing a much broader range of places in the map (rather than just the lands within the current or the 1864 reserve boundaries) critical. The’wá:lí has never been an isolated place with a singular, bounded sense of identity. Rather, this community and its many places must be understood, as Thom puts it, “as living parts of a shifting kaleidoscope of kinship-based senses of place.”

88

Storytelling as Place Making

Stories and storytelling are critical components of this map. Scholarship on storytelling suggests that through storying, Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples alike make sense of their physical environments, their pasts, and their places in them. Stories define senses of and attachments to place, identify rights of access and boundaries of exclusion (creating the boundaries of “us” and “them”), and make and justify people’s claims to particular places. The’wá:lí scholar Jo-Ann Archibald (the sister of Gracie Kelly), for example, writes that storytelling is a legitimate and important form of Stó:lō knowledge-making and educating that should be taken seriously in academic contexts.89 She argues that storywork, the work of Elders educating through Indigenous storytelling, combines sharing traditional,
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ecological and cultural knowledge with values such as respect and responsibility. And indeed, as Naxaxalhts’i’s 2007 work suggests, Xwélmexw knowledge about places goes hand-in-hand with teachings about protocol and how to abide in the land. Ahousaht legal scholar Johnny Mack’s work also suggests that Indigenous peoples have told stories about places to assert their claims to lands in response to colonial change. He and Nuu-Chah Nulth Elder Wickaninnish suggest that focusing on traditional stories about place, and on the particular and varied moments of their expression, can help people to distance themselves from, and critically analyze, what Mack sees as the fundamentally neoliberal framework of modern-day treaty making. Further, Mack argues that Indigenous peoples have told stories about places to assert their claims to lands in response to colonial change. Julie Cruikshank also writes that Indigenous oral stories, including those about places, adapt in relation to historical change, perpetuating social ties to lands from which storytellers have perhaps been dispossessed, while also making sense of such historical processes of change and loss. She calls this the social life of stories.

Naxaxalhts’i discusses stories as central to Stó:lō identities and epistemologies, and as expressions of Stó:lō rights to traditional places. Knowing (and telling) stories, writes Naxaxalhts’i:

establishes a relationship with [a] resource [such as fish, grounds or cedar trees] as well as a spiritual connection ... all our resources that we take care of because we are connected to them. We take care of our land because we’re connected to the land ... and then you start understanding how important it is for us to become part of where we came from again.

That “again” at the end of Naxaxalhts’i’s statement suggests a previous severing of an original connection, to what he calls the places “where we came from.” Stories, to Naxaxalhts’i, are evidence of a long-abiding and unceded claim to places and resources that have been cut off through a history of
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colonialism. Places and resources are “something that’s ours and can’t be touched by anyone else...we have to take care of it. Because nobody else can. We have to take care of it. It’s ours.” Remembering and telling stories, and making them known, is to Naxaxalhts’i deliberately political and potentially powerful.

But storytelling, with all its attendant power, is not exclusively a Xwélmexw or Indigenous way of making place. While stories about place may vary from person to person, from era to era, or from one cultural tradition to another, the act of storytelling is essentially human, rather than particular to any one group of people. The meaning and form that place-making stories may have or take, and its consequences, also may differ from one context to another. Laura Cameron writes about how listening to stories can shed light on how “shifting, ‘messy’” places are “shaped and encountered by living, experiencing bodies.” As various non-Indigenous groups and individuals entered the The’wá:lí and larger S’ólh Téméxw environment, they have brought with them different kinds of place-making stories that have changed the way the landscape and waterscape have been perceived. These more recently introduced stories also have shaped how the environment is used, and defined who has had the power to claim control over them.

Several notable historians have interrogated the discursive tools by which colonial (usually Euro-Canadian, male) place in Canada has been narrated – often to distinguish it from Indigenous (and other “different” types of) place. Tracing divergent and changing “voices of colonialism” in nineteenth-century B.C., for example, Cole Harris discusses how colonial change manifested locally in Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people’s relationships to land and each other. He argues that in places such as British Columbia, colonizing administrations have exerted power over Indigenous peoples and their lands.
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through “an enveloping array of technologies, assumptions and channels” such as maps.\(^96\) This "enveloping array" has undergirded, and been powered by, specific kinds of place making often focused on traditional liberal notions of property, ownership and labour. Such “Western models of property and ownership,” writes Susan Roy, often “define a bounded group of peoples” by associating them with “use” of a specific piece of land.\(^97\) Claiming, further, that non-Indigenous places were not being “adequately used” (i.e. resources not being adequately extracted and Euro-Canadian forms of agricultural activity not in use), non-Indigenous stories of place have often positioned settler claims to place as more legitimate, leading to histories of disposessions and reserve reductions. Non-Indigenous forms of place-making stories in The’wá:lí’s territory have taken physical form in fence lines, property maps and deeds, reserve boundaries and even in a model frontier village in the 1960s at Cultus Lake. These kinds of activities and place-making stories “served to sever” living Aboriginal peoples “not only from their territorial lands but also from their cultural and historical heritage” and have become central to the legitimacy of Indigenous dispossession and settler appropriation.\(^98\)

Anthropologist Jeff Oliver argues that scholars focused on settler-colonial stories of place must also attend to the variations and divergences within and among colonial place-making stories as well. He challenges the common “tendency to unintentionally set up settlers as a monolithic, objectified category, in the face of resistant indigenous voices.”\(^99\) Just as there are and have always been conflicted senses and claims to place among The’wá:lí and other Xwélmexw peoples, so too have various groups sometimes homogenously labeled “colonial” the meanings of important places in The’wá:lí’s territory. Oliver argues in particular that pioneer stories of place in the Fraser Valley set apart one settler form of place making not just from Indigenous peoples, but from another form of settler place making. Pioneer
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narratives in the Fraser Valley were responses to growing urbanism and what was seen as excessive resource extraction. Pioneer stories and the marks on the land that reflected them (roads, signs, fences, old buildings and place-names) also set apart “founding fathers,” “first families,” and those of higher social classes among settlers. They counteracted competing settler narratives that focused on modernization and urban-industrial development by claiming pioneer places as symbols of a bygone, simpler time.100 As reflected in the 1960s Cultus Lake frontier village or in the making of parks and park boards to protect the land and Cultus Lake from excessive resource development, contradiction and difference has always existed in settler place-making stories as well. “The significance of land,” Oliver writes, “cannot be reduced to one thing or another.”101

Interdisciplinarity, Ethnohistory

I apply a mixed methodology to my analysis of place making in this project to suggest, along with Jeff Oliver, that no environment with the place making that has produced it can “be reduced to one thing or another.”102 The mixed, creative and often changing approaches of ethnohistorians are central to understanding stories the The’wá:lí Mapping Project. Scholars of this hybrid discipline primarily combine the research methods of historians and ethnographers. In the digital map, I try to bring together methods used by colonial historians to deconstruct and historicize stories while also being guided by the cultural approaches of anthropologists and ethnographers of Indigenous place whose primary focus is on the cultural structures that inform Indigenous ways of knowing place. While anthropological and historical studies of Indigenous and colonizer place making on their own may be similar in some ways, their outcomes often differ substantially. Explicitly or not, as Oliver argues, such studies often overlook diversity within homogenized “types,” and emphasize and reify the differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous place making. Discussions of the cross- and intra- cultural
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dialogues of place making that make physical environments contested places are limited. A bridging of disciplinary approaches may help fill this gap. Marshall Sahlins wrote in 2002 that “if anthropology was for too long the study of ‘historyless peoples,’ history for even longer was studying ‘cultureless peoples.’” In response, ethnohistorians for decades have been suggesting the “combination of the oral history, cultural focus, and fieldwork of the ethnographer with the archival research and temporal context of the historian” to deal with this issue. The The’wá:lí Map combines research approaches and philosophies from many disciplines, especially history and ethnography, to construct a complicated and colourful picture of The’wá:lí’s places, and their value and history.

Ted Chamberlin asserts that we need to start listening to and thinking about stories across what we often take for granted as impermeable boundaries between “us” and “them.” Doing so is an important part of this project’s approach. Former Lt.-Governor and Xwélmexw knowledge-holder Steven Point writes in his preface to the Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas that “we have both paid too much attention to the differences between us.” Point was writing more about a general tendency among Canadians to “pay too much attention to the differences” between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, communities, experiences and cultures. While acknowledging and talking about differences is essential to understanding one another, seeing difference as fundamentally human (that is, seeing difference as sameness), Point suggests, is critical to fostering empathy among peoples. His statement
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is relevant specifically to this project, too. Scholars have too often paid attention to differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous senses of place in our studies. We have also too often focused on disciplinary differences, when working together can have the potential to lead to greater empathy. Taking on the ethnohistorical challenge, this project encourages viewers and readers to think about storytelling about place as a universal (and not culturally-owned) activity that also has particular articulations producing specific outcomes in local places. Carlson, Lutz and Schaepe contend that we must “treat our western historical sources, and by implication our own inscriptions, as stories.” This may help, according to Hoxie, to “bridge the differences between peoples.” I see the The’wá:lí Mapping Project fitting into a growing conversation about the possibilities and the complexities of ethnohistory. By creating dialogue among disciplinary approaches and between ostensibly oppositional ways of place making, this map will hopefully be able to speak across gaps of difference.

**Counter-mapping**

Another disciplinary gap across which this project stretches is the gap between geography and the humanities. In 2002, ethnohistorian James Carson wrote, “for the most part, scholars have failed to incorporate geography into the interdisciplinary canon of ethnohistory. At the same time, geographers writing on native history have not fully integrated the ethnohistorical method into their own work.” The The’wá:lí Mapping Project explicitly responds to what Carson calls a “failure” to see past disciplinary boundary lines by attending to and applying theory and method from ethnohistory and geography, with a particular focus on counter mapping. It takes a digital cartographic format to critically question colonial uses and representations of The’wá:lí places, while also seeking to represent their varied meanings to the people who live there, and the histories that have changed those meanings.
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Critical cartographers such as J.B. Harley and Denis Wood argue that maps have and make power. Wood writes, “maps selectively link places in the world...to other kinds of things... for the purpose of underwriting the reproduction (or the contestation) of the social relations of power.”\textsuperscript{111} He, among others, argues that maps are by no mean reproductions of things in the world as they actually are. They are more reflective, rather, of the knowledge-systems and political motives of their makers. Historically, maps have been used to construct states and restrict potential challenges to them.\textsuperscript{112} Locating Indigenous peoples “within the Western grid of intelligibility” also “securely positions them as unequivocal citizens...of modern nation-states” or as subjects to colonial power structures, according to Anna Willow.\textsuperscript{113} Maps have been an important tool for the “resettlement, relocation and reserves” that have constricted Indigenous lives “under both external and internal colonial rule.”\textsuperscript{114} In this way, maps have been used to shift The’wá:lil people’s relationships with their places to create new boundaries of place, largely to the benefit of settler populations.

And yet, scholars and Indigenous communities have recently begun to harness the power of maps to respond to colonial change and reassert Indigenous claims to colonized places. Numerous geographers and anthropologists engaged in what is called counter-mapping discuss the potentials and problems of decolonizing the map in this way.\textsuperscript{115} Geographers define counter-mapping as “using geographical techniques to augment awareness of unique relationships to inhabited landscapes, get territorial claims recognized by dominant settler societies, and challenge disadvantageous political circumstances.”\textsuperscript{116} Counter-mapping initiatives have the potential to challenge power imbalances by
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reclaiming and constructing maps in new ways, to better historicize, Indigenize and thus decolonize places. Among the most striking and successful of these projects (and also one of the most obviously relevant to my own mapping project) is the *Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, edited by Keith Carlson and produced in collaboration with Naxaxalhts’ī and archaeologist Dave Schaepe, numerous Stó:lō community members and Elders, students of the ethnohistory field school and a multidisciplinary host of other scholars.¹¹⁷ The volume consists of a compelling mix of large atlas plates combining geographic, historical and ethnographic perspectives on the Stó:lō world; archaeological and historical timelines; striking graphics that include historical and contemporary photographs and art; and text that is equally academic and approachable. The approach of this atlas, which reimagines maps as media through which to listen to and think about Stó:lō histories, identities and place making, is central to the The’wá:lí Mapping Project. Other relevant counter-mapping initiatives in North and South America, including a storied places map in Stz’uminus (Vancouver Island) territory and a mapping project that takes into account Mapuche dreaming as a source of geographic information, provide important examples that inspire the The’wá:lí Mapping Project.¹¹⁸

Some scholars warn about potential pitfalls and apparent contradictions of using maps to reclaim and decolonize. Wainwright and Willow argue that using maps to claim places and sovereignty within a Western legal framework is restrictive and contradictory. Maps create boundaries. They freeze Indigenous land use and relationships in time and space. When used in the courts, for example, they do not and cannot account for changes to land use patterns, historically-situated knowledge, and the kinds of stories and songs that make environments significant to Indigenous peoples, beyond their economic value. Wood suggests that:

no matter the backward leaning efforts to make maps that are authentically Indigenous, the results have to be able to play in state court systems and therefore have to look, feel, and taste like state-sponsored maps...Indigenous mappers find that in the end they have to locate themselves on the invader’s map anyway, for, to say it again, it’s only in the invader’s court that their land claim can be heard where, win or lose, their mere presence validates the state’s claims to authority.”

Counter-mapping, writes Wood, is rooted in practices and forms that are, by their very nature, colonial. Trapped in these contradictions, Wood argues, counter-mapping can do little to overturn state hegemony.

Historian Julianna Barr’s work, I think, provides the grounds for an important challenge to Wood’s criticisms of cooptation in Indigenous counter-mapping. Wood’s argument that Indigenous mapping uses an essentially colonial system of cartography in order to challenge that very system (and therefore necessarily remains restricted by the power structures inherent to that colonial system) would suggest that the act of mapping places is an essentially non-Indigenous activity. However, Barr’s work suggests that Indigenous peoples have always been “mapping” their territories. Admittedly, elements of Western cartography (drawing lines and polygons or orienting a map northward) are part of socially-encoded and culturally-specific forms of place making which Indigenous peoples may not have used before contact. Nonetheless, Barr argues that when non-Indigenous explorers entered the scene, “North America was a political and economic landscape already mapped and surveyed.” Furthermore, Indigenous guides often “impressed them with expansive knowledge of the land, explaining the entire route, giving road markers for which to look, and warning of potential dangers.” Mapping is not just something that happens on paper. She argues that naming, charting movement through, and storying particular places in the land was part of the process of mapping and defining it. Doing so has long stratified different groups of peoples and made sense of conflicted claims to place.
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The The‘wá:lı́ Digital Map seeks to represent the uniquely Xwélmexw ways in which Stó:lō place-making knowledge has already been georeferenced, or mapped, and the world of S’ólh Témexw already mapped, through, for example, oral storytelling and place-naming. Like contemporary, “Western” maps, oral forms of mapping in the The‘wá:lı́ environment have drawn and maintained connections among communities (such as Nooksack, Semá:th and The‘wá:lı́) and also created and upheld borders among peoples. Indeed, in 1965, Elder Bob Joe explained to Imbert Orchard that “long, long before the white race came into this country, the tribes at that time had their own boundaries... one tribe here, another tribe there.”

The longstanding tension between the Nooksack and Ts‘elxwéyeqw communities living near Swí:lhch’a both before and after the Soowahlie Reserve was commissioned is just one example. The‘wá:lı́ Elder Amy Cooper explained to Oliver Wells that the animosity between these two claimants to the land near Swí:lhch’a led to boundary-making in this territory: “there was a line there that they couldn’t cross; and these people never talked to them,” she said.

Indigenous peoples’ ways of knowing and mapping places have always combined “geography with power.”

So, while I do agree with Wood that some tensions exist between counter-mapping and the goals of decolonization, I am unsatisfied with his conclusion that Indigenous counter-mapping initiatives are necessarily cooptive and reactionary. Certainly, many Indigenous mapping projects are framed within culturally-specific sets of cartographic rules and shapes that have historically empowered and justified colonizers in their dispossession of Indigenous peoples. Yet, the The‘wá:lı́ Mapping Project and other such projects take those very tools and turn them against the status quo. I am inclined to think that there is power in using maps to express the persistence of Indigenous senses of and attachments to colonized places. Even (or perhaps especially) through “Western” media such as maps, we should be
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straining to challenge the taken-for-granted lines that have erased Indigenous peoples and place-based knowledge from the picture. Counter-mapping projects like the The’wá:lí project suggest that the most powerful challenges to neo-colonial regimes need not only take shape on higher political or legal ground. In a format that will be accessible to youth, Elders, and Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples alike, this counter-mapping project represents an effort to educate and decolonize from the ground up.

Tad McIlwraith and Raymond Cormier, as well as Brian Thom, make other criticisms of Traditional Use Study mapping projects. They have argued that much of what is called counter-mapping (especially that which is used in courts, to negotiate with settler governments or industry) generally represents Indigenous places as set and immovable points or polygons with distinct boundaries focused on occupancy and use. Doing so, however, may not “always represent Indigenous uses of an area either accurately or completely.”\textsuperscript{125} For one thing, the authors argue, Indigenous hunting activities and forestry “are not reducible to polygons on a map.”\textsuperscript{126} Traditional use studies focused on singular, static sites of significance can minimize and overlook the “cultural value of the space between locations.”\textsuperscript{127} Brian Thom has also challenged the Western liberal underpinnings of land-claims maps that designate a particular polygon on a map as “belonging to” a singular First Nation. In the “Paradox of Boundaries,” Thom criticizes some cartography that sets boundaries around specific places and associates them exclusively with singular groups (fitting them into a traditional Western, property-ownership framework). Such an approach ignores more “regional senses of territory and identity” that are characteristic of Coast Salish place-worlds.\textsuperscript{128} He calls for an Indigenous cartography that recognizes the “importance of complexly networked social groups enmeshed in locally rich property relations.”\textsuperscript{129}
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The The’wá:lí mapping project responds to McIlwraith’s and Thom’s concerns by explicitly representing The’wá:lí space as broadly interpreted, widely connected, fluid and changing and networked through story and kin. Swí:lhcha (Cultus Lake) as a significant The’wá:lí site, for example, cannot be understood in isolation from its surrounding places. For this reason, the map explicitly connects it to other landmarks and waterways of significance by tracing stories about kinship and migration. The map is not just a set of boundaries marking isolated and static points on a map. What McIlwraith and Cormier call the “spaces in between” are not neutral, passive or uninterpreted, but form an important part of the The’wá:lí Map. One way of doing so is by depicting how kinship networks, physical trails and other modes of transport like metaphysical tunnels (such as in Swí:lhcha) overlay those “blank spaces,” to connect points and polygons that represent particular sites. Those “spaces in between” are embedded with meaning because the community has used them for generations to enable kinship and trading networks that feed into widely connected senses of place that stretch beyond single, isolated points and boundaries on a map.

Depicting and interpreting places and their fundamental entanglement with everyday life, and their connections to other places, this map is an example of what Bodenhamer, Harris and Corrigan call a “deep map.” It is a “multimedia and multilayered,” “visual, time based, and structurally open” depiction of a variety of places and their importance to the identities and histories of the people living in them. It (reflexively and interactively, rather than authoritatively) engages, and asks users to engage with the stories, “personalities, emotions, values, and poetics, the visible and invisible aspects” of the expanse of territory that members of The’wá:lí community and their relatives have identified as significant.130

**Momiyelhtel: Learning Together**

**The The’wá:lí Community Mapping Project**

The following section includes my reflections on the relationships and collaborative partnerships that have made this project possible, from the time of the 2013 field school to the present. I also discuss here some of the problems we have come across throughout the process. Amidst the specific land claim in which the community is involved, Otis Jasper and Larry Commodore first proposed the project in 2013, suggesting that a map reflecting the community’s connection to their original land base, and showing its history of colonial change, could be a powerful tool for The’wá:lí. They wanted a database of both oral and archival source material that could tell a story about the pre-reserve The’wá:lí environment, the lands contained within the 1864 Douglas Reserve boundaries, and the current reserve. This material could then be indexed and interpreted, and built into a digital, layered GIS map of the environment. The plan was to make the map accessible to community members, and, in a more limited form, to the public. Chief Brenda Wallace endorsed the project as meaningful for future community development planning and cultural education programs.

Jasper and Commodore suggested that the map should be one of the research projects assigned to students attending the 2013 Ethnohistory Field School Among the Stó:lō. This is a graduate-level field course that takes Masters and PhD students from the Universities of Saskatchewan and Victoria into S’ólh Téméxw for a month-long, intensive learning experience. It is a unique opportunity for students to learn about a rich and particular part of western Canada’s Indigenous and colonial histories on the ground – in the places where they actually happened. Students live the first week of that month with a Stó:lō homestay family, and during that time are often invited to share in family activities like sporting events, fishing trips and cultural events. For the last three weeks, the students live together communally in a traditional-style longhouse located at the Stó:lō Nation headquarters in Sardis, B.C. Here, they work through relationships not only with the First Nations peoples who graciously host them,
but also with each other. Students are required to live cooperatively and communally. To fulfill coursework, students attend traditional university-style seminars every day for the first week and a half, where they respond to readings and teachings on ethnographic, historical and ethnohistorical research methods, colonialism, and Stó:lō histories, places and cultures. They are also each assigned an ethnohistorical research paper topic identified and designed by Stó:lō communities. The paper has to be reworked with accessible language and in a more public format (such as an article for a local First Nation newsletter) that is meaningful to the larger community. The The’wá:lí Community Mapping Project began as one of these field school projects, assigned to me and two other students. Over the course of May 2013, Anne Janhunen, Dallas Posavad and I, with the help of numerous participants from The’wá:lí community and band council, staff from Stó:lō Nation and university advisors, worked out a course of action to build the map.

We spent the first two weeks discussing what the map could be, and what it might contain, with experts on The’wá:lí territory. These meetings shed light on the range and diversity of both Xwélmexw and Xwélitem interpretations of The’wá:lí place, and how these have changed over time. We met first with former The’wá:lí council member and cultural educator Gracie Kelly on 16 May 2013. Gracie immediately expressed interest and enthusiasm for the project and identified herself as someone who would be closely involved throughout. Over the course of those first hours she shared with us, we compiled a list of about two dozen topics or sites of interest that Gracie felt it would be important to

---
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include in the map. She expressed special interest in traditional plants and their Xwélmexw uses and in changes to the reserve’s size over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with a focus on “what was ours traditionally,” as she put it. She wanted to know more about the environmental impacts of the gravel extraction sites on reserve and the damage caused by the creation of a quarry on reserve. Gracie also emphasized the importance of unique species such as the pygmy sculpin and other indigenous animals like beavers, salmon and deer. She provided us with contact information for a list of community members whom she knew to be experts on The’wá:lí and Xwélmexw lands and history. In that initial meeting, we quickly became aware of just how diverse and broad the range of material for the map was going to be, and how significant so many places on and off reserve are for many people from The’wá:lí (and thus how seriously some members of the community might take this project).

A few days after our meeting with Gracie, we scheduled visits with Chief Brenda Wallace and spent time with former chief Otis Jasper to learn about their visions for the map. The chief was receptive to the idea of the map and emphasized that speaking with Elders would be the most important step to take for the project. Our meeting with Otis Jasper helped provide more of an interpretive framework for some of the sites that would be represented on the map rather than a list of points of interest. He posed some deeper analytical questions that I have since tried to address in some of the map’s interpretive panels. One thing that was important to him, like Gracie, was the history of reserve reductions. Otis emphasized the historical importance of particular places off reserve (such as what is now called Cultus Lake) to the community of The’wá:lí and the arbitrariness of the boundaries of the square-shaped 1879 reserve, which separated the community from these places. His questions are what prompted the interpretation included in some of the map features located under the “Colonial Changes” tab. He also suggested that this map should make a point of representing connections between The’wá:lí and other Coast Salish communities, including Nooksack and Tzcheactan. Especially important to Otis were
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The’wá:lí’s Tsel’xwéyéqw origins. He explained that, though The’wá:lí people identify as Stó:lō, he felt that a more traditional way of self-identifying for this community was as Tsel’xwéyéqw. Studying and interpreting these connections, he suggested, challenges the idea that The’wá:lí’s identity is bounded and isolated, as suggested by imposed reserve borders. Again, Otis’ concerns have informed some of the questions guiding the research for this map. The categories titled “Community Origins” and “Community Connections” both represent Otis’ and other The’wá:lí people’s desires to give voice to “community and kin connections to a broad land-base within their wide network of kin.”

Finally, Otis thought it was important that we emphasize some of the things that make The’wá:lí a unique place and community. He said that, though the community is broadly connected through story and kinship, it also takes pride in its uniqueness and seclusion. Unlike some of the more urban Stó:lō reserves, he explained, much of The’wá:lí is “undeveloped.” “When you go outside, you can see the stars at night still,” he said, and children can play on the street or cross without fear of too much danger from traffic. “We don’t want to look like Tzcheachten,” he explained, pointing to a nearby reserve that has leased CP lands to commercial and residential developers. The conversation on the whole left us with some important questions about The’wá:lí’s collective identity, its interconnectedness and its relationships to important places off reserve. Otis’ questions have guided research (both in the archives and in interviews) and provided a framework for cataloguing and interpreting the material we’ve collected.

We also spent a little time with staff from Stó:lō Nation, including archaeologist and GIS specialist Cara Brendzy, archivist Tia Halsted and archaeologist David Schaepe, who helped us formulate a plan of action, suggested further questions and directed us to archival collections and sources and to specific people who might be willing to share knowledge to help build the map. Like a number of other participants, Cara expressed a particular concern about traditional use maps that carelessly made
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privileged, sacred or private place-knowledge (Sxwōxwiyám stories, for example) public, and emphasized that there needed to be a process in place that helped us divide these types of memories, stories or knowledge from the things that could safely be made public. She provided us with digital GIS images of large basemaps of Soowahlie Reserve (some including roads, CP lots and reserve boundaries, and some with only waterways marked), the larger Chilliwack Area, the Chilliwack River Valley and S’ólh Téméxw. Cara, Tia and our advisors also all felt that speakers needed to be clearly identified and credited wherever their words appeared in the map, so that it was always clear whose knowledge was being shared.136

Following these initial meetings, we tried to make a plan for processing and interpreting the material. Our original project prospectus read:

Our heritage/community mapping project proposes to adopt a tripartite approach, focusing on mapping of historical land use following the Douglas era reserve reduction of the Soowahlie reserve, mapping of important sites related to transformer stories that are connected to Soowahlie (such as Blowfly Rock, for example), as well as mapping of contemporary areas that are of significance and importance to community members. The first phase of the project will involve analysing archival documents to try determine how land use patterns have changed since the mid-nineteenth century as well as mapping where transformer sites are located. Following this preliminary work, we propose to have an “open house day” on the reserve and set out base maps where community members could map out certain areas of the reserve that are of importance to them.

As with any research project, of course, neat and well-ordered plans do not fit the diverse, sometimes messy, and often complicated results of talking to living people, or letting the sources they’ve left behind speak. As will be discussed below, the “tripartite” categorization system (colonial changes, storied or Sxwōxwiyám places, and places of contemporary significance) was far too restrictive and simplistic to capture the multiple and changing meanings of different places in the The’wá:lí environment. We quickly found this to be true as soon as people started drawing on maps. Nonetheless, we started with a small number of broad categories of interest that came out of the conversations we
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had with Gracie Kelly, Otis Jasper, our academic advisors and the staff at the SRRMC. These at least helped guide us through what we realized could potentially be an immense terrain of knowledge, memories, stories and perspectives about the The’wá:lí environment and how it has changed.

Further meetings with Band members introduced more questions and concerns. We took our initial plan and presented it to band council at a meeting at Spath Lalem, the community’s band hall, on 22 May 2013. Brenda Wallace gave us a brief introduction before we gave a presentation to Gracie Kelly, her mother Marge and sister Judith, council members Marcie and Latosia Commodore and Tara Kelly, and Nancy Murphy, an advisor from Seabird First Nation. We presented ideas for the map and what could be included in it, along with the categories under which these features might fall. Most of the women at the meeting expressed interest in the project and made suggestions for its shape. Everyone expressed interest in learning the historical processes that transformed lands near Cultus Lake from The’wá:lí territory into Cultus Lake community and park lands. Marcie and Latosia Commodore emphasized the importance of learning about places where youth gather and play, and wanted to know if they had changed over time. This conversation (and later conversations with these two women) was the impetus for the material included in the “Recreation” category. Others mentioned Swílhcha’s reputation as a dangerous and off-limits place because it is a stl’áleqem site and is also bottomless. During this meeting was also one of the first times we heard about relationships between The’wá:lí and the Department of National Defence, and about the community’s agricultural past.

Aside from posing more questions and suggesting points of interest, some people at this meeting expressed concerns about privacy and confidentiality. Nancy Murphy was especially adamant that anyone involved in the project attend to protocol and ensure that private or privileged information be safeguarded from the public. She also felt that the software used to build the map should be accessible and usable to the community (since many Traditional Use GIS studies use costly software that also requires expensive and time-consuming training). Furthermore, emphasizing that The’wá:lí is not a
Stó:lō Nation band (The’wá:lí is rather a member of the Stó:lō Tribal Council), Nancy also expressed concern about the SRRMC having exclusive rights to the information collected. In response to this concern, we have tried to ensure as much as possible that participants have total control over what information is shared or presented. Further, while the SRRMC does house many of the interview recordings in their oral history collection in their archives, they do not hold exclusive rights to the map. Rather, control over editing or approving the project in the end will be in the hands of members of the community of The’wá:lí. All interview recordings and the originals of the paper maps that community members sketched on, all versions of the map key and database (in the form of an Excel spreadsheet), and an online and offline version of the map have been submitted to the band office. Additionally, any community member who wishes to access their interview recording can do so either at the Soowahlie Band Office and Stó:lō Nation. Some of the sources (including interview materials) are housed at the Stó:lō Nation Archives, but The’wá:lí has control over the domain name, server and data included in the map. While it is housed on UVic server space presently, the band and Stó:lō Nation and I are in discussions about where the digital map will be stored. This may result in a cooperation between Stó:lō Nation (who may already have the resources, server space, project capacity and willingness to house the map) and The’wá:lí (who wants to ensure they still are in control of the map data).

In response to Nancy’s (and Sonny’s and Cara’s) concerns about safeguarding private or privileged knowledge, we sought some guidance from members of the community to find out how to distinguish this kind of information from more public information. It was difficult to come to a conclusion on which everyone agreed, however, because many members of the community had different ideas about what was safe to share with the public. Ultimately, we developed a system in which, during our interviews or mapping workshops, we asked people to identify whether the things they shared were public or private, so that the terms of privacy were established by the contributors themselves. We built a spreadsheet of private and public map sites, and all those marked private have
been excluded from the map built this year. When the map is finalized in August 2016, it will go through one more approval process with members of the community, including Gracie Kelly, Otis Jasper, Brenda Wallace and Marcie Commodore, to ensure they are comfortable with what information is included in the public map.

Following this initial series of meetings, we began to reach out to individual community members whom Gracie, Brenda and Otis had contacted in advance to talk to them about the map. We received an overwhelmingly positive response from the Elders, youth and other community members who were interested in discussing what The’wá:lí places were important to them and why. We interviewed numerous people individually, joined an Elders’ meeting to group-interview eight The’wá:lí Elders for a full afternoon on 28 May, and hosted a community mapping open house day at the band office on the 29th. While we recorded over twenty-five hours of interview time with a number of community members: a few in particular were especially present, including Larry Commodore, the Charters family, Bruce Sam, Gracie Kelly and Rena Point Bolton. To all of our interviews, we brought large maps of various scales and asked people to locate, wherever possible, the places in The’wá:lí territory that they felt were necessary to include. We recorded hours of spoken word from people of all ages and from every family in The’wá:lí, as well as several people from outside the reserve.

While I could write for pages about the many interviews we had with individuals who graciously shared their time, memories and knowledge with us, I want to focus in particular on our open house event at the band office, and on the Elders’ meeting we attended. These, to me, best represent the community-engaged, busy and deeply human nature of this first month of research. After being invited by Chief Brenda Wallace and Band Councillor Marcie Commodore, and after Marcie had notified the Elders, we attended an Elders’ meeting at the Soowahlie Health Office on 28 May, where we met with seven Elders from the community, including Lloyd and Maria Kelly, Isadore and Jean Charters, Myra Sam, Marge Kelly and Pearl Commodore. We brought coffee, tea and snacks to the end of their meeting
that afternoon and explained the mapping project and its goals to them, and invited them to participate if they wanted to. The three of us stayed and listened for several hours that afternoon as, to varying degrees, everyone shared with us something important they felt could be included in the map. It was at this time that we first heard about the serpent at Swí:lhcha, Sasq’ets’ travels through the reserve (stories we were surprised to find that people marked as safe for public viewing, as long as the exact locations of these sightings or stories were not indicated), conflict between the community and the Cultus Lake waterpark, and confrontations between the community and Cultus Lake Road users. We heard a wide variety of thoughts, memories and stories, questions and concerns that have since guided the map’s development.

One moment at this meeting stands out. After the meeting had finished and almost everyone had left, Maria Kelly, who had been silent almost the entire time, approached Anne Janhunen and me. She said, “I would like you to visit me again,” she said, “I have some things to tell.” She continued with deep earnestness in her eyes, “some of my people think it’s bad to share. They want to guard our knowledge. But it’s important. Others need to hear. We need to share so you can understand.”137 Anne met her again the following day, where she spoke at greater length about stories she had heard growing up. Her openness to sharing knowledge, and her sense that sharing could lead to greater understanding among peoples, has inspired me ever since. The idea that listening across cultural, socioeconomic, colonial or historical boundary lines can broaden our thinking and encourage empathy is part of the guiding philosophy of this project. Furthermore, Kelly’s quiet comments confirm Paige Raibmon and Elsie Paul’s remarks about community-engaged and collaborative scholarship. Their work suggests that, by listening “transformationally,” that is, by shedding all pretense of already “having got it,” already being an “ally,” community-engaged scholars can begin to hear things that may cause discomfort, and live out research relationships in ways that are meaningful to the community collaborators with whom

the scholars engage. The kind of listening that Maria felt was most important has the potential to expand, decentre and complicate existing historical narratives about shared and contested places like Canada.

The day after the Elders’ meeting, Chief and Council opened the band office for us to host a community mapping open-house day. Council member Tara Kelly had placed an advertisement about the event in the community’s newsletter the week before. That day, we brought dozens of empty maps of various scales and filled a table with food and drinks, and spent several hours welcoming dozens of people to share with us and participate in the map process. Much of the richest and most important material included in the map came from conversations we had at this event, which was lively and well-attended. As more people arrived through the afternoon, the three of us found we had to spread out to separate rooms in the office to allow for greater privacy for some speakers and to get recordings with less overlap and ambient sound.

The recordings that came from the event are also remarkable because, I think, in many ways they reflect some of the most human characteristics of this project. First, they reflect the enthusiasm with which most people participated in the initial phase of the mapmaking. Every person who came agreed to share their sketch maps and have our conversations recorded. Interviews varied from fifteen minutes to two hours, and people spoke about a wide range of subjects that they wanted to share about The’wá:lí places. Some spoke of their memories of family farms and orchards, others of popular hangout spots for The’wá:lí youth, and still others of environmental degradation at Cultus Lake and the gravel pits. A number of people mentioned changes to the reserve size, and talked about countless other topics that have become entries in the map. Those who participated also pointed us in the direction of other community members who might want to participate but could not attend the gathering. We were greeted with enthusiasm and liveliness from everyone who attended. I hope that this reflects the potential importance of this project to the community and the value that some The’wá:lí people see in
representing their place-based knowledge and memories in the form of a collaborative map. At the same time, though, and perhaps more importantly, it also reflects how deeply important The’wá:lí’s places are to the people who live there. The kinds of meaning that people have embedded in the The’wá:lí environment are diverse, dynamic and deep-rooted.

Further, the recordings produced by this event, far from being just quotations stripped of context, give voice to the living encounters and situations that produced them. In many of the interviews, it can be difficult hear the voices of the interviewees because in the background can be heard the overlap of other people’s voices, participants coming and going, phones ringing and just the general movement of people through the event. Scholars of orality have long discussed the problems associated with transcribing the spoken word. Of particular importance is how physical mannerisms, inflection, pauses, silences, emotion, and exchanges between narrators and their interviewers disappear in print.138 Just as the nature of much of the content for this map has proven to be diverse, mixed, and alive, so too are the contexts in which these stories and knowledge have been shared. The community mapping day was a perfect example of the encounters that produced the map and that made it the living, layered and complex thing that it is. While the audio clips included in the digital map have been edited mostly to ensure they flow and make sense (so that loud interruptions like cell phones ringing or jarring coughs are sometimes cut), they are still reflective of the living contexts in which they first were created. In some clips, while an interviewee speaks, others are speaking behind them about something else. In other recordings, the television is audible or dogs can be heard in the background. Sometimes participants stop to converse with one another. In several, the interactions between interviewer and interviewee have to be included. Not all sneezes, coughs, hiccups and pauses were left out of the audio clips. This is to reflect how, as oral historian Carolyn Hamilton writes, “historical knowledge,” or indeed
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any kind of knowledge, “in diverse forms is deeply engaged in every day social processes.” I understand this deep engagement to be just as important to the map as the words being spoken, because they are each parts of the dynamic encounters, the relationships, the awkward moments, that made this project possible.

By the end of summer 2013, Dallas, Anne and I had copied what seemed to be a small archive’s worth of manuscript sources, recorded close to twenty hours of interview material and written dozens of pages of field notes. We had about twenty-five maps filled by community members. We had also begun to develop familiarity with a wide range of interdisciplinary literature. We left Chilliwack with some important and lasting relationships with knowledgeable and hospitable people from the community.

We created an extensive spreadsheet containing map sites with their descriptions, associated media (including audio, photographs, community maps, archival documents and images, etc.), and related primary and secondary source references. We built a preliminary map in a basic, at-home GIS program called Cartographica. In addition, the initial research produced three research essays (mine on stories about Swí:lhcha, Dallas’ on community perceptions of Captain John and Anne’s on cutoffs and colonial changes in Soowahlie Reserve after it was reduced in 1879). By August, however, it was clear how big the project was likely to become. In the end, after consulting with our academic advisors and some community members, we determined to start by submitting and presenting to the community a detailed and researched report of preliminary findings of our research, the spreadsheet, and our plans and hopes for the final map, so that in the years that followed we, or another field school student, could actually build it. We presented this report in August 2013, with a promise that the project would be completed within the next several years.

And indeed, this is the background to my MA project. I attended the field school a second time when it ran in 2015. Over the course of that month and the rest of the summer of 2015, I spent some more time with community members, especially Gracie Kelly, and met with chief and council again to ensure what had been done was satisfactory to them. I followed up on some interviews, searched out archival documents and photographs missing from the database and shared what had already been collected with some of the participants with whom I met. I then began to plan out how the “database” could become a living, digital map.

Over the ten months from September 2015 to June 2016, I have moved to the next stage of collaboration, which has involved working with the experts at the Humanities Computing and Media Centre (HCMC) at the University of Victoria. As I have already stated, this project has been collaborative from its inception to its end, and the collaborations and engagements have not only been between university students and First Nations community members. This last year of collaboration has centred on an invaluable working relationship with Martin Holmes, a digital humanities expert from HCMC who has proven to be genuinely committed, exceptionally patient and extremely adept while working with a student who is learning the very basics of programming (mostly HTML and CSS). Helping me build his map allowed him to use this project as the pilot project for programming a user-friendly mapping interface called BreezeMaps that future digital mapping projects at the HCMC will be able to use. This interface will allow a researcher, student, university class or community to build a digital map of a bounded region by connecting a set of map tiles to a set of data (including categorized map sites, text, images and audio). Working with the interface, the user will be able to draw sites (points, polygons, linestrings and multis), include descriptions and titles, and categorize them within the map website itself. This information will then be exported into a JSON or TEI file that forms the basis of the map. The user will not need to program or code in order to do this, but will be able to build and edit on an interface that is accessible and intelligible to someone without any background in programming.
Based on my content and organization, Martin has programmed the many features of the map, building off base tiles from OpenStreet Maps. Early on, we settled on building and using our own set of map tiles (the images that make up the map base) instead of using Google Maps or other external mapping services, in order to make the map more accessible to the community, and to give them more direct control over editing the map. This process is explained in greater detail below. Apart from some of the more basic features (site names linked to points on the map, and separate displays of HTML documents with images, audio and text included), some of the notable features of the map framework include a drawing interface (by which mappers can trace new features and extract their coordinates directly on the basemap); the capacity to include multiple taxonomies (that is, to design categories and subcategories for map data); the ability to include not only points and polygons, but also multipolygons, multipoints and multilinestrings and multigeometries (a combination of the former) for single entries; a search function; a function that links texts in description boxes and HTML files to other sites and displays the linked site on the map; and an auto-zoom that takes the user directly to the part of the map where the entry she clicks belongs. While he has directed me in my database building and taught me some basic coding, Martin has also helped me to navigate some tricky terrain, including issues of representing sensitivity and sacredness (we talked early on about making two different versions of the map, including a private and a public one, but settled on creating a single map with only public features) as well as complications in categorizing and organizing features. Some of the problems and practicalities that we have encountered in building the map were raised by community members early on, while others arose as we worked. These issues, and our attempts to navigate them, are discussed below.

Problems and Practicalities

No community-engaged project happens without a little bit of awkwardness, and no academic project is without its problems. The very first time I ever interviewed someone (not only for this project, but in my entire career) was in the Soowahlie Band Office in May 2013. To this day, thinking about it
brings me a jab of discomfort. Anne Dallas and I were meeting with Elders Sophinia and Terry Prest, who had agreed to come at the behest their niece, Chief Brenda Wallace. The interview got off to an awkward start. When we asked if we could record the conversation, Sophinia instantly tensed up a little at the thought and declined. When we suggested just having a casual conversation instead, she and Terry agreed. Sophinia was initially very reserved, but later became more engaged in the discussion. Eventually, though, we got to the topic of Cultus Lake. Sophinia began talking about how its name had changed from Swí:lhcha to Cultus, summing up the story pointedly by looking at me and saying, “we used to have everything named and spelled properly, but when you got here, you changed all the names.” She pointed at me, identifying me as a face of the colonizer. While the conversation was a meaningful, uncomfortable experience for me as an interviewer, it also bears deeply important implications for community-engaged, non-Indigenous scholars generally. Sophinia’s comment should serve as a reminder, first, that places within The’wá:lí territory like Cultus continue today to bear different meaning to different people – and that conflicting stories may also be reminders of tense and sometimes violent and traumatic histories of contact and colonization.

It should also prompt us to be aware, self-reflexive and transparent about our positionality within any community-engaged scholarship with Indigenous peoples. In any ethnohistorical project like this one, transformational listening should also mean embracing, wholeheartedly, all the discomforts, uncertainties and awkward moments that go along with working with human beings who see you – for all intents and purposes – as a complete stranger. Producing reflexive writing that comes from a place of transformational listening requires that we must be constantly aware of the persistent and painful realities of a colonial past that continues to shape and affect relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, between scholars and communities, and between collaborators. I have sought, in this essay, in my work on the map (and especially in the introductory panels) and throughout the research process, to remain reflexive and transparent. The following section is a reflection on some of
the concerns, problems and awkward moments that have arisen throughout the making of this map. I acknowledge here where, on rare occasions, these could not be addressed, and how we have best sought to address them when we could.

Among the most sensitive of issues involved Nancy Murphy’s concerns about ownership, privacy and the sacredness of some shared knowledge. Critics of Traditional Use Studies (mostly carried out for industry or government) voice similar concerns, stating that making privileged knowledge about particular places public can make the “spaces in between places” appear open, unused and available to negotiating parties like developers and government.140 The privileged knowledge itself can also be dangerous to share. At the Elders’ Meeting we attended, Jean Charters told a story about Swí:lhcha’s origins and then emphasized how many stories there are about the lake, while lamenting that many of those stories may have been lost because they have not been shared. In response, though, another Elder named Myra Sam quietly explained, “but some things we’re not supposed to talk about – that’s why.”141 Sam was quiet for most of that meeting. Her short statement, and her silence, were charged with important meaning. Her statement and silence reflected two distinct views on sharing information: knowledge is powerful, and knowledge associated with certain places (like bathing sites, hunting trails or certain Sxwōxwiyám sites) in The’wá:lí territory is considered sacred, private and not shareable with outsiders.

While not all community members agreed on the levels of sacredness of different kinds of knowledge, I’ve acknowledged with those community members who expressed concerns that when

140 For an important discussion of this issue, see Terry Glavin, “Spirit Dancers,” in This Ragged Place: Travels Across the Landscape (Vancouver: New Star Books, 2000), 67-79. Glavin discusses an exchange he shared with Larry Commodore, in which he learned that spirit dancers’ “old places, their ‘training grounds,’” which often are located in these kinds of “in-between places” not marked on TUS maps, were disappearing as a result of development, especially because in the past sacred sites have not been afforded protected status under B.C.’s heritage-conservation laws. See also, McIlwraith and Cormier, “Making Place for Space”; Thom, “Paradox of Boundaries”; Wainwright and Bryan, “Cartography, Territory, Property”; and Willow, “Doing Sovereignty.”
141 Myra Sam, interview at Soowahlie Elders’ Meeting with Anne Janhunen, Dallas Posavad and Sabina Trimble, Soowahlie Reserve, 28 May, 2013. Interview recording housed at SNA and Soowahlie Band Office.
digitized or publicized, any private knowledge becomes public, and thus is at risk of misinterpretation, misunderstanding or misuse by various people (especially, perhaps, industry and government). We made sure to mark in our notes, in the interview titles or in the spreadsheet itself, which sites were considered safe to include in the public version of the map and which required safeguarding. So, where people were willing to share stories or knowledge of a private nature, this information is not included in this first iteration of The The’wá:lí Digital Map, which contains only features that our collaborators marked as public. Because of time restrictions on this particular project, we did not develop a tiered-access, password-encoded system as we had originally planned. With more time and resources, the map could expand to also include knowledge that would not be accessible to a broader public, and only to some members of the community. This, however, is a much larger project for the community to consider in the future. Because of different layers of administration on reserve and various disputes among individuals and families on the reserve, it is hard to imagine planning for such a map without significant time spent consulting with all contributors and potential users. Determining who might have a final say over what is or is not safe for public eyes might also prove complicated; for example, while chief and council might wish to have authority over such decisions, many of the biggest contributors to the map do not have a positive working relationship with some members of the current chief and council. For now, therefore, only entries and stories deemed public knowledge by our participants themselves are included in the map. Such an approach, I hope, respectfully takes into account issues of privacy and privilege while also ensuring that the map can be a meaningful teaching tool both for members of The’wá:lí community and for a larger non-Indigenous public that needs to hear these stories.

Martin and I also have discussed the issue of a base map that is already loaded with meaning. That is to say, the map tiles, on top of which all of the layers of data and knowledge are linked, contains place-names, roadways and boundary-lines that need interpretation. These things have histories,
meanings and stories that cannot be left unexplained. Our plan in 2013 was to use a basemap that only displayed an aerial image of the geographical features of the environment in question, in which place-names, roadways, boundary lines, etc. would be part of the layered features. At the moment, the OpenLayers tiles already contain the data. Martin and other staff from HCMC are working to build two new sets of tiles that will address this issue. One set of tiles that displays only lands and waterways will be the base set. A second set of map tiles containing English place-names, municipal boundaries, the national boundary and roadways will be layered on top of the base map. A “fader” function will allow the user to make that second layer appear and disappear with a scroller. The process of building the tiles, however, has proven to be highly complicated and time-consuming for the staff working on it. As a result, these tiles will not appear on the map until the end of summer 2016. In the meantime, I have included some interpretations of the features already embedded in the map tiles. I have traced polygons, linestrings or points over top of them, and users can click feature names (for example, “the International border”), and learn that those parts of the map are neither neutral nor unstoried but rather are important parts of the history of the The’wá:lí landscape.

Further, while Anne, Dallas and I initially acknowledged that the division of features into three or four broad “categories” could risk being highly reductive, and we anticipated overlap, it was not until much later, when reviewing material, that I discovered just how problematic it could be to organize things in any structured, categorical way. While our original categories might be useful for building keyword- and theme-searchable layers for the digital map, such clean-cut divisions of The’wá:lí place-making knowledge actually obscure just how complex that knowledge is. Our original three or four categories were not adequately reflective of the non-linear, richly diverse and inter-subjective conversations that we had with people sharing their knowledge of places. When asked questions about specific subjects (Department of National Defence encroachments on reserve, for example), community members often turned to related, but otherwise “categorized” subjects, such as Sasquatch trails, which
pass through DND-appropriated lands. Thus, when a user clicks on the feature “DND Shooting Range” under the “Colonial Change” heading, she will see the polygon representing the range. The same square will appear if she clicks the feature “Sasq’ets in The’wá:lí” in the “Storied Places” category with a completely different interpretation of that polygon appearing in the side panel. If she clicks on “DND Relations” under “Colonial Change” and reads the longer textual panel, she will learn that Sasq’ets most frequently travels through that section of the reserve, and she will be given the option to read more about Sasq’ets there.

Such overlaps reflect how, in The’wá:lí collective consciousness, seemingly disparate subjects like colonial encroachments and metaphysical creatures in fact are all part of a larger, interrelated picture. They reflect dynamic and complex relationships to place underlying The’wá:lí’s history and identity. While one response to the issue of oversimplification is to cross-list features, ultimately the best answer was to create more specific categories. Even still, many sites appear in multiple categories. The overlap and repetition, though potentially a little clumsy to have to navigate, are explained within the introductory panel (the first thing that users will see when they open the map) as a necessary part of representing diverse, layered and complex place-making knowledge. The table of contents lists features only once in their “categories of origin” so that a user can avoid re-reading cross listed features if they want. Another feature in the map allows a user to click a linked word in a description box or HTML panel and see another associated site appear on the map. With sites thus linked together in a visible and interactive way, users can explore and experience visually the kinds of connections that make the The’wá:lí environment so diverse and networked.

Other practicalities and problems have to do with the fluid, changing and sometimes conflicting nature of place-making knowledge, even in very small communities like The’wá:lí. This point relates particularly to memories, and to Indigenous storytelling, which, according to storytelling scholars like Jo-Ann Archibald, Julie Cruikshank and Johnny Mack, may adapt and shift according to context, storyteller,
audience or purpose for telling. Some memories (“I saw Sasquatch in this particular spot”) or historical moments (the Douglas Reserve was reduced under the authority of Joseph Truch’s administration) can be unproblematically represented on the map. Other stories, however, may have multiple versions. Sometimes these conflict. There are, for example, several different stories accounting for the origins of the community. Men’s and women’s interpretations of certain elements of the environment (like the gravel pits) sometimes differ. As Archibald suggests, when Stó:lō Elders disagree about versions of a story or memory, they do not “openly voice it but show difference by introducing a different type of story by saying ‘well, in my family, this is what I heard.’” Thus, the stories recorded and included in the map are by no means static or wholly representative of a broad, unchanging Stó:lō, or even The‘wá:lí, view of things.

Historically, maps have been understood to represent physical, unchanging realities on the ground. By contrast, the The‘wá:lí Mapping Project, grounded in Indigenous storytelling, makes room for the adaptive features of storytelling, and for multiple versions of stories. As such, this map, like the stories upon which it is built, has a “social life,” like the storytelling Julie Cruikshank analyzes. It should never be considered final or complete, but ongoing: a process, rather than a final product. When I shared the link with members of the community in early July 2016, I made sure they knew that the map could be edited: sites could be edited, deleted or added as they wished. Until the BreezeMaps interface is completed, however, I explained to community members that they would in the meantime have to contact me in order to make those changes. When the interface is completed, community members themselves will be able to take control of editing the map.

A few of my own concerns have arisen while I have written for project. While I have deliberately made the effort to enter into collaborative spaces humbly and self-reflexively, always shedding my sense of authority before coming to interviews and seeing myself as a student when The‘wá:lí knowledge
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holders speak, this humility is harder to represent in writing. Where I can reflect, as in this essay, I am able to discuss my approach and positionality. In interpretive panels for the map, however, it is harder to situate myself explicitly as a learner instead of as an expert. The very underpinnings of academic writing involve assuming authority and making statements based on research. Quotations from interviews can be stripped of their awkward contexts. My academic training prepares me to make authoritative statements (and of course expect challenges and questions to them). To address this, though, in all of the map panels, I have sought to make it explicit when it is my voice interpreting and analyzing, when The’wá:lí participants are doing the same, and when archival sources speak. Part of this process involves writing in a humble way, writing sentences like “some scholars and evidence suggest that The’wá:lí, like other Coast Salish communities, is broadly connected,” rather than saying authoritatively that “The’wá:lí is this or that.” It also involves always acknowledging speakers, and often pointing out the contexts in which they were speaking. The most difficult means of engaging in humility, I have found, has been in writing the textual interpretation included on the map panels in a language that is not heavily theoretical and jargon-laden but equally accessible, meaningful and challenging to a more public audience.

I have also tried to balance my language so that I can tell a deliberately alternative story about the history of The’wá:lí’s lands to a non-Indigenous audience. That is, I have sought to represent histories of colonial change and cutoffs in this environment from the perspectives of those who have shared with me. Doing so, however, carries the danger of potentially alienating non-Indigenous users. This, however, would be the opposite of my goal. With the leaders who first proposed and approved the project, my view is that the map should present many ways of knowing this environment in an educational way: to challenge people to think about their presence in unceded traditional territory and also to inspire empathy, without alienating. As Richard Daly writes, when the listener (me) becomes the speaker or writer, she works with the help of her collaborators “to get the point across more indirectly
or eloquently or diplomatically, and in a manner that emphasizes reflection and deliberation and the sharing of information, values, and knowledge, all the while maintaining respect for the opinions of others.”

The humanist in me is also interested in the tensions, conflicts and disruptions within the community that studying this environment and community has revealed. Focusing on such realities, however, has the danger, again, of alienating people who collaborated. While family conflicts and band disagreements did arise in interviews, they have been excluded from the map for now to avoid engaging in the conflict or alienating anyone involved. This is a specific case where academic interest and scholarly analysis has the potential to be counter-productive in a community-engaged work. Although divisions, tensions and conflict are a very human part of The’wá:lí’s past and present, in which a critical academic likely would take interest, representing some of them in a map intended for public use has the potential to compromise the privacy and security of the people who shared about such sensitive topics. Ultimately, anything of a sensitive nature, or which collaborators specified was private, has not been included in the map.
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Conclusion

I began this essay with a story about conflict and contention, and I’d like to conclude on a completely different note, by talking about another mapping project that focused on unity and coming together. At the end of the first summer of work on the The’wá:lı́ Community Mapping project, community member and knowledge-holder Gracie Kelly told us that working with us on this project had inspired her to turn back to her own mapping project, which she had begun the year before, in 2012. It was a sketch map of The’wá:lı́ community that focused on family histories and the gifts and talents that particular people from The’wá:lı́ brought to the community. She told us that the reason she made the map was that she wanted to share with the community, and with outsiders, the good things that people from The’wá:lı́ do.

She gave us copies of her sketched map, which she had drawn in pencil and black marker on about ten pages of taped-together computer paper. It is titled “The’wali Gifts,” and it depicts a few things primarily. Some features are not unusual for a standard map: it displays where people live, the water park, and the location of the band office, for example. It shows other things too, though, which we might not expect to see (or indeed really think about) if we looked at a typical map of the reserve. She notes the location of the old Soowahlie Community Hall and ball fields north of Gary Cooper’s home, and on the other side of Sweltzer Creek Road she points out the location of the reserve’s first street lights, which were installed in 1993. Gracie’s focus is also often on the activities anchored in particular places, rather than the sites themselves. She notes the different seasonal activities that people used to do and continue to do at a site near Soowahlie Park Lane. She notes that raspberry and blackberry picking, fishing, canning and firewood collection occur in the summertime. In the wintertime, she notes the DND’s snow plough that used to drive through the reserve and the Soowahlie Ice Capades. Elsewhere, she draws a line to a site on the west side of Kelly Crescent with the words “loved this hill in winter” beside it, in brackets.
Near to this, she points out the location of an old, burnt-down shed that was at one time used by her aunt for wool washing. Here, the content becomes a little more dense, as Gracie georeferences her family history. She points out the lots of particular family members, and the sites on those lots where an old house burned down and new ones were rebuilt. Old houses are marked “gone” in brackets. West of there, across Sweltzer Creek Road, she notes where a coyote family used to live in the field behind her mother’s home. To the land where she and her siblings used to pick berries, she assigns the place-name “Strawberry Fields Forever.” Near Sweltzer Creek, Gracie traces the walking trail that she and her sisters took to get to the bus stop to go to school. Nearby, she indicates where that stop was, and beside it writes, “faster to bike to Sardis from here!” One of the most striking points of the map is a heart drawn on the Cultus Lake through-road (the Columbia Valley Highway). The heart represents the place where Gracie’s granddaughter was born in April 1990.

Gracie’s map is remarkably personal, unique and creative. It is also closely related to The The’wá:lí Digital Mapping Project in several ways. First, it is an expression of what makes places important to people from The’wá:lí in particular and to other Xwélmxw people more generally. Gracie’s map puts emphasis on the human interactions and relationships in places that give those places meaning. The map is also a local example of GIS, as defined by Geddes and Gregor, and of counter-mapping, as defined by others, that challenges traditional western map content and reflects The’wá:lí ways of knowing place. It traces movement, change and activity in place rather than simply depicting discrete sites, and it includes and interprets the gaps between those places. The map displays people’s talents and gifts, and places particular emphasis on the places that are important to women. The map focuses on the significance of places to family histories, and to Gracie’s own experiences as a mother and grandmother. Places, for her, are significant because of their association with her family’s own stories. For Gracie and the other Xwélmxw people who participated in building The The’wá:lí Digital Map, people, and their stories and actions, make places what they are.
I wanted to write about Gracie’s map because her participation and input, knowledge and hospitality have been critical to the Digital Mapping project from the start, and because I wanted to honour her request that her map be part of this project. This is a very minor way of expressing gratitude for the tremendous amount of input and the genuine spirit of collaboration and reconciliation that Gracie has contributed to this project. From the beginning, she has shared ideas of how to plan the map and make it the best it can be. She provided insights into the things that people might be interested in seeing embedded in it, and also was a liaison with possible community contacts whose knowledge, memories and histories have provided the body of the project.

But Gracie’s map is also important because it encompasses, in a few ways, the approach and, I hope, the larger significance and purpose of The The’wá:lí Digital Mapping project itself. First, Gracie’s willingness to share her views on what would make the best map, and her knowledge about places, encompasses the spirit of collaboration and sharing that guided the process. Just as she shared her map and stories with us, so too did many others over the course of the last three years. “Momíylehtel” is the Halq’eméylem word for “learning together,” the primary, guiding philosophy of this project. The The’wá:lí Digital Map – and indeed my entire MA career – would be nothing without the relationship-building, the commitment to sharing and listening, that have brought it to life. As some place-related issues (like the Cultus Lake Crossing conflict) create tension and disunity, Gracie’s map attempts to “bring people together” and heal familial rifts by focusing on the contributions all members of the community make to The’wá:lí. It addresses contention by attempting to represent unity.

In a separate conversation Gracie Kelly and I had over coffee one morning two years later, she told me why she felt such projects as her map, and other kinds of public outreach, were important. She pointed out that outsiders to The’wá:lí, and to Indigenous communities more generally, indeed, much of the broader Canadian public, only ever focus on the “bad things,” as she put it, the things that the media focuses on and sensationalizes: violence, high suicide rates, poverty on reserves, band office corruption,
unemployment. And while these are indeed realities that Canadians need to face honestly, Gracie emphasized that outsiders need to start learning the “good things that people do, too,” and all of the good work happening in places like The’wá:lí, as people strive to maintain their connections to the land and keep the community growing and healthy. She said, “if they just knew the history – what we have always done as Stó:lō people and what was done to us,” then they might understand better and have more compassion.\footnote{Author’s field notes, 23 May 2015.} Gracie’s remarks speak to several concerns. One is the consistent misrepresentation or lack of representation of Canada’s Indigenous peoples in the media, a product and producer of deeply entrenched misunderstandings among Canadians about Indigenous peoples and reserves, Indigenous-state relations, and the colonial history at the heart of that very misunderstanding. Difference-making, a sense of “us and them,” and deeply-rooted racism, are still central to many Canadians’ collective consciousness about the land they occupy and about those to whom it first belonged. Gracie’s remarks also suggest, however, that we can respond to those misunderstandings. Her map, as she had explained earlier, was an attempt to do just that.

I see The The’wá:lí Digital Map as an attempt to do something similar. Gracie’s remarks suggest to me that this Mapping Project can be a part of broader processes of Indigenous-newcomer reconciliation and of decolonization. The map is predicated on sharing, on momíyelhtel. It attempts to represent many voices and stories in a critically contested environment and also acknowledges a complicated and sometimes conflicted past. This challenges power imbalances that have led to cutoffs and disempowerment in the community’s history, and encourages users to think critically about their places. Further, it can be a way of speaking across what we often see as hard and fast cultural or ethnic boundaries. Perhaps the many layers of knowledge and interpretation The’wá:lí has shared for this living map have the potential to peel back layers of taken-for-granted misunderstanding between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples locally, and in British Columbia and Canada more broadly.
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