Twentieth-century British Columbia History from an Indigenous Perspective

by

Lianne Charlie
BA, University of Victoria, 2007

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of History

© Lianne Charlie, 2011
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.
Supervisory Committee

Twentieth-century British Columbia History from an Indigenous Perspective

by

Lianne Charlie
BA, University of Victoria, 2007

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Wendy Wickwire, Department of History
Supervisor

Dr. Christine O’Bonsawin, Department of History
Departmental Member
Abstract

Supervisory Committee
Dr. Wendy Wickwire (Department of History)
Supervisor
Dr. Christine O’Bonsawin (Department of History)
Departmental Member

Many scholars today are incorporating Indigenous perspectives into their work. Historians, however, are lagging behind through their heavy reliance on colonial archives to present the histories of Indigenous peoples. Most have ignored Indigenous peoples’ own histories of colonialism. Using British Columbia as a case-study, this thesis argues for the inclusion and validation of a range of Indigenous historical expressions within the BC historical archive. Its larger goal is to encourage the deconstruction of professional historical practice and, at a broader level, encourage a more flexible definition of history.
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Dedication

For my dad, with love.

Before you can learn the tender gravity of kindness
you must travel where the Indian in a white poncho
lies dead by the side of the road.
You must see how this could be you,
how he too was someone
who journeyed through the night with plans
and the simple breath that kept him alive.

~Naomi Shihab Nye
Our Family has experienced a lot of tragedy. My Auntie Eileen said this to me a few years ago while we drank tea at her house in Carmacks, Yukon. Carmacks is her home village. It is located inside the boundaries of the Little Salmon/Carmacks First Nation, our family’s traditional territories. My Auntie Eileen is one of the five aunties remaining in my family. She once had thirteen brothers and sisters. Eight of her siblings – including my dad – have passed away.

It had been twenty years since I had last seen my aunties, when I went back to the Yukon in the summer of 2008. I have been back five times since. The better part of my visits has been spent listening to the stories they shared about their lives. Four of them went to residential school. Most are diabetic, and all but one are recovering alcoholics. They have seen violence and some have been violent. They have seen too much death. One could say they have experienced a lot of tragedy.

It is important that I share this because hearing their stories forced me to reconsider the histories I read about Indigenous peoples. Stories like my aunties’ are not only different from the ones available in mainstream history texts – they are missing altogether. My aunties’ stories are full of pain, death, anger, and guilt; yet, they are also stories of perseverance, strength, and recovery. Their stories – the content, how they are conveyed,

---

1 I have adopted Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel’s definition of “Indigenous” from Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism which states: “Indigenous peoples are just that: Indigenous to the land they inhabit, in contrast to and in contention with colonial societies and states that have spread out from Europe and other centres of empire… the struggle to survive as distinct peoples on foundations constituted in their unique heritages, attachments to their homelands, and natural ways of life is what is shared by all Indigenous peoples, as well as the fact that their existence is in the large part lived as determined acts of survival against colonizing states’ efforts to eradicate them culturally, politically and physically.” (597)
and their subjectivities – informed me deeply as I mapped out my thesis on Indigenous historical perspectives on twentieth-century British Columbia, Canada.

Here I examine the extent to which Indigenous peoples have been excluded from the history-telling process. In the last thirty years historians and anthropologists, among others, have recognized that the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives provides insight into different cultural interpretations of history and sheds light on the knowledge of a shared past. The majority of historians, however, continue to slot Indigenous peoples and their perspectives into a pre-contact or early-contact timeframe. An overview of histories written in the last decade reveals a tendency towards focusing on Indigenous/non-Indigenous relations of the early-contact period, the fur trade, early missionization, and early settlement.

In studies of these earlier time periods, historians have very little choice but to rely on a colonial archive to tell the histories of Indigenous peoples. This is not the case for the twentieth century. The recent past is remembered by people living today. Uncovering living Indigenous versions of BC history provides a starting point for bringing to light the varying historical discourses of specific events and experiences of the remembered past. The need for these additional perspectives demands that historians move past the structural limitations of a “professional” history that relies on documentary and colonial materials. It is not only a question of re-writing history and using Indigenous living-sources to uncover historical “truths”—it is a matter of recognizing that additional perspectives exist, many of which have not been given space in the official historical record.
Outside the confines of the professional historical enterprise, Indigenous history-making is flourishing. Indigenous histories are available in living memory and they are being shared in many different forms; they are also showing up in areas we rarely associate with mainstream history. They are available through literature, art, physical sites and mnemonics. Together, these somewhat unconventional sources make up an Indigenous archive in British Columbia. Items found in the Indigenous archive have a number of shared characteristics: they are all produced by Indigenous peoples; in many cases, they are contemporary and they are the products of experience. An engagement with the legacy of colonialism is also often fundamental to Indigenous histories. The result is a collection of historical materials that is personal and often very subjective.

In comparing this collection of Indigenous histories to mainstream BC historiography, it has become clear that Indigenous peoples’ emotional memories of colonialism are hardly ever included in BC historiography of the recent past. In fact, I would argue that they are dismissed precisely because they are deemed to be subjective. When we consider that almost all Indigenous personal memories about the past are rife with emotion, the impact of their dismissal is paramount to how we understand and view the past.

Further to this, Indigenous histories do not make a distinction between what geographer Derek Gregory calls the colonial past and colonial present. “While they may be displaced, distorted, and (most often) denied,” Gregory writes, “the capacities that inhere within the colonial past are routinely reaffirmed and reactivated in the colonial

---

2 Colonialism is understood to be the purposeful and forceful domination of one culture over another. I have also adopted Tainiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel’s definition of contemporary colonialism they use in Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism. It is defined as “a form of post-modern imperialism in which domination is still the Settler imperative but where colonizers have designed and practise more subtle means (in contrast to the earlier forms of missionary and militaristic colonial enterprise) of accomplishing their objectives.” (597-598)

present.”⁴ BC historians of Indigenous history tend to make this distinction and focus almost solely on the colonial past. Most of their works, according to Dakota scholar Devon Mihesuah, “do not connect the past to the present, which is why,” she argues, “we should be writing history in the first place.”⁵ Historians often do not make this connection, and so overlook the fact that many Indigenous peoples continue to live in a colonial present that is greatly affected by the colonial past. Historian Antoinette Burton calls this disconnect between “discourse” and “reality” a “vexing impasse.”⁶ Making space for Indigenous peoples’ own expressions of the past – subjectivities and all – will serve as a bridge to overcome this theoretical divide.

In this thesis, I give precedence to Indigenous perspectives that are rooted in – and are told with – a deep and emotional understanding of the present colonial reality. In an attempt to connect discourse with reality, I analyze the ways in which these perspectives intersect with the official written records. Indigenous ways of conveying history are different than those of mainstream historians. Because of this, Indigenous histories challenge the norms of the mainstream historical enterprise. They force us to fundamentally rethink what history is, what purpose it serves, as well as what constitutes “legitimate” historical evidence.

To understand the challenge these Indigenous histories offer to the mainstream, we must first understand what defines mainstream history. In his Pursuit of History, John Tosh states that history, as it is broadly defined, provides us with “a sense of identity and

---

a sense of direction.” He identifies two main ways of knowing history: through “social memory,” which he defines as “popular knowledge of the past,” and through “historical awareness,” which he relates to the disciplined approach to history. Everyone is capable of the former, whereas the latter requires a degree of professionalism, objectivity, respect for the autonomy of the past and the ability to look to the past free of present-day assumptions and influences. In other words, the past “should be studied on its own terms.” He continues:

Whereas the starting point for most popular forms of knowledge about the past is the requirements of the present, the starting point of historicism is the aspiration to re-enter or re-create the past.

When a “professional” historian undertakes to recreate or re-enter the past, she relies upon evidence, or what Tosh calls the “raw materials.” In the last thirty years, the kinds of source materials to which historians are turning have diversified. “The fact remains, however,” Tosh writes,

the study of history has nearly always been based squarely on what the historian can read in documents or hear from informants. And ever since historical research was placed on a professional footing during Ranke’s lifetime, the emphasis has fallen almost exclusively on the written rather than the spoken word.

Because the written has been privileged, Indigenous perspectives have been generally excluded by the professional historical enterprise.

---

Paulette Regan, a non-Indigenous scholar of Indigenous/Settler relations, contends that certain assumptions rooted in Western knowledge systems influence what Settler society considers 'real' history. These assumptions value neutrality and scientific objectivity at the expense of engagement and, what she calls, intersubjectivity. She argues that dominant societies' own myths and rituals influence its historical understanding; yet, Indigenous myth, ritual and history are dismissed and questioned for their legitimacy and cultural authenticity. According to Regan, "[t]ruth-telling –moving from denial and silencing of Indigenous presence to recognizing and making space for it – requires nothing less than a paradigm shift, a re-storying of our shared history.

What would a re-storying of BC’s past entail? To help answer this, I turn to a number of scholars. The works of Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Wahpetunwan historian Waziyatawin (2004, 2008), and Choctaw historian Devon A. Mihesuah (1998; 2004) have provided guidance in the development of my project’s methodology and scope. Their work calls attention to a larger “colonial project” that continues to have a hold on how academics write history. These three scholars argue that the historical enterprise is about power. Reclaiming Indigenous perspectives of the past, in their view, is a form of decolonization. “Decolonization,” writes Waziyatawin, “becomes central to

---

15 Regan, “Unsettling the Settler Within,” 79.
unveiling the long history of colonization and returning well-being to our people.” 17

Decolonizing history, then, is a step towards justice for all people.

I have also turned to historian Antoinette Burton and her writing on women’s histories, oral histories, unconventional archives, counter-narratives, and the production of history. I have used her work as a foundation upon which to challenge “professional” historians’ ideas of what constitutes “legitimate” history and “reliable” sources of history. “The question of reliability,” Burton writes, “continues to dog even the most respected work in oral history, in large measure because ‘properly’ archived sources are still considered the standard against which all other evidence must be verified, or at least against which it must be measured.” 18 Yet few scholars are actually questioning the sources upon which we are basing our historical understanding.

This project aims to contribute to the legitimizing of “unconventional” sources; and in doing so I draw upon these materials and the assumption of their legitimacy. The sources and evidence that inform my project are rich and varied. I rely both on mainstream literature and academic scholarship, almost all of which is authored by Indigenous peoples. I include an oral interview with Dorothy (Walkem) Ursaki, an Nlaka’pamux woman, undertaken by Wendy Wickwire in 1991. Finally, I turn to my personal experiences and those of my family to colour the larger arguments I make here. Although my familial experiences are outside the territorial scope of this thesis, as they are Yukon-based, they are included because they have shaped the lens through which I view BC history. It can also be argued that each of these sources I turn to is a component of an

17 Angela Cavendar Wilson, “Reclaiming our Humanity,” in Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities, ed. Devon Abbott Mihesuah and Angela Cavendar Wilson (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 71.
18 Burton, Dwelling in the Archive, 21-22.
Indigenous archive. Like the examples that are shared in chapter three, they are available to us in published materials, people and memories.

This thesis asks for a re-storying of colonial narratives. I draw specifically on British Columbia as an example and argue that the BC historical narrative can be enlarged and essentially re-told with the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives in their existent forms. This requires taking seriously histories that are remembered, created, authored and told by contemporary Indigenous peoples. And it demands that Indigenous histories be considered part of the corpus of “legitimate” histories. In doing so, this thesis requires the very concept of history to be enlarged. Re-storying BC’s past requires that history be understood as not simply a study of the past, but as a study of the past through the lens of the present. When we take into consideration the present realities of Indigenous peoples – our social and economic situation, the unsettled land claims in BC, the inter-generational impact of residential schooling, the legacy of colonization – it becomes increasingly clear that history continues to play out all around us. Mainstream histories that continue to ignore such realities are doing nothing to better the lives of Indigenous peoples. In actual fact, such histories may be doing further damage. After all, is it not history that is supposed to provide us with a sense of identity and a sense of direction?19

Not until I went home to the Yukon did I become conscious of the connection between the colonial past and the present. In my home community, I saw the history of colonization playing out all around me. I heard it in the stories my family told. I saw its impact on people’s faces and bodies. My experiences with my family in the Yukon have had a profound influence on me as I began to research my thesis back in Victoria.

Interestingly, I found that many histories available in the Indigenous archive in BC resonated with the stories my aunties told. The histories available in the Indigenous archive are a collective voice of Indigenous peoples that has been consistently excluded from the history-telling process and the production of history.

Why does this matter? Indigenous peoples, not only in this province but across this continent, continue to be systematically and forcefully denied their hereditary rights to their lands, and they continue to experience ongoing dispossession, deprivation, and poverty. We struggle with these issues, along with health problems, suicide, stereotyping, and day-to-day racism. Historians engaging in Indigenous histories have an ethical responsibility to acknowledge such issues and the role in aiding or abetting. Space must be made for Indigenous peoples to tell their histories in order for decolonization to occur. Paulette Regan writes about “truth telling” in the context of residential school history in her book *Unsettling the Settler within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. She writes:

> Taking full responsibility for the policies and practices that flourished in Indian residential schools entails truth telling. What is truth? Challenging the peacemaker myth and critical reconciliation discourse requires us to be honest with ourselves about the actual impacts of colonial policies and practices on Indigenous people.  

I apply Regan’s use of truth-telling in this thesis and argue, not until it prevails can we expect society to even care about the fate of colonized peoples.

Indigenous perspectives and ways of conveying our past have to be understood as vital to the production of ethical historical scholarship in BC. Yet, as I set out to address

---


these issue in BC history, I was repeatedly confronted by the question why? Why are
Indigenous perspectives and our histories continuously and, in some cases, systematically
denied legitimacy by the professional historical enterprise? As stated early, other
Indigenous scholars argue that a large colonial project controls the histories that are told
and the histories that are silenced. I address this in the conclusion of this thesis as I reflect
on a personal story about my dad’s death. In an attempt to answer this question, I am
reminded that we must recognize our responsibility – as Indigenous peoples, as
historians, as residents of unceded territories, and as human beings – to demand and to
create ethical scholarship for a better future.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Outside the realm of professional history—in disciplines such as anthropology, political science and the like—Indigenous peoples’ views have established a foothold in academic texts and publications. In some instances, their views are included verbatim, to underscore their roles as the main sources of knowledge. Conversely, a majority of BC historians continue to relegate Indigenous peoples to the nineteenth-century, or worse, to a pre-contact past, where they can only be understood through the lens of the colonial archive. Through a literature review of sources in history and anthropology, I will analyze this issue in some detail. The main crux of my argument is that historians have remained discipline-bound and have neglected to put into practice the approaches, methods, and insights of other professionals that call for people-based research. In turn, historians have missed a significant opportunity to develop their practice and broaden the scope of BC/Indigenous history.

Anthropologists, for example, have been actively seeking out firsthand accounts of twentieth-century Indigenous peoples. Although historians have taken note of this trend, few have incorporated it into their work; instead, they have stuck to the well-established practice of archival-based research. Take, for example, a mainstay British Columbia history: Margaret Ormsby’s 1958 *British Columbia, a History*. The first comprehensive provincial history of British Columbia, it’s based solely on the colonial archive and it begins with the arrival of Europeans. It focuses almost exclusively on economics and politics with very little mention of Indigenous peoples. It marks a fitting

22 For example in 1991, anthropologist Julie Cruikshank was awarded the Sir John A. Macdonald Prize, the Canadian Historical Association’s highest prize, for her book *Life Lived like a Story: Life Stories of three Yukon Native Elders* (1992).
point of departure for this analysis, as it is from Ormsby onward that we see the incorporation of Indigenous views progress from almost none to a significant amount more.

The main problem, as we will see, is that there are very few records of Indigenous first-hand perspectives available in the colonial archive. Historian Richard White has noted this problem. He explains that in the early stages of Indian history (i.e. early contact/settlement periods) historians are essentially dealing with an imperial history whose documents are not produced by Indians and reduce Indians to a European order and understanding.\(^{23}\) As a result, White argues, we “rarely know Indians alone; we always know them in conversations with whites.”\(^{24}\) Building on White’s point, this literature review will study the degree to which Indigenous voices in British Columbia continue to be mediated through non-Indigenous peoples and rarely, despite the growing application of people-based research, are Indigenous peoples’ own perspectives and firsthand experiences drawn upon to inform our mainstream historical understanding. This trend can be seen woven in the last three decades of scholarship produced by historians on BC/Indigenous history.

First, to set the context for examining BC historiography, I will provide a general overview of the last three decades of work produced in other disciplines outside that of history. It is here that we begin to see the incorporation of living Indigenous perspectives gleaned from oral interviews and the application of the life history approach by

---

\(^{23}\) Richard White, “Indian Peoples and the Natural World: Asking the Right Questions,” in *Rethinking American Indian History*, ed. by Donald L. Fixico (New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 93.

\(^{24}\) White, “Indian Peoples and the Natural World,” 93.
anthropologists and the like. Dotted throughout these examples are a few historians who can be considered as the pioneers of a people-based approach in the discipline of history.

The 1960s and 1970s mark a foundational period in people-based research. Two significant British Columbian works created at this time had national influence. Canadian playwright and novelist George Ryga (1932-1987) and Secwepemc leader and activist George Manuel (1921-1989) played a profound role in bringing Indigenous issues into the public light. On 23 November 1967, Ryga’s play *The Ecstasy of Rita Joe* premiered at the Vancouver Playhouse. The play tells the story of an Indigenous woman who moves from the reserve to the city in search of work and a new life only to become disconnected both from her own people back home and from those living in the white world. It was the first Canadian play to address Indigenous peoples’ historical and contemporary issues on a national stage. It reached many communities as it travelled across Canada.

In 1974, a few years before he became the President of the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, Manuel published his seminal work *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*. Unlike any other history text available during this time, Manuel’s work offered an Indigenous historical perspective that was personal and based on lived experience. Manuel, a residential school survivor, was extremely active in bringing Indigenous social, economic and political issues to the fore during the 1950s and 60s. Both Manuel’s and Ryga’s work personalized Indigenous history and brought to light contemporary experiences that were previously silenced. *The Ecstasy of Rita Joe* and *The Fourth World* were important catalysts for subsequent Indigenous studies that began to integrate Indigenous views.
A decade after Ryga and Manuel released their work a similar movement began to emerge in BC academia. In 1977, historian Robin Fisher published his foundational study, *Contact and Conflict: Indian-European Relations in British Columbia, 1874-1890*. It offered a new approach to Indigenous history by expanding the study of Indigenous history beyond the end of the Fur Trade and into the “disruptive settlement period.” He argued that historians of this time period relied solely on European records which led to unbalanced and one-sided accounts of the past. To counter such an approach, Fisher made use of the anthropological sources for the region. Doing so, he argued, gave historians “descriptions of Indian cultures as well as insights into the Indians’ response to the impact of Europeans.” Though his study only went as far as the 1890s, his work infused new energy into Native/Newcomer studies in BC.

The 1970s also marked the beginning of active incorporation of Indigenous peoples’ perspectives into the work of anthropologists. It is during this time that we begin to see more of an Indigenous presence in academic works, not just within the page of texts, but as co-authors and collaborators of books. Historian Kathleen Mullen Sands, reflecting on the trends of the 1970s, pointed out that it was during this time period that literary and feminist scholars were also beginning to recognize and build a separate ethnic women’s

---

26 Fisher, *Contact and Conflict*, xii.
autobiographical form. In anthropology, this took the form of life history research with Indigenous women.

One sees this clearly in the pioneering works of State University New York anthropologist Margaret Blackman and University of British Columbia anthropologist Julie Cruikshank in the 1970s. Both women injected a new vigour into life history research in the Pacific Northwest with the publication of their collaborative work with Indigenous women in BC and the Yukon. Both Blackman and Cruikshank’s work, among others, shed light on the diverse life experience of Indigenous peoples, particularly women, in the twentieth century. In giving Indigenous peoples a voice in the history-telling process, Blackman and Cruikshank’s studies acted as models for other scholars. Underpinning their work was an emphasis on bringing “the past to the present.” As Cruikshank explained, the shift towards making space for Indigenous peoples to tell their own stories “begins by taking seriously what people say about their lives rather than treating their words simply as an illustration of some other process.”

Blackman’s and Cruikshank’s approaches impelled other professionals in a variety of disciplines to follow their lead.

Historian Wendy Wickwire joined this effort in 1989 with the publication of her work with Okanagan elder Harry Robinson (1900-1990). Wickwire and Robinson highlighted a line of stories rooted in the twentieth century, all of which stemmed from Robinson’s own memories. Many of his stories focused on conflicts between Euro-Canadians and Okanagan peoples. They offered valuable insights on Indigenous perspectives on recent colonialism in BC history. Also in 1989, Bridget Moran, a social worker in Prince George, published the results of her collaborative work with Mary John, a Carrier woman. Their book, *Stoney Creek Woman: the story of Mary John*, highlighted Mary John’s personal stories of growing up in a community devastated by colonialism.

Harvey Thommasen, a physician based in Bella Coola, undertook a similar project with Nuxalk elder Clayton Mack. Their work focused on Mack’s life as a hunter and guide for American tourists.

In 1988, political scientist Paul Tennant published *Aboriginal Peoples and Politics: The Indian Land Question in British Columbia, 1849-1989*, a political study that examined the historical and contemporary issues of the “Indian land question” in BC. Drawing on the ethnographic approach taken by Cruikshank, Blackman and others, Tennant based his study on interviews he did with “Indian leaders” during the 1970s. His goal was to highlight their views of the land conflicts, along with other political and social issues that pervaded their lives.

---

35 A more recently example would be that of anthropologist Martine Reid who published interviews with a contemporary Kwakwaka’wakw noblewoman, Agnes Alfred in 2004. Their work, the first publication of its kind to focus on a Kwakwaka’wakw woman, highlights Alfred’s knowledge of myth, historical accounts, and her own personal reminiscences. Agnes Alfred, *Paddling to Where I Stand: Agnes Alfred, Qwiqwasutinuxw Noblewoman*, ed. Martine J. Reid, translated by Daisy Sewid-Smith (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004).
Anthropologist Elizabeth Furniss’ 1999 study of the history of racism in Williams Lake, British Columbia, *The Burden of History: Colonialism and the Frontier Myth in a Rural Canadian Community*, is a strong example of people-based work that built upon the work of 1980s anthropologists. Furniss’s unique and influential community history project honed in on historical and contemporary racism that permeated the isolated town. Furniss drew on oral interviews and the personal commentary of community members to support her work. One of her goals was to address the prevailing issues affecting a community still dealing with colonization. “Social problems, violence, suicide, alcohol abuse, poverty, and substandard living conditions…plague reserve communities across Canada,” Furniss wrote. Williams Lake served as a good example for her larger argument that “Canada persists as a colonial society whose culture remains deeply imprinted by the legacy of colonialism.”

A growing awareness of the importance of people-based research had developed out of the 1970s and was evident in anthropology and other disciplines. It flourished during the 1980s, and by the 1990s it seemingly had a stronghold in the discipline of anthropology. This, however, was not the case for the discipline of history. What follows is an overview of key studies in history that emerged out of the 1990s and 2000s. Some first-hand Indigenous accounts are incorporated into these works; however, rarely do we see stand-alone Indigenous perspectives. Instead, when they are incorporated, Indigenous peoples’ views are mediated through the historian’s own voice and put forth as supplemental.

---


Unlike the trends apparent in anthropology, the trends in history reveal a hesitancy to fully engage the people-based approach and to incorporate oral interviews verbatim. The following examples illustrate how again, despite the developments outside the discipline, there is a strong focus on histories of the nineteenth-century. Histories of this time period have unique limitations when it comes to incorporating Indigenous views because historians have little choice but to glean Indigenous views from European sources. This, as I will demonstrate, raises some concerns.

Historian Jean Barman’s 1991 study *West Beyond the West: A History of British Columbia* referred frequently to Indigenous life histories. She cited Harry Robinson, Clayton Mack, Mary John, Florence Edenshaw Davidson, and Kwakiutl and Squamish chiefs Harry Assu and Simon Baker – but not once did she integrate their firsthand commentary into her main text. Instead, she bracketed their contributions and listed them as “supplemental sources,” useful for additional information on various topics. Further, rather than referring to these Indigenous people by name, Barman identified them as “a Kwakiutl” or “a Coast Salish.” To find out the names of Barman’s sources, the reader must flip to the footnotes at the back of the book.

Simon Fraser University historian Mary-Ellen Kelm made major strides in twentieth-century Indigenous history with the release of her book *Colonizing Bodies: Aboriginal Health and Healing in British Columbia, 1900-50*, which analyzes the impact of colonization on Indigenous peoples’ bodies, health, and mental well-being. Kelm used a variety of anthropological and ethnographical sources to support her study. She also

---

40 For example, she cited Harry Assu in *Assu of Cape Mudge* as a source on Kwak’waka’wakw arranged marriages.
41 Barman, *West Beyond the West*, 15-16.
42 Barman, *West Beyond the West*, 179.
incorporated the oral interviews she did with a number of Indigenous elders. Although unique in its approach and temporal focus, as it is based solely in the twentieth century, \textit{Colonizing Bodies} did not incorporate any verbatim Indigenous perspectives. For the most part, Kelm presented the Indigenous points of view through her own voice.

Many reviewers have praised the work of historical geographer Cole Harris for being foundational to BC/Indigenous history.\textsuperscript{43} \textit{The Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographical Change} (1997) was his first contribution.\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia}, published in 2002 his second. Both works have been heralded as making “arguably the most significant contribution to our understanding of colonialism in the province since Robin Fisher’s \textit{Contact and Conflict} (1977).”\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Making Native Space} tells the story of dispossession and displacement of Indigenous land as a result of settler expansion and resettlement. Yet despite Robin Fisher’s earlier insistence that Indigenous memories and perspectives need to take precedence in our analysis of colonialism in BC, Harris “deal[s] largely with colonial strategies and other modern ways introduced to British Columbia, and touch[es on] only a few dramatic responses from the Native world they were displacing.” He openly admits that Indigenous peoples have “an altogether other set of stories to tell.”\textsuperscript{46} In a few instances, he shared some of these stories. However, beyond a few references to Indigenous perspectives on epidemic\textsuperscript{47} and the use of chiefs’ testimony

\textsuperscript{43} In addition to \textit{Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia} (2002), see: \textit{The Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographic Change} (1997)
\textsuperscript{44} Cole Harris’ \textit{Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographical Change} (1997) makes use of some oral sources. See chapter one: “Voices of Smallpox around the Strait of Georgia.” Pages 3-31.
\textsuperscript{45} Cole Harris as quoted in Wendy Wickwire, “Behind Cole’s Notes: Reading Passion and Precision into BC Colonial History,” Invited paper at “Settler Colonialism in Canada: A Workshop on the Contributions of Cole Harris to the Historical Geography of Canada,” Conference at University of British Columbia, Vancouver (June 21-23, 2006): 1
\textsuperscript{46} Harris, \textit{Making Native Space}, xv.
\textsuperscript{47} See Cole Harris, \textit{The Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographic Change} (1997)
in the McKenna-McBride Royal Commission (1912-14), Harris included very little from a first-hand Indigenous perspective.

In her book, *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late-Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast*, historian Paige Raibmon problematized the myth of the “authentic Indian.” However, like Harris, she too ignored Indigenous perspectives. Raibmon’s study effectively demonstrates Indigenous peoples and Euro-North Americans grappling with notions of “authenticity,” but she does this largely from a Euro-Canadian standpoint. One reviewer, historian Lissa Wadewitz, argued that current historical work such as Raibmon’s is bound by the limitations of documentary evidence. Raibmon, after all, had to turn to anthropological and ethnographical materials as the source for nineteenth-century Kwakwaka'wakw perspectives. Wadewitz criticizes Raibmon on the grounds that her thesis is “sometimes undermined by the problems with sources that confront all scholars of subaltern studies” and that is the lack of Indigenous perspectives available in these Euro-generated materials that serve as the foundations for understanding this time period. Wadewitz noted that they lack perspectives of those they undertake to study. One is left wondering: how can one track Kwakwaka'wakw motives for participating in dances at the World's Fair without Native voices or assertions?

In her 2001 study of the social and cultural life of mid-nineteenth century BC, Adele Perry ran into similar problems. Perry framed her narrative mostly from the “white” or Settler perspective, largely because Indigenous peoples’ views and experiences of mid-century BC social culture are very difficult to glean from late nineteenth-century
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European sources. Reactions to Perry’s study were mixed. Historian Sarah Carter claimed that Perry’s work was important for moving beyond “happy stories [that] obscure both coercive details and the larger brutality of colonialism.” Yet historian Elizabeth Elbourne criticized it for leaving out Indigenous perspectives.

A look at two nineteenth-century mission histories further illustrates the constraints of the colonial archive. Brett Christophers, studied the late nineteenth century mission culture in Nlaka’pamux territory through the lens of Reverend John B. Good, an Anglican missionary who worked in the territory for sixteen years. To tell Good’s story, Christophers understandably turned to the imperial archive. He did the same to uncover the Nlaka’pamux perspectives. Reviewers noted the problems with Christophers’s approach. Historian Ingo W. Schroder criticized the study for “never really entering into an in-depth discussion of [Nlaka’pamux] cultural ideology.” Susan Neylan undertook a similar study of late nineteenth century mission culture in a northern BC context. Unlike Christophers, she consulted a larger body of ethnographic sources to fill in the gaps she saw in the Indigenous side of the story. The result is “a more nuanced view of process of religious change among the Tsimshian.” Yet Neylan’s work revealed the complexities of working with anthropological and ethnographic sources as a substitute for the missing “Indigenous perspectives.” As one reviewer pointed out, the sources used
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53 Elizabeth Elbourne, review of On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871, by Adele Perry, Canadian Historical Review 85 issue 3 (September, 2004), 597.
54 See Brett Christophers, Positioning the Missionary: John Booth Good and the Confluence of Cultures in Nineteenth-Century British Columbia (1999).
57 Peggy Brock, review of The Heavens are Changing: Nineteenth Century Protestant Missions and Tsimshian Christianity, by Susan Neylan, Canadian Historical Review 85, no. 1 (March 2004), 131.
to inform Neylan’s understanding of Tsimshian “pre-contact” cosmology post-dated the introduction of Christianity.58

Reviewers of Raibmon, Perry, Christophers and Neylan’s work beg the question of whether in-depth incorporation of Indigenous perspectives can be undertaken considering the limitations of the nineteenth-century colonial archive. Perhaps a more useful discussion would be on the complexity of capturing Indigenous voices within nineteenth-century European source materials. Such a discussion would lead to a more fruitful analysis of the limitations of nineteenth-century BC history for revealing the Indigenous perspective.

Historians already engaged in this discussion are Elizabeth Vibert and Daniel Clayton. Their works suggest an increasing awareness of the shortcomings of the nineteenth-century colonial archive for telling the Indigenous story.59 The nineteenth-century archive, they argue, is more useful for telling us about its European authors than for telling us about Indigenous peoples. Vibert argues that instead of taking the trader’s accounts as “whole truths,” for example, as is evident in the majority of the historical scholarship on the Plateau region, she suggests taking the opportunity to use them as insights into the traders.60 Her argument mirrors historian Richard White’s point that historians of this early period who are searching for “Indigenous perspectives” are “prisoners of the documents.”61 Documents, as Vibert and Clayton reveal, are better suited for insight into their European creators rather than their Indigenous subjects.

58 Brock, review of The Heavens are Changing, by Susan Neylan, 133.
60 Elizabeth Vibert, Traders Tales: Narratives of Cultural Encounters in the Columbia Plateau, 1807-1846 (Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997), xii
61 Richard White, “Indian Peoples and the Natural World: Asking the Right Questions,” 93.
The abundance of nineteenth-century histories of BC is clear. The problems with telling the Indigenous stories for this time period are also clear. One is left wondering: what then is the trajectory of BC history?

The work of two historians marks the emergence of a new approach to BC/Indigenous history. It is what historian Keith Thor Carlson calls commissioned history, in which historians are commissioned by communities to write community histories from their perspective. A good example is Carlson’s own work. For the past 15 years, Carlson has been working closely with the Stó:lō Nation. The Stó:lō commissioned Carlson to create a number of books on their behalf, including You are called to Witness (2003) and the Stó:lō Coast-Salish Historical Atlas (2001). Both were co-authored with Stó:lō historian, Albert Jules McHalsie. The Atlas uses the format of a geographical atlas to convey Stó:lō knowledge and history of their territory. Included are stories and events of historical significance to the community. They range from transformation and creation stories to the historical impact of residential school and settler encroachment on their culture and traditional territories. His work has been received very well, by both the Indigenous community and the academic community. It is interesting, however, to note that despite the community’s involvement at various levels in the development of the books, it is still Carlson’s voice that takes precedence. An example of this is the chapter on St. Mary’s Boarding School and Stó:lō residential school history. Where one may
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expect to read Stó:lō perspectives on a very specially Stó:lō experience, one finds no unmediated Stó:lō voice at all.\(^\text{64}\)

The other is evident in historian John Lutz’s most recent work, *Makuk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations*. Lutz turns a new and “diologic” lens on the early contact period. He brings his study well into the twentieth-century and includes Indigenous peoples’ lived experiences in the form of oral narratives, interviews and commentary. For this, his work has been very well received by both the academic and Indigenous community. But we must still consider that to a large degree, the Indigenous voice available in *Makuk* is still heavily mediated not only through Lutz’s voice, but through the non-Indigenous voices of the imperial archive. He places the bulk of Indigenous voices in footnotes and appendices and gives preference to the evidence culled from the colonial archive.

In conclusion, based on the works revealed in this chapter, I argue that the writing of BC history today suffers from several major limitations. A majority of historians remain discipline-bound (despite the influence of anthropology, political science, and elsewhere that lays out dynamic approaches and methodologies for the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives of the past including oral interviews, life history and people-based research). These alternative ways of studying the past are especially important for historical scholarship considering that historians continue to tell (and re-tell) one-sided histories of the nineteenth century without acknowledging the problems of the colonial archive. There continues to be a troubling lack of Indigenous perspectives available for nineteenth century BC history, though this time period is still given ample attention by historians. Of

course, even while attempting to address this void, we must be wary of the always-
present limitations of all primary sources generated by Europeans in the nineteenth-
century to inform us on Indigenous historical experiences. As Clayton and Vibert remind
us, even a study of ethnographies and Euro-generated sources from the nineteenth
century are perhaps better suited for their insight into nineteenth century Euro-Canadian
culture than into Indigenous cultures and experiences they were observing.

Emma Battel Lowman, who identified this trend in her research on Lytton missionary
Stanley Higgs, concluded that the BC historiography is heavily weighted with histories
about “firsts”: first contact with Indigenous peoples, the first explorers, the first traders,
the first missionaries, the first settlers, etc.65 These “firsts,” however, almost by
definition, rarely took place beyond the turn of the twentieth century. This means that
within a very large portion of BC historiography, the Indigenous historical experience has
been based on European sources.

There are a number of historians bringing their studies into the twentieth century and
including Indigenous perspectives;66 however, many continue to rely heavily on the
colonial archive and on the Euro-Canadian-generated print sources as substitutes or
qualifiers of Indigenous perspectives. This is unsettling, considering that living
Indigenous peoples are available to speak to their experiences during the twentieth-
century. Many of these people not only remember but actually experienced the topics
under study. Wickwire notes, “If historians are truly serious about incorporating
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Indigenous histories into the mainstream record, they must recognize the limitations of the archives and begin to move instead toward fuller and more dynamic sources.**67**

In the next chapter I turn to these more dynamic sources and I propose that they form the beginning of an Indigenous archive in BC. These sources, as you will see, are created by Indigenous peoples and they range from materials produced for public consumption, like children's books, novels and art; to materials created specifically for community consumption, like family histories and compilations of interviews with elders that focus on preserving traditions and cultural practices. Each in its own way is a unique source of history. Unlike their academic counterpart addressed in this chapter, these sources are rooted in the recent past. Memory and personal experience, not Euro-generated documentary materials, serve as the evidence for these materials. There is a strong focus on the legacy of colonization; the pain of which is felt throughout almost all of the examples shared in the next chapter. Consider that a large and diverse Indigenous archive exists alongside mainstream academic historiography, yet few historians are aware of it or even willing to consider it.
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Chapter Three: Indigenous Archive

Shin-chi and Shi-shi-etko are preparing to go to residential school. This is Shin-chi’s first year; he is six. Shi-shi-etko went for the first time last year; she is eight. They are both sad to leave their family; the children’s family does not want to let them go. If it were not for a law that said they must send them, their family would not do it. Soon a cattle truck comes to pick up the two children along with the other school-aged children from their reserve. The siblings wave good-bye to their parents and their grandmother. They will see them next summer. While at residential school, Shin-chi is called David and Shi-shi-etko is called Mary. They are not allowed to speak their language; they are not allowed to speak to one another. It is a confusing time for them both.

Like Shin-chi and Shi-shi-etko, Seepeetza must go to residential school – Kalamak Indian Residential School. While there, she keeps a secret journal in which she writes about her daily experiences: playground fights, being strapped by Sister Superior for accidently wetting the bed or for daydreaming in class, feeling hungry, missing her family. Seepeetza, who is called Martha while at residential school, is also not allowed to talk to her siblings who attend the same school or see her parents who live just a few miles away. Her journal entries are filled with memories of home: trips she has taken with her dad, horseback-riding with her sister, snuggling with her mom under warm quilts. These memories give her comfort throughout the school year.

Shin-chi, Shi-shi-etko and Seepeetza are fictional characters from two children’s books: Shin-chi’s Canoe (2008) by Nicola I. Campbell and My Name is Seepeetza (1992) by Shirley Sterling. Campbell, who is of Nlaka’pamux and Métis ancestry, based the stories of Shin-chi and Shi-shi-etko on interviews she did with residential school
survivors from her family. Sterling, also Nlaka’pamux, was a residential school survivor. She attended Kamloops Residential School (1893-1977) in the 1950s. *My Name is Seepeetza* is based on her own experiences. Both books, which draw on first-hand knowledge, are part of a recent emergence of work that brings to light the disturbing realities of Indigenous peoples’ shared past.

Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun’s artwork also addresses residential school history. He is of Okanagan and Cowichan ancestry, born in Kamloops, BC in 1954. Like Sterling, he too attended the Kamloops Indian Residential School. Yuxweluptun’s critically-acclaimed art documents and promotes change in contemporary Indigenous history. Using large-scale paintings, his work explores historical issues affecting Indigenous peoples’ lives.68 As in the case of Campbell and Sterling, Yuxweluptun uses first-hand knowledge to confront the history of residential school. His 2005 piece *Portrait of a Residential School Child* (162.5x133cm), for example, demonstrates his engagement with this history through art. Art critic Sarah Milroy of the *Globe and Mail* describes the painting as “a seamless hybrid of aboriginal and Christian iconography, uncomfortably co-joined.”69 As Yuxweluptun puts it, his work “up-dates history,” and at the same time forces into public view the experiences of a residential school survivor.

**Introduction**

These three examples raise interesting questions about the production of history: who constructs it, in what ways, and for whom? The production of history has long been reserved for the trained professional historian, but the examples included here challenge this idea. This chapter will highlight the contributions of twentieth-century Indigenous
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peoples of British Columbia in making and telling history by drawing on a unique collection of their historical records. These written records, which reflect a diverse and wide range of individual experiences, make up the Indigenous archive in British Columbia. They challenge conventional notions of history and they ought to be engaged as part of the production of BC history. However, despite the Indigenous archive’s relevance to our historical understanding, it remains largely overlooked.

Indigenous peoples in BC are using a variety of mediums to tell their histories, including (but not limited to) novels, autobiography, poetry, plays, art and film. Individuals are producing their own community historical records; they are publishing them in books and telling them through community-run museums and urban-based traditional architecture. Others are hiring academic historians to write their community histories in ways they want them told. Currently, a new cohort of Indigenous graduate students in history, anthropology, environmental studies and law is using theses and dissertations to tell their family and community histories in unique ways.

This chapter will survey the large and growing body of materials that comprise the Indigenous archive in BC. It is divided into four main sections. In the first, I highlight works that scrutinize the colonial archive and its hegemonic grip on our historical understanding. For this, I draw on African and Asian scholarship that argues for the recognition and use of new and more dynamic historical sources. The arguments made in these works take root in other colonial historical contexts (Africa and Asia); but, they have yet to be applied to a BC/Indigenous historical context. In the second section, I turn to residential school history and its legacy. A major theme running through Indigenous peoples’ colonial experience in BC and in Canada is the personal and intergenerational
impact of the residential school experience. By drawing on a number of key sources from
the Indigenous archive, I will demonstrate how personal reflections on residential school
history are a consistent part of Indigenous historical accounts as survivors and their
families come to terms with this part of their shared past. The third section covers the
ongoing impacts of the legacy of colonialism in the present. Its impacts are detectable in
memories shared in the various historical materials that I discuss here. The examples
reveal that many Indigenous people continue to carry painful memories and endure
trauma as a result of the impact of colonialism. Finally, in the fourth section, I highlight
work that exemplifies how Indigenous peoples are actively and purposefully re-storying
the past using their own first-hand knowledge. These works are rooted in family history
and collective memory. In many ways, they move beyond the traumas of colonialism to
reclaim the past and change how we engage with it.

My goal in writing this chapter was to identify some common issues that Indigenous
community members, artists, writers and others are highlighting in their work. I quickly
discovered that most are dealing, in one way or other, with the legacy of colonization. I
then discovered that many are targeting the residential school as a primary agent of
colonization. Many are going to their communities, rather than the public archive and
official written record, to find their evidence. Here individuals and communities are
telling their own histories in their own ways. The result is a unique and living
historiography with little in common with its academic counterpart.

**Background**

In addition to highlighting Indigenous peoples’ records of the recent past, this chapter
asks readers to seek out a more complex and nuanced understanding of history. To do so,
I argue, requires us to reconsider what constitutes an archive. This line of inquiry, although yet to be fully considered in BC, is not new. Historians Luise White, Antoinette Burton, and Ann Laura Stoler, among others, are currently arguing for a re-conceptualization of the archive. They insist that it include more dynamic and fluid sources.

In 2000, White published an historical analysis of East African vampire stories. The stories, she argues, “offer historians a way to see the world the way the storyteller did.” White contends that with some interrogating, the vampire stories provide new sets of evidence; they become the basis for re-writing the history of colonial East Africa. White takes the vampire stories “at face-value.” They reveal a world through the eyes of East Africans who, for the most part, have been left out of the colonial history-telling process of their region. Like other unconventional historical sources, White argues that these vampire stories “change the way historical reconstruction is done” because they recast prevailing interpretations and offer new sets of questions.

White’s colleague, anthropologist Carolyn Hamilton, offers a similar perspective in her study of alternative historical sources in South Africa. Hamilton’s goal is to better understand and critique the biased colonial record of twentieth-century South African history. Hamilton, Verne Harris, and Graeme Reid, in their introduction to Reconfiguring...
the Archive, demonstrate that alternative historical sources exist in a variety of different forms. “Literature, landscape, dance, art, and a host of other forms [such as, cultural mnemonics],” they write, “offer archival possibilities capable of releasing different kinds of information about the past, shaped by a different record-keeping process.”

Like the others, Antoinette Burton sheds light on new sources that provide insight into “unstoried” aspects of the past. In *Dwelling in the Archive*, she makes a case for what she calls a “re-conceptualization” of the colonial archive to illuminate the experiences of women of the late colonial period in India. She maintains that “memory” and various history-telling places such as the “house” and the “home” are sites of historical knowledge. She uses these concepts to challenge historians to reconsider what constitutes legitimate, “reliable” evidence of the past.

American historian Ann Laura Stoler issues a similar challenge. In her “Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance,” she draws attention to a new “archival turn” in history. Stoler highlights the emergence of scholarly work over the last decade that challenges the colonial archive by asking the following questions: whose archive is it, who maintains it, and to what ends? Stoler argues that a more ethnographic study of the colonial archive will render it more a subject rather than a source of study.

Applying Stoler, White, Hamilton and Burton’s insights to BC yields some significant historical innovations. In BC, the Indigenous archive – like White’s vampire stories,
Hamilton’s landscapes and mnemonics, and Burton’s house and home—sheds light on the way Indigenous peoples or, to borrow a term from Burton, the “rememberers,” in essence, remember the recent past. Using the insights of these scholars as my starting point, I will show that the sources that make up the BC Indigenous archive, when taken at face value, “make for better, more comprehensive histories” of the Indigenous past.  

**Residential School History and its Legacy**

Over the past two decades, former residential school students have made countless public claims through the courts and media about their experiences at residential school. As a result, residential school history has come under increased public scrutiny, culminating with the announcement of the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* (TRC) in 2008. This recent public emergence of personal stories about residential school history is mirrored in academia. Over the last decade, some historians have begun incorporating Indigenous peoples’ personal and first-hand accounts of their experiences in residential schools into their studies, many using oral interviews with survivors. For the most part, however, the topic remains relegated to the margins, too contentious for the non-Indigenous scholar to engage. In contrast, Indigenous peoples have had no choice but to be fully entangled in this past. The stories they are telling and sharing publicly using forums such as the TRC attest to this. In addition, they are using a variety of other mediums to share their experiences and actively confront this past.
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84 The TRC was designed to provide a culturally appropriate forum for residential school survivors and their children to share and officially document their experiences. It was a government funded commission that helps survivors heal and promotes reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. According to the TRC, during the residential school era in Canada, approximately 150,000 children were placed in residential schools, more often than not, against their parents will. The TRC estimates that there are 80,000 residential school survivors alive today.

Nlaka’pamux playwright Kevin Loring confronts residential school history and its legacy in his Governor General award-winning play Where the Blood Mixes (2009). In a recent interview with Joe Wiebe for the Belfry Theatre in Victoria, BC, Loring explains that “all the main characters [in the play] are either directly or indirectly affected by their experiences at residential school.”

Loring, whose mother attended residential school, explains that he wants to deal with how the residential school experience “echoes [through]… the community” via alcohol abuse, community fragmentation, and individual and collective grief. Many children from his region attended residential schools; these included St. George's Indian Residential School (1902-1979), All Hallows Indian Residential School for native and Anglican girls (1884 –1917), and the Kamloops Indian Residential School (1893-1977).

In his play, Loring deals with the intergenerational impacts these schools had on his community.

As a child, Floyd, a character in Loring’s play, was forced by law to attend residential school. Now, two decades later, having lost almost everything, Floyd is trying to rekindle a relationship with his daughter, Christine, who was taken from Floyd and raised by a White family in the city. Christine is embarking on her own journey. She is trying to understand her father’s past and trying to reconcile the history she and her blood family carry. Floyd’s friend and fellow student at residential school, Mooch, is also coming to terms with his past. A victim of sexual abuse at the hands of the Church, Mooch is struggling to shake his dark secrets. As the play unfolds, the aftermath and the intergenerational effects of the residential school experience are clearly laid out.
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88 Note that All Hallows was a school for white girls and Indian girls. When the school closed in1917 the girls were transferred to St. Georges School for boys and girls in Lytton, BC. See Jean Barman’s “Separate and Unequal: Indian and White Girls at All Hallows School, 1884-1920” for a history of the All Hallows school.
Syliva Olsen, Rita Morris and Ann Sam also deal with residential school history in their youth fiction novel *No Time to Say Goodbye: Children’s Stories of Kuper Island Residential School* (2001). Although a work of fiction, *No Time to Say Goodbye* personalizes an aspect of BC’s history that is very real. It tells the story of five Tsartlip children – Thomas, Wilson, Joey, Nelson, and Monica – who attend Kuper Island Residential School (1890-1978) during the 1950s. The book documents each child’s experience: in his first weeks of school Wilson almost starves to death; Thomas is taken to the school without his parents’ consent; Joey attempts to escape, and is successful, but his mother sends him back to the school out of fear of the authorities; Monica is sexually abused by the head priest; and Nelson, who excels at athletics, uses running to keep him grounded at the school.

Though *No Time to Say Goodbye* is fiction, it offers haunting reflections of what former students of Kuper Island Residential School actually experienced. The story is based on interviews the authors did with members of the Tsartlip community and family members who had survived residential schools. The stories of all five children were based on the experiences of former students of Kuper Island Residential School. Interviewees peer-reviewed the book and provided feedback to the authors. The novel reflects not only the authors’ relationship to this history of Kuper Island, but the whole community’s relationship to and participation in its shared past.

Filmmaker Christine Welsh also interviewed former students of Kuper Island Residential School for her 1998 film *Kuper Island: Return to the Healing Circle*. The film documents former students’ journey back to Kuper Island twenty years after it formally closed in 1978. In the film, a number of survivors share stories about their
experiences with sexual and cultural abuse, starvation and loneliness, and of the effects
those experiences have had on their lives. One young man featured in the film attended
Kuper Island when he was a little boy. In a healing circle documented in the film, he
speaks candidly of his alcohol abuse – a coping mechanism he used to forget the deep-
seated memories of his school years. He, like others in the film, is on a journey towards
reconciliation with his own past. His story encapsulates the film’s haunting
personification of residential school history, and of the story of healing as survivors
continue to try to survive their past.

Loring, Olsen, Morris, Sam, and Welsh, along with the three storytellers profiled at the
beginning of this chapter, have some notable commonalities: Sterling, Yuxweluptun, and
Sam are residential school survivors; Campbell and Loring are first generation residential
school survivors (children of those who have actually attended residential school). Welsh,
Olsen and Morris are part of the larger community of people that are connected to
residential school survivors. All are witnesses and carriers of residential school histories;
all are either telling or collecting these histories and sharing them publicly for both
personal and political reasons.

The histories and their rememberers reveal that the memories of residential school live
deep within survivors, their kin and their communities. The very act of sharing their
stories is courageous and part of a purposeful effort to break the silences about our shared
past. This act serves as a crucial part of the healing process – but it is also a part of
recognizing that the past is remembered differently than what is available in mainstream
and colonial historical records about the recent past. These stories reveal that the lived
experiences of residential schools has significantly impacted not only individuals, but
families, and generations of families – and this continues to play out all around us. Mainstream histories often do not capture the fact that these stories are not just part of the past, they are also part of present.

While the residential school experience is perhaps the most renowned of the colonial legacy in BC, it is just one facet of it. Others are telling and sharing their historical experiences to inform the public of past (and present) injustices that go beyond the more infamous residential school history. But like residential school survivors, their stories challenge the official record using facts and memories based on personal and collective experience.

**Colonialism**

For Indigenous peoples, the twentieth century has been wrought with pain as a result of colonialism. The contemporary impact of colonialism is often left out of the mainstream historical records, obscuring the fact that it pervades Indigenous stories and histories. According to Waziyatawin, a Wahpetunwan Dakota scholar, when we question whether the root causes of the pain still affect our lives, we see that the same oppression our people faced in the past still exists today.89 Colonialism, which is often studied at a theoretical level in mainstream historical texts, is not an abstract concept or theory in the Indigenous archive. On the contrary, colonialism is not only a constant and consistent part of Indigenous peoples’ everyday lives, it is visibly woven throughout their memories. Some never fully identify it as such, while others name it and actively funnel their frustrations at it. The examples that follow do much to reveal the impact that colonialism has on Indigenous peoples’ lives and emotional well-being today and
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throughout the past. Their stories force us to move beyond theory and to confront the human experience. On the ground, Indigenous peoples experienced and continue to experience devastation and to struggle as a result of colonialism. The following stories are very much part of what Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith calls an “epic storytelling of huge devastation, painful struggle and persistent survival.”

In 1994, geographer Helen Bromley interviewed Dorothy Walkem Ursaki (1907-1997), a Nlaka’pamux woman, for her MA thesis on disease ecology in the Fraser Thompson Canyon region. Bromley argues that little attention had been paid to the social influences of disease on Indigenous peoples in BC. She uses Dorothy’s childhood memories as the main source of her evidence. Dorothy’s history-telling revealed that contaminated water was the source of many problems in the small town of Spences Bridge, BC, and that social inequalities influenced who got clean drinking water and who did not. Dorothy’s firsthand account gave Bromley an opportunity to see how this played out in peoples’ lives and memories.

Dorothy’s perspective on the water issue revealed that colonial oppression was experienced by children. In a conversation with Bromley, Dorothy explained the situation as follows: raw sewage, she stressed, flowed in “…from the town site of Spences Bridge where the white people lived – there was no Indian people on the town site – we were lower down…all the raw sewage was going into the river.” Dorothy recalled a doctor from Ashcroft who vomited the first time he saw the river water. Shocked by the amount
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of sewage in the river water, the doctor asked Dorothy’s father, Charles Walkem, whether they really had been drinking it. “We’d been drinking this for years,” noted Dorothy.94

The polluted drinking water had devastating effects on Dorothy’s family and in interviews she did with others, she stressed this point. In a conversation with historian Wendy Wickwire in 1993, she shared the story of her sister, Ester, who died of typhoid from the dirty drinking water:

My five year old sister was in the…girl’s [residential] school…. She cried all the time. She was only five. Of course she was lost. And she eventually was taken to Lytton hospital also and they said she’s got typhoid. She was there for months. She couldn’t hold anything in her stomach. And I’ve asked doctors about that. They said your lower bowel collapses when you have typhoid. She was there for months. She was just skin and bone. She was at home, I don’t know how long. She was just in bed all the time. My dad he laid off his work, whatever work he was doing and they’d ask what she would like [to eat]. She threw everything up. She couldn’t hold anything in her stomach. She finally died. She’s buried in Spences Bridge on our Indian Reserve cemetery.

I would like to know who is responsible for this. I lost my beautiful sister. She would have been 81 years old and she died when she when five and a half. She suffered for six months before she finally died. I think of her often. And I want to know whose fault that was. It was somebody’s fault. Just because were Natives…we were here first…we couldn’t get fresh water to drink…they had to throw all the dirt in there. I guess they were in a hurry to get rid of us.95

When one listens to Dorothy’s voice on the oral recording of her interview with Wickwire, the trauma of her experience is almost palpable. She is clearly upset and her voice shakes with pain and anger over the death of her sister. Although the details of Dorothy’s story are important, the power of the story is her raw emotion. This is

colonialism: Indigenous peoples denied access to clean drinking water, while their White neighbours received it with little thought about what their sewage was doing to Indigenous people downstream. In theory, it is a story of power and oppression. For Dorothy and her family, colonialism goes beyond theory to real life. So real and devastating was the death of her sister that it continued to affect her, decades later.

The themes of Dorothy’s story are not uncommon within the BC Indigenous archive. Many sources draw attention to the toll – emotional or otherwise – colonialism has taken on human lives. Consider Mary John (1913-2004) from the Stoney Creek First Nation. Like Dorothy, Mary shared stories of neglect, trauma and oppression in her book *Stoney Creek Woman*. Written in partnership with social worker Bridget Moran, who met Mary in the early 1970s, the book describes Mary’s life growing up on Stoney Creek Indian Reserve. Throughout the book, Mary recalls poignant memories from her childhood. In a candid admission to Moran, she reveals that her mother was raped at age 13 by an Englishman named Charlie Pinker and that this man was Mary’s father.96 Moran, having witnessed the telling of Mary’s stories, shares insight into the emotional toll it had on Mary, who, visibly upset by her memories, struggled to share her stories. Moran recalls: “it is when Mary speaks of what has not been good in her personal life that grief drops her voice almost to a whisper.”97

Like *Stoney Creek Woman*, the film *Finding Dawn* (2006) by Christine Welsh confronts a more recent history of colonialism and its impact on Indigenous women and their families. Welsh is keenly aware that Indigenous women’s colonial experiences tend

97 Moran, *Stoney Creek Woman*, 11.
to occupy the margins of public consciousness. Like her other films,98 *Finding Dawn* makes space for Indigenous women to tell their own stories. “One of my goals as a filmmaker,” said Welsh at the premiere of her 2006 film *Finding Dawn* at Cinematheque in Vancouver, “is to do what I can to give voices to those who don’t always have a voice.”99

*Finding Dawn* documents recent cases of missing Indigenous women who remain ignored, their cases unresolved by both the public and the RCMP. Central to the film is the story of Daleen Kay Bosse of Alberta, who was missing for more than six months before the RCMP finally heeded Daleen’s parents’ repeated calls for help and assistance in finding their daughter. Daleen, who is still missing, is one of approximately 600 Indigenous women who have gone missing or murdered in Canada over the last three decades.100 In BC, as the film illustrates, more than 60 Indigenous women have disappeared along the “Highway of Tears”101 with very little attention paid by the RCMP or the public. The film puts faces and names to these missing women. It also points a finger at colonialism and the extent to which its systemic nature has affected Indigenous women.

Okanagan scholar, writer, and activist Jeannette Armstrong uses literature in similar ways that Welsh uses film. In her critically acclaimed adolescent novel, *Slash*, she writes about a young Okanagan man coming of age in the 1970s and 80s during the grassroots era of Indigenous political movements in British Columbia. In the novel, Tommy
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101 The “Highway of Tears” – a name that has been given to the 720km stretch of highway that connects Prince George, BC to Prince Rupert, BC that is notorious for the number of women who have gone missing or been murdered while travelling it.
Kelasket, who got the nickname Slash after getting into a bar fight, travelled around North America in his early twenties joining protests of all kinds, including the 1972 march of the “Trail of Broken Treaties,” the occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in Washington, DC, and Wounded Knee in 1973. Closer to home, Slash participated in Band Office sit-ins and protests both in his home community and in Vancouver. The people of Slash’s generation and community were becoming disconnected from their culture and traditions; many of them turned to drugs and alcohol, and got swept up in the excesses of capitalism. Slash witnessed what was happening in the world around him: his people struggling to fit in to mainstream society, struggling politically to save their land and resources from continued encroachment, and struggling to hang on to their traditions and culture. What he witnessed and experienced himself is colonialism and Armstrong’s novel documents Slash’s effort to articulate this. *Slash*, published in 1985, is the first book in Canada written by an Indigenous female author to bring these issues to the public. It puts a name and face, albeit fictional ones, to the realities of Indigenous life in the 1970s and 80s.

Artist Yuxweluptun expresses his vision of colonialism in a different way. The figures, landscapes, imagery and colours in his work reveal a world ravaged by colonialism. He says that he paints what it “feels like to be Native.” The landscapes are bleak and decrepit and the human forms look unhealthy and almost skeletal. Interestingly, he and Armstrong are of the same generation. He also takes on similar issues as Armstrong, including the political tensions of the late twentieth-century, capitalism, cultural disconnection and confusion. His 1984-1988 works are most indicative of his
engagement with the consequences of colonialism. Consider the following: *Outstanding Business, Reservation Cut-off Lands* (1984, 210.8 x 281.9cm), *Profile of and Indian Bureaucrat* (1985, 182 x 91cm), *Severing Aboriginal Birghtrights and Extinguishing Policy* (1986, 170.2 x 317.5cm), *Downtown Vancouver* (1987, 174 x 127 cm), *The Universe so Big, the White Man Keeps Me on My Reservation* (1987, 182.9 x 228 cm), and *Throwing their Culture Away* (1988, 91.4 x 66 cm). The titles alone draw attention to the realities of the 1980s. As in *Slash*, Yuxwelupton demonstrates how politically and culturally volatile this time was. His work provides an insider’s view of the world around him.

Another Indigenous artist who is exploring the emotional impact of colonialism is Kwantlen poet and playwright Joseph Dandurand.103 His work reflects his anger and frustration with the past and present effects of colonialism.104 Dandurand’s 1998 poem, “Fort Langley”105 offers an alternative view of the history of Fort Langley, operated by the Hudson’s Bay Company Trading post on Kwantlen traditional territories from 1827 to 1886. Contrary to the standard colonial history of the Fort, Dandurand’s poem weaves “personal and colonial history together”106 and provides insight into the impact the Fort had on his community. In the poem, Danadurand “resists” the broader and more intrusive
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103 For Dandurand’s historical poems relating to residential school history, see: “St. Mary’s III” and “St. Mary’s IV” available online: http://www.hanksville.org/storytellers/dandurand/
105 See also: Dandurand’s *Upside Down Raven, I Touched the Coyote’s Tongue*, and *burning for the dead and scratching for the poor.*
colonial record by offering a counter historical perspective that is based on what he has
witnessed around him.\textsuperscript{107}

Fort Langley

you can see the fort from where I live.

wooden walls,
trees,
desperate voices.
they call to me,
come on over,
come on over
come on.

shut up,
I say.
shut up and stay over there.

used to drink at that bar,
used to sip whiskey,
used to fight,
used to be blind from it all.

now
I stare at their walls.
wooden walls.
thick with history.

many men and women never made it home.
they found them trying to climb over the walls.
whiskey bottles broken and empty roll down to the
river,
laceless shoes sit silent as if wanting to fit someone else,
a picture of someone’s mother blows away and over the
walls,
the gate is closed.

the fort.
over that way.
over past the mass grave.

Dandurand’s poem blurs the lines between the past and the present: “I can see the fort from where I live,” he writes. Yet as Dandurand looks at the fort, he is remembering history. The fort represents loss – loss of time spent drinking, loss of culture, and loss of people to smallpox. For Dandurand, all of this is encapsulated in the physical presence of the fort. Dandurand’s poem is a powerful example of how colonialism, its impact and its legacy, continues to take a toll on people who live with it. Jeannette Armstrong calls this style of writing “resistance poetry.” Its very nature confronts and resists the colonial narrative of the past and present. In her edited anthology of Indigenous poetry in Canada, Armstrong stresses that poetry is “a way to distil into symbolic imagery a perspective coming from our common experience of being Native in Canada.”

The examples given here illustrate Indigenous peoples’ experiences of colonialism in the twentieth century. Dorothy Ursaki and Mary John grew up in similar eras, and their stories reveal that the impacts of colonialism in their childhoods continue to echo through their lives. Through Finding Dawn, filmmaker Christine Welsh shows how colonialism has shaped the structural inequalities that allow missing and murdered Indigenous women to go ignored. Armstrong, through the eyes of Slash, along with Yuxweluptun and

---

Dandurand, reveals that Indigenous people continue to grapple with the political injustices and cultural dispossession of their generations. Together, these “rememberers” voice the history of colonialism. They also put names and faces to colonialism across generations. They humanize history by saying this happened to me, and this continues to happen to us.

Reclaiming the Past

The following examples are part of an emerging trend that challenges mainstream historiography by putting forth new kinds of stories. These are stories of resilience, reclamation and revitalization. Collectively, they acknowledge the shared traumas and oppression of colonialism; but instead of remaining preoccupied with colonialism’s damaging effects, they emphasize strengths and celebrate that which has survived. The following are stories of the endurance of individuals, of families, of communities, of traditions and of ways of being. Together, they confront injustice and re-story the past. They are also tools used to restore communities’ pride and to empower younger generations.

Nuu-chah-nulth hereditary Chief Earl Maquinna George told his life story in his book Living on the Edge: Nuu-chah-nulth History from an Ahousaht Chief’s Perspective (2003). In his introduction, George explained that he produced the book because he “want[ed] [his readers] to know about [his] family and about the changes in the structure of the village, the families, the residential school. “These changes,” he wrote, “have much to do with our lives.” He felt that he had something different to offer than that which was available in the ethnographic accounts and other academic studies of the Nuu-chah-
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110 Chief Earl Maquinna George, Living on the Edge: Nuu-chah-nulth History from an Ahousaht Chief’s Perspective (Winlaw, BC: Sononis Press, 2003), 15.
nullth people. His stories, unlike mainstream Nuu-chah-nulth histories, are rooted in first-hand experience. This kind of perspective was something he felt was greatly lacking in non-Indigenous historical and anthropological “reconstructions” of the Indigenous past.\textsuperscript{111}

Nancy Turner and Dave Duffus, George’s MA co-supervisors assisted greatly with the book’s production. In the preface, the noted that they were moved by his motivations: George’s “life story,” they explained, “told in his own words, stands as an important record and insight into a troubled and challenging time for Aboriginal peoples and their neighbours along the British Columbia coast.”\textsuperscript{112} George explains it as follows:

\begin{quote}
There has been a great deal to think about joining the past to the present and planning for the future of our people. This book documents some legends, recollections, and my own thoughts and feelings to develop a story that may allow onlookers to understand some of the things that are not readily apparent, especially to non-native people, about a coastal First Nation and the relationship between the people, the land, and the sea.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

George’s work is important for illustrating Indigenous peoples’ individual and personal recollections of the past, especially on topics of twentieth-century Nuu-chah-nulth family history, land and resource dispossession and the BC treaty process as experienced by his community.

Shirley Louis of the Head of the Okanagan Lake First Nation has produced a similar work of family and community history in her book \textit{Q’Sapi: A History of Okanagan People as Told by Okanagan Families} (2002). “Q’Sapi serves to pay tribute to our

\textsuperscript{111} Chief Earl Maquinna George, \textit{Living on the Edge: Nuu-chah-nulth History from an Ahousaht Chief’s Perspective} (Winlaw, BC: Sononis Press, 2003), 38.

\textsuperscript{112} Nancy Turner and David Duffus, “Forward,” in \textit{Living on the Edge: Nuu-chah-nulth History from an Ahousaht Chief’s Perspective} by Chief Earl Maquinna George (Winlaw, BC: Sononis Press, 2003), 9.

\textsuperscript{113} George, \textit{Living on the Edge}, 14.
ancestors,” writes Louis, and “provide the means whereby the Okanagan people can remember their history through stories and photographs.” Louis stresses that one of her goals in writing Q’sapi was to preserve traditional Okanagan names. She also describes the work as “an education of a people’s history and the stories associated with that history.” The book has a different historical emphasis than most mainstream community histories. Stories of sports teams, of experiences in the First and Second World Wars, and numerous family photographs are included in the book. In a review, historian Jenny Clayton describes it as a “path-breaking Aboriginal-authored history, one that offers a multi-voiced insider perspective of a community that has been marginalized in other histories of the Okanagan.” Counter to mainstream records in which “non-Aboriginal historians…situate First Nations people and their significance to community development in the margins…[Q’Sapi] inverts this picture by placing the Okanagan people at the centre of the story and non-Aboriginal settlers at the edges.” The book focuses on people and topics of the past that are integral to the community and it offers a rich insight not only into recent Okanagan history, but into Okanagan people and experiences.

The Kwakwaka’waka peoples are also re-storying events of the remembered past. Since the 1970s, The U’mista Cultural Centre in Alert Bay, BC has served as a community museum. The 1884 potlatch laws made the potlatch, a significant aspect of Kwakwaka’waka culture and tradition, illegal for more than half a century. Numerous
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cultural pieces – including regalia, rattles, coppers, and drums – were confiscated or, in some cases, stolen from Indigenous communities by the Canadian government. The majority of these items, most of which held great spiritual, cultural and personal significance, were sold to museums and into private collections around the world.

U’mista, which means “the return of something important” in the Kwakwa’la language, documents this history as experienced by the Kwakwaka’waka peoples. Unlike state-run museums, U’mista is owned and operated by the community. The emphasis at U’mista is very much on the cultural and spiritual significance of the pieces and on the devastation the community experienced upon the items’ removal. The exhibits also document the process by which the community reclaimed its belongings. While many pieces of ceremonial regalia remain in state and private collections, the museum pays tribute to the ones that have been returned home.

Like the Kwakwaka’waka, the Lekwungen and Esquimalt Nations of southern Vancouver Island have been reclaiming their history through another unique historical register, namely through the use of public art forms. In 2004, the two nations partnered with the City of Victoria, the Provincial Capital Commission, and the Greater Victoria Harbour Authority to develop a self-guided historical and cultural tour of Victoria that recognized Lekwungen and Esquimalt land-use and occupation predating colonial settlement. By 2008, seven carved, bronze-casted, enlarged spindle whorls – “small discs used traditionally for spinning wool”119 – were placed around downtown Victoria at significant Lekwungen cultural and historical sites. Each spindle whorl, which was carved by master carver Butch Dick, includes a description of the traditional place name

119 “Signs of Lekwungen” (brochure online), City of Victoria (website) http://www.victoria.ca/cityhall/comdev_ccv_wlkwy.shtml (accessed 23 September 2010)
and of the landscape’s cultural and historical significance. The spindle whorl’s story of the landscape of greater Victoria draws public attention to Coast Salish history that lies just below its colonial surface.

The re-storying of the recent past using community knowledge can also be seen in community-university collaborations. Take, for example, historian Dan Marshall’s work with the Cowichan Nation on Vancouver Island. In 1999 he published *Those who fell from the Sky*, a history of the Cowichan people beginning with the Cowichan creation story and spanning well into the twentieth century. The book conveys significant Cowichan events using documentary evidence coupled with oral sources and puts the emphasis on events that are most significant to the Cowichan. For example, it highlights the 1906 trip to England undertaken by a number of BC Chiefs (including one from Cowichan) to deliver a petition to King Edward VII outlining the dispossession of Cowichan traditional territories. This particular event has served as a touchstone for the Cowichan people in their struggle to protect their hereditary lands from continued settler encroachment for more than 150 years. Oral traditions and stories reveal the connection to the territories and lands of the Cowichan; they assert that they have occupied these lands since the beginning of time. Marshall demonstrates how over the last 150 years, Cowichan stories and claims have been “white-washed” by colonial histories. An in-depth analysis of the colonial archive reveals how Cowichan territories were “illegally annexed by the colony.” In the introduction to the book, Cowichan elder Wes Modeste writes that the book is the first Cowichan history “written for and approved by the
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Cowichan Tribe.” Its purpose is twofold: to inform non-native readers of Cowichan history and to inform Cowichan youth of their past.

For thirty years, Tlingit writer Nora Marks Dauenhauer and her partner, anthropologist Richard Dauenhauer have recorded “the words of [Tlingit] elders” in Alaska. Like the examples above, the knowledge conveyed by these community members preserves community knowledge, regenerates traditions and supports claims to traditional lands. The collection consists of more than five large volumes. One focuses on clan crests, names and land, and describes their acquisition by the ancestors. Another on Tlingit speeches, most of which are shared at “taking-away-grief” ceremonies. It includes short biographies and photographs of the orators that contributed to the publication. According to one reviewer, the information revealed in these texts has huge cultural significance for the “political and social history of the Tlingit people of Alaska.”

The Dauenhauers’ work is an important contribution to Tlingit cultural resurgence and the revival and continuance of Tlingit traditions. The texts do much to instil pride in community members. They emphasize the Tlingit culture’s deep roots in the past. For the Dauenhauers, the stories included in the text also serve to buffer the impact of colonialism. “[W]ith an 80% native high school drop-out rate in some communities,” they write, “and with raising rates of teenage suicide and subsistence abuse” plaguing the Tlingit people, they argue that injecting Tlingit knowledge into the school system as a

121 Marshall, Those Who Fell from the Sky, xiii
means to restore pride and address community problems “is worth a try.” As well, the texts serve as teaching tools for Tlingit youth. At a time when a lot of knowledge keepers are passing on, the books serve to connect the younger generation with the old ways of the Elders in the hopes that they will continue their Tlingit traditions and, in turn, begin to restore their perspectives of the past.

In addition to working collaboratively with scholars, many Indigenous peoples are producing their own scholarly work. In 2000, Gloria Jean Frank from the Ahousaht First Nation (Nuu-chah-nulth) published an article in *BC Studies* titled “‘That’s my Dinner on Display’: A First Nations Reflection on Museum Culture.” A revised version of an essay written for a graduate course in the Department of History at the University of Victoria, Frank’s article critiqued the *First Peoples* exhibit at the Royal BC Museum in Victoria. Central to Frank’s argument was the “permanent” *First Peoples* exhibit located Indigenous culture and history in the distant past with little connection to the present. Frank argued that “many of the objects housed in display may not be entirely defunct and antiquated.” After all, many of the items were still being used by her contemporaries. Frank drew on personal experience and knowledge to challenge the larger colonial claims being made by the Royal BC Museum, that First Nations culture – at least in its purest pre-contact form – is dead.

Tommy Happynook, huu?ii/at (pronounced Huu-ay-aht), drew on customary and family knowledge to challenge the colonial and anthropological misrepresentation of the haWiih (hereditary leaders) system of governance. In his 2010 Master’s thesis, he

---
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challenged outdated mainstream and colonial contexts. Nusquimata (Jacinda Mack), a member of the Nuxalk and Secwepemc First Nations, also used an alternative form in her York University thesis in Anthropology. Her film, *Remember Ista: Nuxalk Perspectives on Sovereignty and Social Change* (2006), examines the Nuxalk’s recent stand against a logging campaign to clear-cut a valley within their territory. “Ista,” Mack explained, is “a song, a dance, and a story, all of which retell our heritage, our responsibilities, and our connection to the creator, to the land and to each other.” The film included what Mack called “in-person elements,” oral storytelling, personal recounting and visual experience. The film tackles the legacy of colonialism as experienced by members of her community. For Mack, *Remember Ista* allowed her community to “tell their own story.”

In 2008, Megan F. Moody, also from the Nuxalk Nation, wrote an MA thesis titled “Eulachon past and present” in the School of Environmental Studies at the University of Victoria. Focusing on the past and present uses of the eulachon fish by the Nuxalk people and, more specifically, her own family and community, Moody acknowledged that Nuxalk fisheries have received little historical and contemporary documentation and their uses are little known outside the community. To fill this gap found in the mainstream records, she drew on traditional and local ecological knowledge via community interviews. Moody’s scholarship demonstrates that Indigenous peoples are telling their histories in a variety of disciplines.

128 Tommy Happynook, “iN sii /aZ niS Kvii sii yuk mit kin: The end of one journey is the beginning of another,” (M.A. thesis, University of Victoria, 2010).
In her doctoral dissertation in Law (University of Victoria), Val Napoleon focused on the Gitksan legal order, laws, and legal theory.\(^{132}\) In an interview for the “Torch,” the University of Victoria’s alumni magazine, Napoleon explained that her research was a form of ‘legal anthropology’ because it crossed ethnography, history and Gitksan knowledges.\(^{133}\) What interested her was “how people talked about Gitksan law and how people acted on Gitksan law” as well as how legal theorists, political theorists and Indigenous theorists interacted with Gitksan law.\(^{134}\) “Most of that law is based on oral history (both formal and informal)” she explained, “and may be also represented in songs and artwork.”\(^{135}\) Furthermore, like with Indigenous history, “trained memories are [also part of] the archive of law, even if it’s not written down.”\(^{136}\) Napoleon’s work challenges mainstream notions of history and law by identifying how the disciplines have homogenized Gitksan knowledges through court and legal processes.

These five Indigenous scholars are part of an emerging trend in academia to challenge mainstream and official knowledge sets. Their work highlights personal and collective knowledge in academic settings. They also showcase how Indigenous peoples, especially of younger generations, are finding new and innovative ways to celebrate and promote cultural knowledge and resurgence.

One final example of this reclaiming of the past is found in *StrongMan: A Tlingit Story.* Written by Ishmael Hope and illustrated by Dimi Macheras, it re-tells the story of “the Strong Man.” Hope and Macheras base their account on a story originally told by Tlingit


\(^{134}\) Ibid.

\(^{135}\) Ibid.

\(^{136}\) Ibid.
storyteller Frank Johnson and first published by the Dauenhauers (mentioned earlier). Hope and Macheras got permission from both the Dauenhauers and Edward Thomas, Frank Johnson’s maternal nephew, to use the story in a new way. Hope also asked the late Elizabeth Katasse, the matriarch of the clan for permission to re-tell the story. The two young men presented the story of Strong Man in the form of a comic book. As Hope writes in the opening page of the comic,

Dimi and I have viewed this undertaking as a way of extending the history, of finding new genres to express ancient (and still relevant) traditions. Yet, as individual artists, we’ve strived to find our own voices and styles.137

In the case of Strong Man, Hope and Macheras adapt traditional ways of telling history to fit “contemporary plotlines.” “In this way,” writes Hope, “the traditional and the contemporary intersect, making the past and present conversant with each other, and, hopefully, enhancing each other.”138

The various examples shared in this section demonstrate how Indigenous peoples in BC are finding ways to tell their histories as they know and experienced them. As historian Susan Miller writes, these histories “often begin and end with the living.”139

Indigenous peoples are contributing to the Indigenous archive using a number of different mediums: locally operated museums, community publications, public art forms, theses, dissertations and comic books. In their own ways, these works move – some more subtly than others – beyond the traumas of the past by focusing purposefully on Indigenous peoples’ strengths and resiliencies. As Christine Welsh writes, the stories,

138 Hope and Macheras, Strong Man: A Tlingit Story, no page number.
poems, songs and films such as those shared here are proof of our survival and
continuance.  At the same time, these stories also work to challenge mainstream
history’s often exclusionary nature. With young people interviewing family members and
elders, and young and old alike sharing their stories, this multigenerational and
intergenerational re-storying of history serves to create community solidarity and hope.
These many voices – distinct by mode of transmission only – are all saying the same
thing: we are still here and these are our stories.

Conclusion

Anthropologist Julie Cruikshank argues that “academic narratives…can be enlarged if
we take seriously the stories people tell about themselves.” The stories that Indigenous
peoples are telling of themselves, although diverse in presentation and scope, share many
commonalities. All address the legacy of colonialism – sometimes from individual
perspectives, sometimes from community perspectives. Central to this is the legacy of the
residential school experience. The works shared here demonstrate that many, if not all,
Indigenous peoples are affected by the past and are making an effort to come to terms
with it in different ways. The work outlined here also show us that Indigenous peoples
are confronting this past while at the same time trying to move forward. This process,
again, looks different for everyone. Some communities are producing works that
commemorate survival and encourage Indigenous youth and other community members
to take pride in their traditions, language and history in an attempt to move beyond the
hardships of the remembered past.

140 Christine Welsh, “Women in the Shadow: Reclaiming a Métis Heritage.” in Feminism in the Cinema, ed. Laura
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Indigenous histories are carried by “rememberers” and, as Luise White argues, they reveal the world from the point of view of the storyteller. The many storytellers, or history-tellers, for that matter, force us to ask challenging questions about the sources upon which historians typically draw. “At issue in the project of interrogating archival evidence – what counts, what doesn’t, where it is housed, who possesses it, and who lays claim to it as a political resource – is not theory,” writes Burton, “but the very power of historical explanation itself. At risk is the presumption that history is simply the study of the past, rather than the study of the past and its ‘living active existence’ in the present.”

Mainstream BC Indigenous history has largely been “the study of the past.” It has failed, like Burton suggests, to recognize its living counterpart in the present. Its living counterpart, in this case, is Indigenous history. Indigenous history is largely rooted in first-hand knowledge and based on experience. Who better to exemplify this than the creators of the works shared here? As Burton offers:

At a time when the practice of professional history appears to have so little grip on the contemporary imagination – when History of the academic variety is thought to be so persistently irrelevant to the average person’s experiences, identities and desires – it seems fitting that we are, effectively, all archivists now.

Indigenous peoples are creating histories that are “testimonies to the richness, variety, detail, and complexity of the interpretations of history,” writes historian Waziyatawin. “Our role as historians should be to examine as many perspectives of the past as possible – not to become the validators or verifiers of stories, but instead to put forth as many
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perspectives as possible.”¹⁴⁴ What the two latter scholars are arguing for is a broadening of history to include that which Indigenous peoples are creating themselves in their own ways.

After all, the issue has not been that “Native peoples were ever wordless,” writes Indigenous writer Emma LaRocque, “but that, in Canada, their words were literally and politically negated.”¹⁴⁵ There is no denying that there are underlying issues that prevent Indigenous histories from being recognized as history. According to historian Ann-Louise Shapiro, this is true about anything that challenges a discipline built upon entrenched ways of “knowing”:

While it cannot exactly be news to historians that there are many kinds of history, emerging from different sorts of producers, within disparate specialized languages, for various ends; it is certainly also the case that the issues linked to this awareness typically inhabit the fringes of our professional consciousness, and come into focus via mostly uncomfortable prods from outside the academy.¹⁴⁶

Perhaps it is the very “discomfort” raised by these Indigenous histories that historians are hesitant to engage.

In her study of Lytton’s mission history, Emma Battell Lowman argued that there are serious silences in BC historiography around twentieth-century Indigenous experiences. Manifestations of the “pioneer complex” in BC historiography, she argues, encourage emphasis on the nineteenth-century narratives of discovery, settlement and conquest to


¹⁴⁵ Emma LaRocque as quoted by Laura J. Beard, “Giving Voice: Autobiographical/Testimonial Literature by First Nations Women in British Columbia,” Studies in American Indian Literature 12, no. 3 (Fall 2000), 68.

the exclusion of events of the twentieth-century.\(^{147}\) Lowman wonders if “the problem stems from feelings of guilt and discomfort in the wake of revelations about national projects of cultural genocide directed against Indigenous peoples.” As she puts it:

Distanced temporally from the present, predating entrenchment of the colonial order in B.C., and untainted by the excesses of the residential school system, this can be seen as perhaps a “safer” period of study.\(^{148}\)

But do histories that distance themselves from the present – and ignore the painful, emotional and subjective experiences of the Indigenous past – have an impact on our general understanding of Indigenous peoples today? Write Greg Sarris, of Kashaya Pomo and Miwok ancestry, suggests that scholars are sometimes unaware of the consequences of their work in a historical and political realm.\(^{149}\) Ignoring Indigenous peoples’ past and present colonial experiences of the twentieth century in mainstream historiography, and instead building and sustaining an historical enterprise that focuses on the distant past – perhaps has made it easier to pretend that there are no “issues”.

What accounts for the disparity between how the past is remembered (by Indigenous peoples) and how it is written about (by mainstream historians)? Why do some historians continue to relegate Indigenous peoples to the distant past? Why do some continue to sideline an Indigenous archive in favour of the colonial one? The next chapter turns to these questions and suggests that perhaps it is because the Indigenous archive consists of personal stories that lead to emotional spheres, which has resulted in it being discounted or dismissed. Twentieth century Indigenous histories have emerged from the aftermath of


recent and continued colonialism. The question then becomes: what do we historians do with these emotional histories when we have reached a point where it is inappropriate to continue ignoring them?
Chapter Four: Conclusion

My dad died when I was seven. He was thirty-five. Two months prior to his death he was in a mining accident that broke some of his ribs and his nose. Despite being almost fully recovered from the accident, he went to the hospital several times complaining of chest pain and an inability to breathe comfortably. The hospital staff turned him away, saying that injured ribs “always hurt like that” and that if he wanted to get better, he should quit smoking. Days after his last attempt to see a doctor, he died in his sleep on a friend’s couch. The coroner concluded that he died of “natural causes” that had nothing to do with the mining accident. My mom wanted the coroner to do an investigation into the hospital staff admittance procedures because she thought the hospital staff had been negligent, but she needed my dad’s family’s permission and they refused to comply. Their consensus was to just let it be. Since my mom could not afford a private investigation on her own, she had to let it go; they all did. My dad was buried on 18 November 1988 atop a hill in the community cemetery overlooking our families’ traditional territories and the village of Carmacks, Yukon.

For a long time, I knew that something was not right about his death. It was not his age, although thirty-five is very young to die of “natural causes,” nor was it the fact that his family did not demand an inquiry. It was that he was turned away from the hospital, repeatedly. I cannot help but wonder if the outcome might have been different had he been seen by a doctor. I remember my great aunt – a white, upper-middle-class woman of European ancestry – saying that he should have demanded to see a doctor. For a while, I thought that too. Why did he not demand to see a doctor? With time and education, I
began to understand his death, as well as his supposed failure to demand assistance, his siblings’ recoil from an inquiry, and my aunt’s comment, differently. I now understand the whole situation to be part of a larger and more complex history. To borrow the words of another Indigenous scholar, I learned of a new language that I could use “to make sense of the things that were happening around me.”

I went to university to study the history of Indigenous peoples. Through the knowledge and the people I encountered at university and through paying attention to a broader Indigenous archive, I learned that this history is messy and unsettling. It is rife with stories of neglect, racism, violence and inequality. It is a history of silences. Between these silences are stories of courage, persistence, and our own stories of determination. I also learned that Indigenous history is a history of colonialism. This new vocabulary has shaped how I understand my dad’s death and how I see it in the larger context of Canada’s colonial present and colonial past.

The events that led up to my dad’s death and the events that followed are an expression of a broader colonial narrative. We have a hospital—an institution of power—and we have hospital staff, nurses, and doctors—wielders of power. We have a young Indigenous man who, at the time, was a residential school “survivor” struggling with an alcohol addiction. He was part of a family and a community that had been subjugated by the state and dominant society for more than a century. These worlds had collided time and again throughout my dad’s life. Sadly, like a lot of other Indigenous peoples’ family stories, the ending to my dad’s is all too familiar.

Why share this story? Because it speaks to a number of concerns I have about Indigenous history – how we as Indigenous peoples remember and tell it versus how dominant society chooses to remember and tell it. This particular family story reminds me that colonial history is playing out around us. It illustrates how Indigenous history is remembered by the living, and the degree to which it is emotional and personal. My story is also a history that runs counter to a dominant narrative of power and privilege. My history reflects themes that are mirrored by the whole of the Indigenous archive of BC. When I think about my family history, I understand the link between the past and the present -- a link that forces into focus the major silences in mainstream BC Indigenous histories. Through the process of researching and writing this thesis, I have become even more connected to my own identity as an Indigenous woman and, in many ways, I have learned what it means to be accountable to my own familial history.

When my great aunt inferred that had my dad demanded service, he’d still be alive, she basically blamed him for his own death. Her comments demonstrate to me that the stories that society tells itself – using history, the dominant public and private discourses, which are coloured by privilege – reinforce a certain picture of the past and a certain understanding of the present. Unfortunately, dominant society’s views – as well as my aunt’s – obscure the larger social, structural and institutional factors that continue to control how Indigenous peoples live their lives. My aunt’s statement is representative of a viewpoint that ignores the fact that Indigenous people continue to live with the consequences of colonization and continued colonialism, and are simultaneously blamed for their situation. Yet when we offer our version of the story, our views are denied legitimacy because dominant society has the power to dismiss them. What I want to
understand now is why British Columbians get to live free of the consequences of a “brutal” past when they played a part in creating it.

I will conclude my thesis by exploring the effects of what Waziyatawin terms “the distortion of history” with regards to the production of BC history today.151 This distortion of history leaves an impression on the way that the public – those outside the discipline of history – views and understands Indigenous peoples. What are those effects? How do they impact Indigenous peoples living today? As Emma LaRocque notes, “destructive attitudes, unabashed biases, polices, and violence that we footnote cannot be mere intellectual or scholarly exercises. They do affect Native peoples, real human lives.”152 If what John Tosh writes is true -- that our political, social, and cultural milieu is understood and informed by history -- then historians have a larger community, beyond simply their colleagues, to which they are accountable.

When historians write Indigenous history, they are doing more than just writing about Indigenous peoples in the past, they are setting the stage for how we understand and treat Indigenous peoples in the present. Professional historians interpret, represent, and write our past. In doing so, they have the power to emphasize some aspects and downplay others. In fact, according to historian Philip J. Deloria, “[p]ower relations continue to make it possible for Euro-Americans to choose to write about history through Euro-American lenses.”153 Historians doing this focus on certain "safe" topics, while relegating
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others to “collective memory.” This is aided by categorizing Indigenous perspectives as too emotional and too subjective; therefore, illegitimizing our forms of knowledge and our perspectives of the past. According to Emma Battell Lowman, historians “are subject to, and wielders of, power.” Her point raises an important question: how can historians of Indigenous history wield their power in a way that is responsible and also accountable to the people about whom they write?

The Indigenous scholars and others who inform this thesis have taken a strong stance on the issue of producing history responsibly and respectfully. Choctaw scholar Devon Mieshuah writes of “useful” scholarship – scholarship that is written with the intention of drawing attention to and/or “helping” Indigenous peoples in their current circumstances. Similarly, in her article “A Discussion of Scholarly Responsibilities to Indigenous Communities,” Cherokee historian Joyce Ann Keivit asks: “If essays are going to continue to be reprinted in anthologies, then why can we not see more collections of papers devoted to the historical roots of why Natives are in their current situations, in addition to proposed solutions to their concerns?” I appreciate and endorse their insistence on the necessity of ethical and responsive scholarship. Writing “useful” scholarship that at the very least recognizes current circumstances and sets out to right them, is what is required to be accountable to the people about whose lives (past and present) historians are writing.

Why do ethically responsible histories matter? In 1985 David Cohen circulated a paper insisting that “[a] question central for historians and anthropologists, and others, becomes
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'what is the fate of expert knowledge of the past as members of the crafts of guilds of the historical disciplines recognize, or are forced to recognize, the immense power created as people popularly process the past outside the work of the guild’?"157 Understanding the power of history in relationship to British Columbia’s current political and social context is critical and should not go without serious consideration. Ninety percent of the land mass within BC’s borders is unceded and is non-treaty land.158 Indigenous communities continue to experience ongoing dispossession and contemporary deprivation and poverty159 and we are just now coming to realize the detrimental and invasive inter-generational damage residential schooling has had on Indigenous peoples, not to mention the continued effects of past and present colonialism. This has reared its head in a number of tragic forms: alcohol and substance abuse, addictions, suicides, domestic violence, child abuse, sexual abuse, disproportionate representation of Indigenous peoples in correctional facilities and living on the streets, difficulty accessing social services, and an array of other detrimental health issues.

In his most recent work Why History Matters, Tosh points out that “[t]ime and again complex policy issues are placed before the public without adequate explanation of how they have come to assume their present shape, and without any hint of the possibilities which are disclosed by the record of the past.”160 In BC, the historiography that informs the public is distorted. For the most part it focuses on the deep past; it includes very few named Indigenous participants; and is founded on Euro-North American documents and perspectives that, by nature, are deficient in Indigenous voices and perspectives. For the

most part, Indigenous views are filtered through non-Indigenous collaborators – historians, anthropologists and the like. In their quest for objectivity, academics have in fact objectified Indigenous peoples making them into entities that are not us and totally non-relatable.

Mainstream histories about Indigenous peoples are unemotional, impersonal and disconnected from its human participants. They misinform dominant society about its active and passive role in the devastation of our past. Instead of challenging the status quo, historians are in fact producing scholarship that feeds it and that continues to dehumanize Indigenous peoples whether purposefully or inadvertently. Looking at BC history this way challenges us to reconsider its production, goals and motivations, and its impact upon wider society.

We are at a crossroads. As historians, we can continue along the route we are on – or we can radically shift how we tell history. Whichever path historians choose will determine how we move forward and how we deal with the legacy of our unjust past: either through denial and conformity, or through ethical justice and “truth-telling.”

Consider the following: “Settlers must confront our duplicity and hypocrisy,” writes Paulette Regan, “our denial and guilt about the past is not really past, but continues to define our relationship with Indigenous peoples today. A relationship that is rooted in the non-recognition of Indigenous history and presence in what is now called Canada.”

In contrast to non-Indigenous peoples’ non-recognition is an Indigenous peoples’ archive that calls attention to the silences in the historical record and the past/present injustices we experience on a regular basis. Indigenous peoples demand redress by putting forward counter-narratives that challenge the dominant understanding of the past.
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As Waziyatawin argues, “the recovery of other forms or knowledge requires abandoning or challenging existing academic norms.”¹⁶² The authors, poets, artists, storytellers, and Indigenous scholars profiled here demonstrate that this is possible by “re-storying” BC’s past using our own personal experience, memories and family stories as our sources of knowledge. These sources are important because they are emotional, subjective and based on first- and second-hand experience.

Historians are quick to point out how such sources of knowledge fail to meet academic standards of rationality, objectivity and legitimacy. They are considered to be generally unreliable on their own. As a result, therefore, many Indigenous peoples’ views continue to be supplementary, and are assumed to require some degree of contextualizing and qualifying by the “official” record. Historian Barbara H. Rosenwein explains that:

[D]espite a generation’s worth of social and cultural history, the discipline has never quite lost its attraction to hard, rational things. Emotions have seemed tangential (if not fundamentally opposed) to the historical enterprise.¹⁶³

As Rosenwien’s comment suggests, not only have historians ignored the place of emotion in their work, many resist it outright. “Since the time of Decartes,” argues Neal Oxenhandler, “the reasons which motivate the resistance to [the] emotive have been extremely consistent.”¹⁶⁴ Emotion, Oxenhandler and others argue, is considered too subjective to be useful. Subjectivity, they stress, goes against the grain of historicity which is based on objectivity. Emotion, which is considered “passive or involuntary,” cannot be analyzed based on “reason.”¹⁶⁵ Instead, an historical analysis based on
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¹⁶² Wilson, “Reclaiming our Humanity,” in Indigenizing the Academy, 77.
emotional concepts and impressions must rely on “empirical estimation,” and such an approach is simply not acceptable in conventional history-writing. Oxenhandler explains: “judgments based on such concepts are [believed to be] fatally tainted,” again, “with subjectivity.”\(^{166}\) Furthermore, he notes, emotion “provides no basis for the exercise of analytic power and control over the text.”\(^{167}\) Yet, this thesis has set out to challenge this stance by highlighting not only the value of emotion, but the power it has to influence us as we move towards broadening our understanding of the past.

However, when we frame the academic requirements and constraints highlighted above in the larger context of BC history – and within the understanding that Settler society needs to legitimize its social, economic and political position using history– the historical enterprise’s motivation for silencing our perspectives becomes even clearer. Perhaps it is not so much how Indigenous people are telling their histories, it is what we are saying. Our memories about the past and the stories we tell not only pose a challenge to the historical enterprise, they challenge the mainstream belief that dominant society’s past and present actions are and were legitimate.

I think we have reached an apex, not just as historians, but as inhabitants of this place. The real wrongdoers in this situation have to take responsibility for their actions and inactions. Who are these people? In the context of British Columbia, it is anyone who chooses to live in these unceded territories. With the choice to live here comes great responsibility. We have to confront how it is we got here. This requires asking “whose land is this?” Asking this question and attempting to answer truthfully reveals the very roots of the silences about our unjust past. Yet in order to move forward justly and fairly,

\(^{166}\) Oxenhandler, “The Changing Concept of Literary Emotion,” 105.
not only do these questions have to be posed to all who live here, they have to be answered ethically. For too long, the dominant society has had the privilege to deny that this land has been stolen from its original inhabitants. They have the luxury of creating, teaching and reading histories that support their position while discrediting others that challenge it.

Tosh writes of history playing a crucial part in the intellectual equipment of the active, concerned citizen.\textsuperscript{168} How do we create active, concerned citizens in BC? How do we get mainstream society to take responsibility for being here on unceded lands? How do we get them to care? These are tough questions and ones that I cannot answer. There is also a part of me that suspects that these are perhaps the wrong questions to be asking because they are rooted in the assumption that British Columbians will care and will be accountable to the past \textit{if} ethically informed. Perhaps what is required is not so much the right questions, but identifying and engaging in a new course of action; one that requires a paradigm shift.

For a long time, and in a lot of ways, the onus of proof has been on Indigenous peoples. It is our responsibility to prove this is our land, that we used it, and that we used it exclusively. We have to prove that we were abused at residential school or that we are not negligent parents. We have to prove that our knowledge is legitimate, that our oral stories and traditions are truths, and that the facts in our oral histories are not from a book. We also have to prove that we are the original inhabitants of this land and that we got here the ways our ancestors say we did. It is time that Indigenous peoples are relieved of their burden to prove and that the emphasis be shifted elsewhere.

What we should be questioning is not how Indigenous peoples are failing to assimilate to or meet the standards of the mainstream framework – be it professional history, Canadian culture, or Western societal norms – but the very framework to which we are forcing Indigenous peoples to conform. In the quest for an inclusive, respectful, and ethical historical enterprise, the “problem” lies not with subjective and emotional sources, but with the academy’s reluctance to consider those sources legitimate. Indigenous peoples who live in the present, and who are always haunted by the past, offer access to an Indigenous archive that can recalibrate the way we understand BC history. Professional historians can no longer claim that they “lack” sources with which to understand an Indigenous perspective of the past. As this thesis has demonstrated, a rich, multi-layered, vibrant – and, yes, emotional and subjective – Indigenous archive exists, and continues to be created. The onus lies with historians to recognize this archive, and to take it seriously.

The implications of this recognition goes beyond the walls of the academy. Historians have a role to play in creating knowledge and influencing public opinion more broadly. Academic histories are the basis for public knowledge. Often historians are called upon as the voice of historical reason, they are interviewed on public television and radio; their works are published online, in newspapers and magazines; their opinions are taken verbatim in Canadian courts. Their audience is broad and susceptible. The historians' responsibility is great and should not be taken for granted. Layer this responsibility with the social and historical context of Indigenous British Columbia and it's hard to deny the historians’ powerful role in interpreting the past and influencing the present.
In my own questioning of mainstream history, I have come to a new understanding of my dad’s death. There is perhaps no more powerful reminder of the capacity of the historical enterprise to shape the way we understand ourselves and our place within society. Antoinette Burton, as quoted earlier, has reminded us that history is losing its grip on the imaginations of contemporary peoples. Yet, if we are going to take it seriously and actually use it as a catalyst for change, then Indigenous people (all people, for that matter) need a place to tell their stories. To make space for our stories, the veil of denial that distorts our views of the past needs to be lifted, and we must accept that the “destruction of persons, of culture, of entire populations,” as Michael Harkin writes, is not simply a story of the past, but of the present. “These events,” Harkins reminds us, “are experienced and remembered with emotion.”169 And it is these sometimes horrific events of our shared past – mine and yours – that remind us what it means to be human, what it means to not just share feelings of happiness and courage, but loss, fear, and sadness. If we deny these feelings, we deny the essence of our human experience. And if history is not the record of our past human experiences and the foundation upon which we build our future human experiences, then what is it?
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